

A Conceptual Review on the Relationship between Teacher Self-Efficacy and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

Yuen Onn Choong, Jamal @ Nordin bin Yunus & Hamidah binti Yusof

Faculty of Management and Economics, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia

Email: alexleochoongvo@gmail.com

Abstract

The main objective of this study is to examine the relationship between dimensionality of teacher self-efficacy and organisational citizenship behaviour amongst teachers at government school, Malaysia. Teacher self-efficacy is comprised of personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy. A research issue is highlighted and discussed in detail and thoroughly. A theoretical background for both construct: efficacy theory and organisational citizenship behaviour have been systematically and clearly discussed. Both constructs are also found to be significantly contributed to the school achievement positively. The conceptual framework is also developed based on past empirical arguments. Numerous contributions are pointed out and adequate justification is provided. Past studies revealed and confirmed the relationship between personal teaching efficacy and organisational citizenship behaviour as well as between general teaching efficacy and organisational citizenship behaviour. Hypothesis is formulated that used to achieve research objective.

Keywords:

organisational citizenship behaviour, collective efficacy, teachers

INTRODUCTION

Due to the globalisation and internationalisation, education sector is playing an important role in producing competent manpower in order to ensure Malaysia are competitive enough to other Asian Countries and even countries from all over the world. Further to this, the OECD has pointed out that school receiving a lot of challenges due to demands from society (Demand-sensitive schooling?: evidence and issues, 2006). Malaysian Government is willing and accepts the challenges by “transform the teaching profession into a profession of choice, empowering state and district education offices and schools, and promoting greater parent and community involvement” (Malaysia Economic Monitor: High-Performing Education, 2013, p.47). With the challenges faced by Malaysian Government, it is a must for teachers to work beyond their formal job duties and responsibilities in order to success in future (Runhaar, Konermann & Sander, 2013; Somech & Ron, 2007). It seems apparent that organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) are vital constructs for schools as both constructs are salient aspects for creation and maintenance of effective learning environments (Dipaola & Hoy, 2005a; Dipaola & Hoy, 2005b; Dipaola, Tarter & Hoy, 2005).

Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) is originally developed by Organ (1988). The term of OCB has been applied and envisaged as a salient guise in various industries context (Chiang & Hsieh, 2012; Lee, & Low, 2012; Jo & Joo, 2011; Jiang, Sun & Law, 2011; Bolon, 1997). However, the concept of OCB has been neglected in schools context (Erturk, 2007; Dipaola & Hoy, 2005a; Dipaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Erturk (2007) indicated that it is lack of study focus on OCB in School setting. In 2009, there is only ten studies research on OCB in school context (Yilmaz & Tasdan, 2009; Oplatka, 2006). This is also mentioned in Oplatka (2009). Thereafter, there are more than 20 studies has been conducted in different country in education industry such as Israel (Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000; 2004; Somech & Ron, 2007; Belogolovsky & Somech, 2010), Ohio in United Stated (Dipaola & Hoy, 2005a; 2005b; Dipaola & da Costa Neves, 2009), Queensland in Australia (Jimmieson, Hannam & Yeo, 2010) and India (Garg & Rastogo, 2006). Hence, it is still

required substantial effort and study on OCB in education sector (Schwabsky, 2014). Yimaz and Tasdan (2009) stated that OCB is relatively new to education sector.

Likewise, in Malaysia, there is a paucity of empirical study focus on education sector (Khalid, Kamaruzaman Jusoff, Othman, Ismail & Abdul Rahman, 2010; Fatimah, Amiraa & Halim, 2011; Khan & Abdul Rashid, 2012; Teh, Boerhannoeddin & Ismail, 2012; Munir, Khan, Khalifah, Asif & Khan, 2014). Meh and Nasurdin (2009) also mentioned that there is limited research on OCB among teachers in Malaysia education industry. In order to encourage teachers to practice citizenship behaviour, it is important to have TSE so as to perform a task confidently. Teachers with low sense of efficacy will reduce the willingness and ability to practice OCB in their workplace. Several studies have identified that TSE is significantly contributed to OCB and positively impact on student achievement and school effectiveness (Cooper, 2010; Dussault, 2006). The construct of TSE has been found to be significantly related to various aspects of education (Jackson, 2009) such as teacher's willingness to try different classroom instructional approaches with their students during classes (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). Instead of testing TSE as an overall towards OCB, it is also worth to be examine the dimensionality of TSE towards OCB. Hence, the main purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between the dimensionality of TSE and OCB in school environment.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The term OCB has been constructed in the past decades and a widespread component of organisational literature in recent years. Although the concept has been researched for decades, it still continues to be a popular topic for most of academicians. The existence of the concept has produced great contributions to various types of organisation (Spitzmuller, Van Dyne & Ilies, 2008; Dalal, 2005; Ilies, Nahrgang & Morgeson, 2007; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000; Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff & Blume, 2009). In the 1980s, there are about 13 related OCB articles that have been published online. Due to the popularity of the construct, the number of publications related to OCB has increased dramatically to nearly 200 records in 1990s and reached over 650 records in 2000s (Podsakoff et al., 2000; Podsakoff et al., 2009). The number of publications is in growing rapidly whereby they are empirically and conceptually enlarging the theoretical and practical knowledge of OCB concept. Podsakoff and his colleague have identified several reasons of why OCB is one of the main domains of scholars' research topic. In view of Podsakoff et al. (2009), the main reason is that OCB has been empirically proven to have significant positive effect on organizational effectiveness (Borman, 2004; Podsakoff et al., 2009). Hence, it is important for scholars to shift their focus to OCB concept. The inconsistent result generated by past researchers is another reason for researchers to pay more attention on the antecedents and consequences of OCB (Podsakoff et al., 2009). The third reason is that the managerial evaluations and reward allocation decision are largely depending on both OCB and task performance. Therefore, it is worth and essential to examine the effect of difference between OCB and task performance (Podsakoff et al., 2009).

In the mid of 1960's, Katz (1964) also introduced and addressed the OCB as supra-role behaviour. The supra-role behaviour can be defined as non-prescribed behaviour or behaviours that are not required in advance for a given job (Katz & Kahn, 1966). This behaviour is vital to ensure the smooth function in any organization but this behaviour is not prescribed as usual notion of task performance stated in formal job description (Katz & Kahn, 1966). Bateman and Organ (1983) stated that this behaviour "lubricates the social machinery

of the organization” (p. 588). For instance: assisting and helping co-workers to solve problematic job-related issues, ensuring workplace cleanliness, helping co-workers with heavy workloads, conserving organization resources and tolerating the inevitable temporary impositions of work without complaining (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Katz & Kahn, 1966). Conversely, Organ and his colleagues re-operationalised and named the concept as OCB instead of supra-role behaviour which was previously conceived by Katz (1964) (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983). In accordance to their operationalization work, they defined OCB as “individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p. 4).

Substantial researchers have constructed different citizenship like behavior such as the original construct introduced by Smith et al. (1983) which consists of two dimensions named: altruism and generalized compliance, the five dimensions OCB construct from Organ (1988; 1990), two dimensions constructed by Williams and Anderson (1991) in private organizations and Skarlicki and Latham (1995) in university setting, five dimensions of contextual performance by Borman and Motowidlo (1993; 1997) and three dimensions of citizenship behavior constructed by Coleman and Boorman (2000). However, Dipaola and his colleague argued that the term OCB can be defined differently in service organizations such as universities, hospitals and schools that normally employ professionals to work with their organizations. Therefore, OCB constructs and measurements that is well constructed and proposed in earlier research studies are not applicable in Dipaola and his colleagues’ study. The adoption of 16 items scales measurement originally developed by Smith et al. (1983) have been tested comprehensively and re-structure the measurements to 15 items. Two different samples of schools studies have been conducted with factor analysis which discovered only one strong factor. This is concluded that OCB in school setting will only have one dimension instead of five separate distinct dimensions which were previously mentioned by Organ (1988). Both dimensions: altruism and generalised compliance dimensions construct of Smith and his colleague are combined to become a single bipolar construct (Dipaola & Hoy, 2005a). The reason behind this single dimension OCB construct is that OCB is context specific. Hence, this resulted in earlier studies producing a series of different OCB constructs. Second, the school setting or teacher profession is very different compared to private organization or other profession (Dipaola & Hoy, 2005a). The main goal for school organization is to improve student achievement. Eventually, this will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of school as an overall.

TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY

Gibson and Dembo (1984) have applied the concept of self-efficacy into teaching sector. There are two factors of self-efficacy identified by Gibson and his colleague which are general teaching efficacy and personal teaching efficacy. Most of the studies found that the two separate dimensions or factors are still debatable topics (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Goddard, Hoy & Hoy, 2000; Pajares, 1997; Tschannen-Moran, Hoy & Hoy, 1998). The personal teaching efficacy refers to one own feelings of competence as a teacher. It is unlikely to general teaching efficacy. There are a lot of arguments for the labels of this factor. Hence, there are a number of different labels proposed by scholars.

Emmer and Hickman (1990) has named the second factor as “external influences” which is similar to the construct developed by Rotter’s known as external control or beyond teachers’ control. It is likewise to Riggs and Enochs (1990), they have labelled the second

factor as outcome expectancy. From Tschannen-Moran and Hoy's point of view, outcome expectancy is related to the construct of motivation as a person who is motivated and expected to exhibit the level of performance based on his or her capabilities in order to achieve the desired outcome. However, the nature of the meaning for general teaching efficacy is the possibilities of all teachers to attain certain outcome under the same circumstances or environment. Therefore, the labelled outcome expectancy is not appropriate to be used for the second factors of efficacy.

For TSE, it can be expressed as "the teacher's belief in his or her capability to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context" (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998, p. 233). Teachers with higher self-efficacy are perceived to have stronger ability to influence students' learning outcome (Ross, Cousins & Gadalla, 1996) and the teachers are more ambitious to set challenging standard on student learning progress for themselves (Brookhart & Loadman, 1993). Teachers will determine the amount of effort contributed to teaching and are willing to confront with problem encountered during teaching (Ross et al., 1996).

TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY AND ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Dussault (2006) claimed that there is a limited study tested on the relationship between TSE and OCB in school setting. The main objective of his study is to examine the relationship between TSE and OCB amongst French Canadian high school teachers. The measurement and construct of self-efficacy are adopted from a French Canadian researcher with 15 items. This measurement scale is originally from Gibson and Dembo (1984). A comprehensive confirmatory factor analysis is conducted with 15 items and factorized two components namely personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy. In view of the study, TSE is partially related to OCB. In view of Dussault (2006) findings, the personal teaching efficacy is related to OCB, whereas the general teaching efficacy is not related to OCB (Dussault, 2006). Teacher with higher sense of efficacy is more likely to volunteer to help or assist co-workers with work-related problem matters, restructure their working timetable to accommodate others and adopt different innovative classroom instructional approaches to students (Beauregard, 2012). Similarly to Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2000), it is found that teacher self-efficacy is significantly related to organisational citizenship behaviour whereby teachers with high self-efficacy is more willing to help weak students in terms of academic outcomes and continuously improve teaching performance through learning and integrate new teaching methods (Lauermaann, 2014; Lauermaann & Karabenick, 2013; Halvorsen, Lee & Andrade, 2009).

Dipaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) stated that OCB is something beyond their formal job tasks. The teacher formal job requirement and responsibility is highlighted by Lauermaann (2014). For example, the extra-role behaviour towards student is helping students on their own time or willing to spend extra time to guide students after their working hours (Dipaola & da Costa Neves, 2009). In fact, an individual with high self-efficacy will have higher ability and confident to carry out their job effectively and higher probability of success rate (Dussault, 2006; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000). In return, they are more likely to display OCB such as volunteer to assist colleague to solve work-related problems, to attend voluntary meetings, contribute extra time to work without demanding extra pay (Beauregard, 2012). As a result of the above studies, the expected relationship between self-efficacy and OCB is formed as follow:

Proposition: Teacher Self-Efficacy is significantly related to organisational citizenship behaviour.

CONCLUSION

The Malaysian Government is aiming to transform the country from middle-income nation to high-income nation by year 2020 (Economic Transformational Programme: A roadmap for Malaysia, 2010). The most essential key area in economic transformation programme (ETP) is education sector. It is mentioned by the Minister of Education that a successful and effective education system would significantly contribute to human capital development (Economic Transformational Programme: A roadmap for Malaysia, 2010). Hence, the improvement of school achievement is important to Malaysia as it would help Malaysia to achieve the objective of ETP and further develop Malaysia economy. This could be enhanced by inculcating the OCB in school environment whereby the adoption of OCB is essential to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of any organization (Jimmieson et al., 2010; Yucel, 2008, ; Erturk, 2007; Bogler & Somech, 2005; Dipaola & Hoy, 2005a; 2005b; Podsakoff et al., 2000).

REFERENCES

- 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.
- Beauregard, T. A. (2012). Perfectionism, self-efficacy and OCB: the moderating role of gender. *Personnel Review*, 41(5), 590-608.
- Belogolovsky, E., & Somech, A. (2010). Teachers' organizational citizenship behavior: examining the boundary between in-role behavior and extra-role behavior from the perspective of teachers, principals and parents. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 914-923.
- Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2005). Organizational citizenship behavior in school: How does it relate to participation indecision making? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(5), 420-438.
- Bolon, D. S. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior among hospital employees: a multidimensional analysis involving job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Hospital and Health Services Administration*, 42(2), 221-241.
- Borman, W. C. (2004). The concept of organisational citizenship. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13, 238-241.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, W.C. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations*. (pp. 71-98). San Francisco Jossey-Bass.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: the meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10, 99-109.
- Brookhart, S., & Loadman, W. (1993). Relations between self-confidence and educational beliefs before and after teacher education. Paper presented at the Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association., Atlanta, GA.
- Chiang, C. F., & Hsieh, T. S. (2012). The impacts of perceived organizational support and psychological empowerment on job performance: the mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31, 180-190.
- Coleman, V. I., & Borman, W. C. (2000). Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10, 25-44.

- Cooper, J. D. (2010). Collective efficacy, organizational citizenship behavior, and school effectiveness in Alabama public high schools. (Doctor of Education), University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organisational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241-1255.
- Demand-sensitive schooling?: evidence and issues. (2006). Retrieved from Paris:
- Dipaola, M., & da Costa Neves, P. M. M. (2009). Organizational citizenship behaviors in American and Portuguese public schools: measuring the construct across cultures. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47(4), 490-507.
- Dipaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11, 424-447.
- DiPaola, M. F., & Hoy, W. K. (2005a). Organizational citizenship of faculty and achievement of high school students. *The High School Journal*, 88, 35-44.
- Dipaola, M. F., & Hoy, W. K. (2005b). School characteristics that foster organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of School Leadership*, 15, 308-326.
- Dipaola, M. F., Tarter, C. J., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). Measuring organisational citizenship of schools: the OCB scale. In W. Hoy & C. Miskel (Eds.), *Education Leadership and Reform* (Vol. 4, pp. 319-341). Greenwich, CN: Information Age Publishing.
- Dussault, M. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Psychological Reports*, 98(2), 427-432.
- Emmer, E., & Hickman, J. (1990). Teacher decision making as a function of efficacy, attribution, and reasoned action. Paper presented at the Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.
- Erturk, A. (2007). Increasing organizational citizenship behaviors of Turkish academicians: mediating role of trust in supervisor on the relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 257-270.
- Fatimah, O., Amiraa, A. M., & Halim, F. W. (2011). The relationships between organizational justice, organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction. *Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 19, 115-121.
- Garg, P., & Rastogi, R. (2006). Climate profile and OCBs of teachers in public and private schools of India. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 20(7), 529-541.
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: a construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(4), 569-582.
- Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(2), 479-507.
- Halvorsen, A.-L., Lee, V. E., & Andrade, F. H. (2009). A mixed-method study of teachers' attitudes about teaching in urban and low-income schools. *Urban Education*, 44(2), 181-224.
- Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Leader-member exchange and citizenship behaviours: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 269-277.
- Jackson, J. C. (2009). Organizational citizenship behaviors, collective teacher efficacy, and student achievement in elementary schools. (Doctor of Education), The College of William and Mary, Virginia.
- Jiang, J. Y., Sun, L. Y., & Law, K. S. (2011). Job satisfaction and organization structure as moderators of the effects of empowerment on organizational citizenship behavior: a self-consistency and social exchange perspective. *International Journal of Management*, 28(3), 675-693.

- Jimmieson, N. L., Hannam, R. L., & Yeo, G. B. (2010). Teacher organizational citizenship behaviours and job efficacy: implications for student quality of school life. *British Journal of Psychology*, 101, 453-479.
- Jo, S. J., & Joo, B. K. (2011). Knowledge sharing: the influences of learning organisation culture, organisational commitment, and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Leadership and Organisational Studies*, 18(3), 353-364.
- Katz, D. (1964). Motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9, 131-146.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Khalid, A. S., Kamaruzaman Jusoff, H. J., Othman, M., & Abdul Rahman, N. (2010). Organizational citizenship behavior as a predictor of student academic achievement. *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 2(1), 65-71.
- Khan, S. K., & Abdul Rashid, M. Z. (2012). The mediating effect of organizational commitment in the organizational culture, leadership and organizational justice relationship with organizational citizenship behavior: a study of academicians in private higher learning institutions in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(8), 83-91.
- Lauermann, F. (2014). Teacher responsibility from the teacher's perspective. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 65, 75-89.
- Lauermann, F., & Karabenick, S. A. (2013). The meaning and measure of teachers' sense of responsibility for educational outcomes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 30(1), 13-26.
- Lee, K. L., & Low, G. T. (2012). Leadership styles and organizational citizenship behavior: the mediating effect of subordinates' competence and downward influence tactics. *Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, 13(2), 59-96.
- Malaysia economic monitor: High-performing education. (2013). Bangkok, Thailand: The World Bank Group.
- Meh, S. C., & Nasurdin, A. M. (2009). The relationships between job resources, job demands and teachers' OCB: concept paper. 1-12.
- Munir, Y., Khan, S.-U.-R., Khalifah, Z. B., Asif, T., & Khan, H. (2014). Interactive effect of organisational cynicism on perception of organisational politics and citizenship behaviour. *International Journal of Information Processing and Management*, 5(1), 18-27.
- Oplatka, I. (2006). Going beyond role expectations: toward an understanding of the determinants and components of teacher organizational citizenship behavior. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(3), 385-423.
- Oplatka, I. (2009). Organizational citizenship behavior in teaching: the consequences for teachers, pupils, and the school. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 23(5), 375-389.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: the good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In B. M. Staw & L. L. C. (Eds) (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 12, pp. 43-72). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Pajares, F. (1997). Current directions in self-efficacy research. In M. L. Maehr & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement* (pp. 1-49). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: a meta analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122-141.

- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- Riggs, I., & Enochs, L. (1990). Toward the development of an elementary teacher's science teaching belief instrument. *Science Education*, 74, 625-638.
- Ross, J. A., Cousins, J. B., & Gadalla, T. (1996). Within-teacher predictors of teacher efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 12(385-400).
- Runhaar, P., Konermann, J., & Sanders, K. (2013). Teachers' organisational citizenship behaviour: considering the roles of their work engagement, autonomy and leader-member exchange. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 30, 99-108.
- Schwabsky, N. (2014). Teachers' individual citizenship behavior (ICB): the role of optimism and trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 52(1), 37-57.
- Skarlicki, D., & Latham, G. (1995). Organizational citizenship behavior and performance in a university setting. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 12, 175-181.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
- 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, 649-659.
- Somech, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2004). Exploring organizational citizenship behaviour from an organizational perspective: the relationship between organizational learning and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 281-298.
- 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.
- Spitzmuller, M., Van Dyne, L., & Ilies, R. (2008). Organisational citizenship behavior: a review and extension of its nomological network. *The Sage Handbook of Organisational Behavior*, 106-123.
- Teh, C. J., Boerhannoeddin, A., & Ismail, A. (2012). Organizational culture and performance appraisal process: effect on organizational citizenship behavior. *Asian Business and Management*, 11, 471-484.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, W. A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 202-248.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organisational commitment as predictors of organisational citizenship and in-role behaviours. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617.
- Yilmaz, K., & Tasdan, M. (2009). Organizational citizenship and organizational justice in Turkish primary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47(1), 108-126.
- Yucel, C. (2008). Teacher burnout and organizational citizenship behavior in Turkish elementary schools. *Educational Planning*, 7(1), 27-43.