Educational Administration Quarterly
Vol. 42, No. 3 (August 2006) 385-423

Going Beyond Role Expectations: Toward an Understanding of the Determinants and Components of Teacher Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Izhar Oplatka

Purpose: *To fill the gap in theoretical and empirical knowledge on the patterns of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in school, the aim of this study was to explore the components of teacher OCB as well as its personal and contextual determinants.*

Research Design: *Semistructured interviews were conducted with 50 schoolteachers, 10 principals, and 10 supervisors, all from the elementary and secondary educational systems of Israel. The analysis followed the principles of qualitative research.*

Findings: *The article presents an initial conceptualization of the components of teacher OCB. Among these components are supportive behaviors toward students and colleagues, initiation of changes and innovations in teaching, strong orientation toward the organization, and strong loyalty to the teaching profession. In addition, the study identified a variety of determinants of teacher OCB, such as the school principal, the teacher's character, and the school's climate.*

Conclusions: *Empirical and practical implications for the educational system and the educational research are suggested. Principals are strongly encouraged to establish a school environment that promotes OCB-oriented teachers and to create workshops to help him or her in this task. Researchers of educational systems are provided with new directions for research on the teacher's role and behavior.*

Keywords: *empirical paper; organizational citizenship behavior; teachers; educational leadership; role tasks; professional commitment*

Throughout the 1990s, many educational systems in Western countries experienced large-scale reforms whose aims included the alteration of the entire teaching profession and the integration of the individual teacher within

Author's Note: The research was supported by a grant from the German-Israeli Foundation (GIF) for Scientific Research and Development.

DOI: 10.1177/0013161X05285987

the context of the school organization (Fullan, 2000; Murphy, 1992; Oplatka, 2002). The teacher's role has been extended to new spheres of responsibility and tasks, encouraging teachers to work collegially, to implement changes in their work, and to be responsive to their communities and the like (Hargreaves & Evans, 1997; Helsby, 1999). This led, among other things, to schools that are dependent on teachers who are committed to school goals and values and more willing to exert considerable effort beyond minimal formal role expectations, as Somech and Bogler (2002) postulated.

The research on extrarole activities in the workplace has been receiving increasing attention in recent years, providing us with terms such as *prosocial organizational behavior*, *extrarole behavior*, *helping behaviors*, *contextual performance*, and *organizational citizenship behavior* (OCB) that refer to behaviors in the workplace that are discretionary, nonformally prescribed and of high benefit for the organization (e.g., Kidwell, Mossholder, & Bennett, 1997; Organ, 1988, 1990; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996).

OCB, the focus of the current study, gained the most attention in the management and organization literature, and many definitions, conceptualizations, determinants, and outcomes of this phenomenon in the workplace have been suggested by, mostly, American scholars (e.g., Bolino, 1999; Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, & Lord, 2002; Dipola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Kidwell et al., 1997; Organ, 1988, 1997; Turnipseed, 2002; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994; Wayne & Green, 1993; Wong, Ngo, & Wong, 2003). Generally speaking, it is proposed that OCB denotes "those organizationally beneficial behaviors and gestures that can neither be enforced on the basis of formal role obligations nor elicited by contractual guarantee of recompense" (Organ, 1990, p. 46). Examples of OCB include helping other employees, volunteering for things that are not required, making innovative suggestions to improve a department, not abusing the rights of coworkers, not taking extra breaks, and attending elective company meetings (Kidwell et al., 1997).

Although there has been considerable interest in the subject of OCB in business and organizational studies, there remains a paucity of research on this behavior among schoolteachers. A search for articles on OCB in schools yields substantially fewer than 10 citations worldwide (e.g., Bogler & Somech, 2004; Christ, Van Dick, Wagner, & Stellmacher, 2003; Dipola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000), of which only 1 is from the United States. These quantitative studies have linked personal and contextual factors (e.g., job satisfaction, school climate, autonomy, participative leadership) to teacher OCB. An inventory of teacher OCB based

on scales developed in noneducation sectors (with a necessary matching) was suggested by Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2000).

This article is based on a larger qualitative study of the components of teacher OCB from the perspectives of Israeli teachers, principals, and supervisors. It traces teachers' role behaviors that these educationalists perceive as discretionary and nonprescribed, that is, behaviors that are not part of the teacher's formal role obligations. In addition, the study aimed at describing teachers' perspectives of the personal and contextual determinants of teacher OCB. I will bring up later the reasons for excluding principals' and supervisors' views in this respect.

I believe that teacher OCB may differ in some aspects from the commonly held conceptualizations of OCB originated in noneducational organizations, for two major reasons: First, it was found that employees will be more likely to engage in OCB when objective criteria for assessing in-role performance are lacking (Bolino, 1999). Teaching is characterized as an ambiguous, uncertain organizational technology with vague boundaries and an unclear input-process-outcome connection (Meyer, Scott, & Deal, 1992). The question of what is perceived as OCB and what as role-regulated tasks, thus, is open to various interpretations based on every individual's stance and experience, as well as on his or her role position in school.

Second, the ideal of service is imbedded in the ideal of teaching and includes a responsibility over other persons' development and commitment to moral values (Day, 1999), a commitment that is basically emotional in nature (Hargreaves, 1998; Nias, 1989). Good teachers, Hargreaves (1998) commented, are "emotional, passionate beings who fill their work and their classes with pleasure, creativity, challenge and joy" (p. 559). It is assumed, therefore, that teachers' OCB may comprise many more emotional aspects than other employees' OCBs.

An examination of OCB among teachers is beneficial on three levels. First, as teaching has an "endless appetite" for the investment of scarce personal resources (Nias, 1989), mapping OCBs in school may help sharpen the boundaries between officially prescribed regulations and extrarole activities, thus minimizing role conflicts that may derive from ambiguity and uncertainty of role expectations.

Second, OCB researchers argue that this sort of behavior is critical to organizational functioning because it reduces the need to allocate scarce resources to the maintenance function within organizations (Bolino, 1999; Organ, 1988). Thus, schools may benefit by exploring teachers' OCB because a greater understanding of this sort of behavior may help the establishment of "OCB encouraging environments" in which the facilitators of OCB will be intensified and its barriers reduced.

Third, as additional research is needed in a variety of organizations and occupations to identify all types of OCB (Schnake, 1991), the present research enables us to identify the types of this behavior occurring in educational organizations, thereby enlarging our understanding of OCBs in various settings.

The first section of the article summarizes the literature and research on employee OCB in organizations. The second section outlines the design of the study and the context in which its participants live and work. The third section discusses the components of teacher OCB through a display of the domains in which this behavior is perceived to emerge and its determinants. The article's closing will offer practical implications and suggestions for increasing the body of literature on teacher OCB.

EMPLOYEE OCB: A CONCEPTUAL, THEORETICAL, AND EMPIRICAL REVIEW

The literature about employee OCB is replete with definitions and conceptual models of this organizational phenomenon. Since the early 1980s, a great deal of research has explored the validity of OCB constructions, first in the United States (e.g., Organ, 1988; Schnake, 1991) and later on in a wide variety of countries, including Australia, Chile, Cuba, England, Finland, Germany, India, Israel, France, Russia, and more (Chhokar, Zhuplev, Fok, & Hatman, 2001; Paine & Organ, 2000; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000; Wong et al., 2003).

Definitions of Employee OCB

In the early stage of research on OCB, the emphasis was on discretionary, unrewarded behavior, which employees do not receive training to perform, as Wayne and Green (1993) maintained. This kind of behavior was defined by contrasting its nature with that of in-role performance. Whereas the latter includes behaviors that are formally required for fulfilling the role or job and are typically assessed and rewarded through the formal performance evaluation, the former are neither part of the formal reward system nor a part of an employee's job description.

In his comprehensive and most prevalent definition of OCB, Organ (1988) highlighted the positive implications of this behavior for the organization. In his classic book, OCB is defined as

> an individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system which, in the aggregate, promotes the effective functioning of the organization. By discretionary, we mean that the behavior is not an enforceable requirement of the role or the job description, that is, the clearly specifiable terms of the person's employment contract with the organization; the behavior is rather a matter of personal choice, such that its omission is not generally understood as punishable. (p. 4)

According to this definition, OCB is performed with the intention of promoting the welfare of the individual, group, or organization toward which it is directed. It seems to be desired by managers who may encourage their subordinates to perform this behavior, but, as Motowidlo (2000) assumed, cannot require them to perform.

Three years later, Schnake (1991) proposed a reduced definition of OCB: "functional, extra-role, pro-social organizational behavior, directed at individuals, groups, and/or an organization." The aspect of rewards and sanctions was omitted to stress the altruistic aspects while allowing for the option that OCB, although unrequited, may be rewarded.

From a slightly different point of view, Graham (1991) dissented on the dependence of the OCB definitions on a distinction between in-role and extrarole tasks on the ground that what are considered in-role/extrarole behaviors may vary over time. She defined OCB from a standpoint of civic or political citizenship, claiming it to be nonmandated, based on independent individual initiative that contributes to the best interests of the organization. Her definition was adopted, for instance, by Bienstock, DeMoranville, and Smith (2003).

In recent years, Organ ended up redefining OCB in essentially the same way that Borman and Motowidlo (1993) defined contextual performance; that is, the emphasis in this concept moves from discretionary and nonrewarded aspects to nontask. He defined OCB "as contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance" (Organ, 1997, p. 91). Based on Organ's revised definition of OCB, Haworth and Levy (2001) claimed that employees will enact and sustain OCBs only when they believe that their managers will fairly reward such behaviors. Needless to say, this study was impossible using the previous definition that OCB must be unrewarded.

To sum up, the development of OCB conceptualizations during the past two decades has brought about two different definitions of OCB in use in this literature, the early versus the recent ones. Thus, in agreement with Motowidlo (2000), this makes it important for researchers who use the term

to be very explicit about which of the alternative definitions they are adopting. In this study, I preferred to be guided by a more comprehensive working definition, such as that adopted by Organ in his book from 1988, rather than the narrow ones that have appeared in subsequent years. It derives mainly from the holistic standpoint underlying the qualitative inquiry through which deep and abundant description is necessary to reveal the complexity and contradictions inherent in social phenomena (Bruner, 1986; Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Paton, 2002; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). A qualitative researcher is advised, then, to commence the study with a broad point of view, thereby enabling the respondents to express a large range of perspectives on the phenomenon in question without limiting or setting its boundaries a priori.

The Antecedents of Employee OCB

The relationships between OCB and its antecedents have been widely considered in past research. The large body of empirical research that focused on this kind of relationship identified employee characteristics, role and organizational characteristics, and leadership features (e.g., Dipola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Kidder & McLean Parks, 2001; Organ, 1988, 1997; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Somech & Bogler, 2002).

As far as employee characteristics are concerned, it was found that a variety of dispositional, demographic, and cognitive variables are correlated significantly with the construct of OCB (e.g., Organ, 1988; Smith et al., 1983; Turnipseed, 2002). Among these variables are affectivity (Organ, 1990), a belief in hard work (Ryan, 2002), and strong ethical values (Turnipseed, 2002). Of the cognitive variables, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perception of fairness, and indifference toward rewards were found to be positively related to OCB (Diefendorff et al., 2002; Kidwell et al., 1997; Organ, 1988, 1990; Somech & Bogler, 2002; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000; Spector & Fox, 2002). However, less conclusive evidence has been found in regard to the scope of the job (full-time vs. part-time employment) and gender.

Several role and organizational factors of OCB have been identified in past research; task feedback, intrinsically satisfying tasks, group cohesiveness, and organizational support were positively related to OCB (Kidwell et al., 1997; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Conversely, task routinization, role conflict, role ambiguity, bureaucratic work cultures, and peer competition were negatively related to this kind of behavior (Haworth & Levy, 2001; Spector & Fox, 2002; Thompson & Werner, 1997).

Leadership behavior was found also to be significantly related to OCB both in industrial organizations (e.g., Schnake, 1991) and in schools (Dipola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001). The quality of the relationship between an employee and the employee's immediate supervisor (leader-member exchange), characterized by mutual trust, respect, and obligation (Graen, Novak, & Sommerkamp, 1982), was found to be related to OCB worldwide (e.g., Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997; Wong et al., 2003). Forms of transformational leadership (e.g., vision articulation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration), contingent reward behavior, and collegial leadership style are positively related to OCB (Dipola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Before moving to discuss the conceptual framework of this study, it is important to note that the extension of the research on OCB has not been without criticism, and there has been considerable debate about the sources and instruments used to measure this concept and the boundaries of the conceptual definitions. Accordingly, many of the detailed studies on OCB have used a substantive validity rather than a construct one, in that they have focused "more on understanding the relationships between organizational citizenship and other constructs, rather than carefully defining the nature of citizenship behavior itself" (Podsakoff et al., 2000, p. 515). This study aims, among other things, at exposing the elements of teacher OCB as they are subjectively perceived by educationalists, that is, the nature of teacher OCB.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

When seeking a conceptual framework to guide the study, I followed Podsakoff et al.'s (2000) "seven dimensions of employee OCB," which are based on prior conceptualizations and taxonomies of OCB (e.g., Organ, 1988, 1997; Van Dyne et al., 1994). Accordingly, employee OCB is composed of seven elements: (a) helping behavior, which involves voluntarily helping others with, or preventing the occurrence of, work-related problems. Assistance to new employees or providing colleagues with advice are included under this dimension. (b) Sportsmanship has been defined by Organ (1990, p. 96) as "a willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining." Employees performing in this element usually avoid consuming a lot of time complaining about work life or trivial matters or tend to express a positive attitude even when others do not follow their own particular way of working. (c) Organizational loyalty involves the promotion of the organization to outsiders, "protecting and defending it against external threats, and remaining committed to it even under adverse

conditions" (Podsakoff et al., 2000, p. 517). A positive answer to the items "eager to tell outsiders good news about the company" or "willing to stand up to protect the reputation of the company" appears to reflect this element properly (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1993). (d) Organizational compliance refers to the employees' internalization and acceptance of the organization's rules, regulations, and procedures even when no one is observing or monitoring. This dimension is considered to be a behavioral content of OCB mainly because employees are usually not presumed to follow organizational rules completely and unquestioningly. (e) Individual initiative is attached to OCB on the grounds that change or innovation initiation is far beyond the actions minimally required or generally expected from employees on the day-to-day level. Behaviors referred to in this dimension are, for example, the making of innovative suggestions to improve a department or organization or implementing an externally imposed change. (f) Civic virtue represents, according to Podsakoff and colleagues (2000, p. 525), "a macro-level interest in, or commitment to, the organization as a whole." This reflects an employee's feeling of being part of a larger whole (e.g., the organization) and acceptance of the responsibilities that entails. Examples of this dimension are attendance at elective company meetings, actively attending company meetings, and reporting of hazardous activities, even at great personal cost. (g) Self-development refers to the development of oneself for the sake of others. It includes voluntary behaviors by employees to improve their expertise and skills.

The first six dimensions have received, by and large, empirical confirmation in the research on OCB (e.g., Kidwell et al., 1997; MacKenzie et al., 1993; Organ, 1988, 1997; Schnake, 1991; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000). The last one has not yet been supported in the research. However, one should bear in mind that these dimensions have often been confirmed empirically in noneducation sectors, leaving the voices of educators in this respect unheard. In light of the qualitative paradigm adopted in this report, these dimensions, then, are conceived of as a starting point to expose the nature of teacher OCB and not as the final construction of this concept.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a qualitative research methodology to collect and analyze the empirical data. Following Erickson (1986), who claimed that the conceptions in qualitative research are revealed during data analysis, no defined hypothesis is tested in the study. However, based on the literature on OCB described above, it was assumed that teachers might experience these kinds of behaviors in their work.

In terms of methodology, I sought to distinguish my work from previous studies in two ways. First, although the knowledge base of the research on OCB has been shaped largely by quantitative methodologies (e.g., Organ, 1988, 1997; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000; Van Dyne et al., 1994; Williams & Anderson, 1991), I used semistructured, in-depth interviews that, according to Paton (2002), are directed at exposing the respondents' personal constructions (i.e., of teacher OCB). Teaching has long been conceived as a subjective rather than objective reality whose members can add to and expand its duties and give it their own individual interpretation (Socket, 1993). This implies that any understanding of the teacher's role ought to address the teacher's voice and his or her subjective interpretations of and experiences in this role, an empirical attitude shared also by other researchers (Goodson, 1991; Nias, 1999).

The second way I sought to distinguish this study from prior work was to include interviewees from three different groups, that is, teachers, principals, and supervisors, adopting Allen, Barnard, Rush, and Russell's (2000) view that it is relatively unreliable to use only one source (e.g., superiors, subordinates) to test OCB. Whereas past research on teacher OCB sampled only teachers (e.g., Christ et al., 2003; Dipola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000), I believe that the inclusion of superiors may provide as wide a range of perspectives as possible about the construct of teacher OCB and provide some validity for the teachers' subjective construction of this behavior. Nonetheless, when the determinants of teacher OCB are concerned, it seems that those who are engaged in this behavior (i.e., the teachers in this study) are more likely to link it to personal and contextual variables than those observing this phenomenon from outside (i.e., principals, supervisors).

It is assumed that a research design that departed in significant ways from previous work with teachers (and workers in general) would be necessary to reach a more informed understanding of teacher OCB. Qualitative methods allow deep and abundant description for revealing the complexity and contradictions inherent in social phenomena, from a holistic point of view (Bruner, 1986; Paton, 2002).

Participants

In pursuit of answers to the research questions, a total of 70 interviews were conducted (50 teachers, 10 principals, 10 supervisors). All were tenured.

Teachers. The sample consisted of 40 female and 10 male teachers from the religiously nonobservant Jewish educational system, the largest one in Israel (60% of the K-12 students). The average age of the teachers was 43 years (range = 28-64); the average number of years in teaching was 23 (range = 8-38). The sample included married (n = 42), single (n = 3), divorced (n = 3), and widowed (n = 2) participants; 44 of 50 had children. The participants, who live in the center, north, and south of Israel, came from urban (n = 43) and rural areas (n = 7). Elementary (n = 27), middle/junior high school (n = 11), and high school (n = 12) teachers participated. They represent a highly homogeneous group in terms of religiosity and class. They are all nonobservant Jews who belong to the middle class.

Principals. Five men and 5 women principals participated in this study from elementary (n = 5), junior high (n = 3), and high school (n = 2) systems. The average age of the principals was 51.1 years (range = 43-64); the average number of teaching years was 16.37 (range = 10-24); and the average number of years in principalship was 10.8 (range = 1-34). They work in three different educational districts (south, center, Haifa), and their schools are located in eight different cities. Nine participants were married, and 1 was divorced. All had children.

Supervisors. The sample of supervisors included 7 women and 3 men. The average age of the supervisors was 51.3 years (range = 45-59); the average number of years in supervision was 7. Participants came from five different education districts (Haifa, center, Tel Aviv, south, Jerusalem), and all were married with children.

Participant Selection

Because of the need to focus on a homogeneous group of participants in a qualitative inquiry that aims at understanding a certain phenomenon profoundly (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Paton, 2002), the teachers in this study were selected using criterion sampling, that is, all participants that meet some criterion. That is, I purposely selected participants who represented "information-rich cases that manifest the phenomenon intensely . . . excellent or rich examples of the phenomenon of interest, but not unusual cases" (Paton, 1990, p. 171). Conversely, principals and supervisors were randomly chosen, mainly, on the ground that (a) the information gathered from these two sources aims at supplementing that of the teachers and (b) it is less plausible to determine at this stage of their career

whom of the principals/supervisors used to manifest OCBs when they were teachers.

Research staff approached principals and other informants (either head of department or a schoolteacher), both from the primary and secondary educational systems in five districts in Israel. The informants were asked to recommend elementary and secondary teachers with 8 years and more of teaching experience, who are considered to be those who do more than is needed formally in school, not to impress others but for the sake of the whole. Informants were provided with adjectives such as *caring*, *helpful*, *committed*, and *dedicated* to indicate the kind of person that the research was seeking.

Based on the literature on OCB discussed at length in this article, it was believed that teachers meeting the above-indicated criteria are more likely to adopt OCBs in their work and therefore could provide much knowledge about this kind of behavior in education. Thus, after receiving recommendations from two sources in a certain school, the two to three teachers most highly recommended were contacted by phone, and a face-to-face meeting was scheduled with teachers who agreed to participate.

It is worth noting, nonetheless, that because only teachers initially recommended by their principal were interviewed, some degree of deviation may have occurred; any teachers who engage in extra-role activities and suit the rest of the criteria specified but are not appreciated or recognized by their principal are excluded. Coupled with research findings that indicated that many OCBs occur out of sight of the superior (Allen et al., 2000), this potential weakness was taken into account in the interpretation of the data gathered in this study. In addition, I am conscious that my choice of teachers who engage in OCB also shaped the study; therefore, the findings are less likely to represent the perceptions and constructions of teachers whose inclination is to adhere to the prescribed, in-role tasks.

Procedure

One to two semistructured, face-to-face interviews were conducted with the participants by four research assistants (M.A. students) during 2003 to 2004, mostly at the respondent's home or after school to avoid time pressure. This instrument was selected with the intention of enabling the researcher to collect data that more closely represent the personal perspectives of individual participants, concurrently with the advantage of using an interview guide that helps make the interview of different individuals more systematic (Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Paton, 2002; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). It is important to indicate that the interviewers avoided using the term *OCB* or any other

normatively desired terms (e.g., to assist) to refrain from indicating social desirability (Paton, 2002).

At the beginning of each interview, the interviewer obtained permission to record the interview and promised complete confidentiality. In the first part of the interview, participants were asked about teachers' perceived formal duties to establish the difference between required and nonrequired role tasks. This section proved problematic at first because respondents tended to answer in terms of what they saw as their "moral obligation" rather than contractual job requirements. To overcome this problem, these questions were rephrased to inquire about specific tasks and job requirements that could be demanded and monitored by a superior (the principal, assistant principal, department head, and the like).

Next came questions about their perceptions regarding nonrequired tasks and role behaviors in teaching. Likewise, teachers were asked only about behaviors they perform at work that they do not perceive to be part of their formal role obligations and their motivation for performing them. In addition, they were asked about facilitating factors they perceived to be related to nonprescribed behaviors. To avoid social desirability, extrarole tasks were not presented as more or less desirable than required tasks. The research team spent about 140 hours in interviewing the participants; this procedure generated some 2,000 pages of transcription for analysis.

The manual analysis of the interview data followed the four stages described by Marshall and Rossman (1995): "organizing the data," "generating categories, themes and patterns," "testing any emergent hypothesis," and "searching for alternative explanations." This analysis aims at identifying central themes in the data, searching for recurrent experiences, feelings, and attitudes so as to be able to code, reduce, and connect different categories into central themes. The coding is guided by the principles of comparative analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998), which includes the comparison of any coded element in terms of emergent categories and subcategories.

The author, as the principal researcher, analyzed the entire data set independently, and the research assistants examined the results of this analysis independently (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The research team then met to compare their analysis and discuss contradictory interpretations that arose and to search for disconfirming evidence (Marshall & Rosman, 1995). Upon completion of numerous cycles of analysis, we managed to present elements and determinants of teacher OCB that are inductively drawn from the data.

To increase trustworthiness and reliability in the research, the analysis was strengthened by structured analysis and peer review (every research

assistant reflected on the principal researcher's analysis), two common indicators qualitative researchers use to build confidence in their analytic procedures (Marshall & Rosman, 1995). However, consistent with most qualitative researchers who assume that those they study interpret reality from multiple perspectives for varying purposes (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993), I was interested in revealing participants' subjective ideas about reality, rather than finding some objective reality. Yet some comparisons with the existing literature on OCB were made to intensify validity of the data (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Context

Before moving to present the research findings, some information about the Israeli educational system is needed to help readers understand how this study may relate to other educational systems. Although gradually changing, the Israeli educational system is highly centralized both in structure and procedure (Iram & Schmida, 1998). The government is the provider of education for almost everyone, and education is geared toward matriculation exams that usually take place at the end of high school and are necessary to gain entrance into higher education institutions (Goldscheider, 1996). All schools are required to follow a basic national curriculum, although at the same time, the Ministry of Education (MEO) encourages schools to specialize and offer unique subjects out of a predetermined list of subjects.

Under these circumstances, the MEO regulates the formal tasks of the teacher's role. In broad terms, the teacher is formally responsible for (a) teaching the subject matter in accordance with the curriculum, (b) matching the teaching methods to the class level, (c) appraising student achievements, (d) being on duty, and (f) attending weekly or monthly pedagogical meetings after school and extracurricular activities during his or her schedule (Ministry of Education, 1994).

The definition of the Israeli teacher's role coincides, by and large, with major conceptualizations of teaching suggested by American scholars (e.g., Jackson, 1986; Pearson, 1989; Shulman, 1987; Socket, 1993), according to which the teacher's core task is actually pedagogical and instructional in nature. To wit, although teaching is embedded with administrative tasks, what distinguishes it from other profession is pedagogy. Admittedly, teachers worldwide are, first and foremost, paid for instructing and developing young people in any society, and all other tasks are oriented toward the performance of this core mission. In this sense, American, European, and Israeli teachers share, to a certain extent, the same formal role expectations.

TABLE 1
Domains and Elements of Teacher Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

Domain	*Elements of OCB*
Individual pupil	Pedagogical assistance out of formal class hours
	Caring for a student in distress
	Proactive attentiveness to pupils
Classroom	Initiation and implementation of classroom changes
	Thorough assessment of students' assignments
	Participation in class's social activities
Staff	Giving of teaching materials to colleagues
	Professional assistance and pedagogical information exchange
	Helping colleagues with administrative tasks
	Emotional assistance and attentiveness
School organization	Teachers' participation in school events and activities
	Teachers' participation in ad hoc school committees
	Taking on unrewarded roles in school

FINDINGS: FOUR DOMAINS OF TEACHER OCB

In essence, we have organized the teacher OCBs derived from the interviews with our subjects to domains in which these behaviors were perceived to take place: with the individual pupil, in the classroom, in the staff room, and in the school as a whole. Three of four domains drawn from the database of this study—pupil, staff, and school—gain support from previous studies that claimed that discretionary behaviors that go beyond existing role expectation are directed toward the individual, group, or organization as a unit (e.g., Podsakoff et al., 2000; Somech & Bogler, 2002). The classroom domain is located between the individual (i.e., pupil) domain and the staff/school (i.e. group/organization). Nevertheless, this is a study of perspectives only; such a study cannot determine the frequency and occurrence of a certain OCB described by the participants, although many teachers reported being involved in a variety of OCBs. In addition, in no way do I claim that this division represents a pure distinction between the domains, but rather I use it as a means to describe the various elements of teacher OCB indicated by the participants of this study. Table 1 summarizes the domains and elements of teacher OCB.

Domain 1: The Individual Pupil

This domain includes teachers' OCBs directed toward pupils, as described by participants in this study. Three kinds of OCB in this category

were indicated: pedagogical assistance out of formal class hours, assistance to pupils in distress, and proactive attention to pupils' needs/difficulties.

Pedagogical assistance out of formal class hours. Formally, teachers are obliged to be physically present in their classrooms during teaching hours and the school day. But when a teacher voluntarily teaches students or classes out of school class hours (e.g., during breaks, in the evenings), he or she is considered by the participants to be expressing an OCB. To understand the perceived discretionary nature of this phenomenon in schools, let us look at the next citation, from an interview with a female elementary school principal:

> Interviewer: What in your opinion is beyond what teachers are required to do?
> Principal: We have a teacher who noticed a group of second graders with reading difficulties. She volunteers and takes a group of children at the end of her work day. She finishes at 12 and stays till 2 p.m. She works with children improving their skills in her own free time. That is an initiative that I wouldn't dare request [from her].

Participants believed that the much effort and time expended by teachers in this assistance cannot be forced on teachers on the basis of the teacher's formal role obligations. This is echoed in the following citation:

> Interviewer: What part of your work do you believe is voluntary?
> Teacher: First of all, the treatment of the students themselves. If there is a child who needs help, it doesn't matter when. If he was absent, or was in class but didn't understand the material. . . . Whatever he needs and comes to me for help, I always help, no matter when. That's how I'd like my children to be treated. . . . So I sit during my free hours, I come in before time and stay after. It's no problem whatever when it is connected to students. I'm willing to give everything, because they are our children. . . . They sometimes call me at home to ask about homework. What I had given or if what they had done is okay. There is no problem to call me, and they call all the time. (Female elementary schoolteacher)

In the view of many participants, the purpose underlying these OCBs in teaching is the promotion of pupils in general and in the teacher's subject matter in particular.

Caring for a student in distress. Interestingly, but hardly surprising, given the belief that teaching is not on par with charity, participants perceived compassion-led behaviors such as material and physical assistance to less privileged students, as a

kind of OCB in teaching. When asked to provide the interviewer with examples of "things that teachers do beyond what is required," a female supervisor said,

> In another area of mine where there are social problems, there are definitely groups of teachers who organize to make the students sandwiches during the break or who arrange clothing or a computer for a child or sports shoes for an Ethiopian student who excels in athletics . . . he was an excellent runner and he needed sport shoes. So the teachers took up a collection and bought him sport shoes. These are very small things, but very heartwarming.

Be it washing the laundry of a female pupil, driving a sick pupil once a week to the hospital, or letting a student use the teacher's own computer, all of these teacher behaviors are perceived as examples of OCB.

Proactive attentiveness to pupils. The last teacher OCB directed at the pupil refers to attention and sensitivity to pupils' emotional needs or behavioral changes. For many respondents to go beyond what is formally expected from teachers is to dedicate much time and energy to diagnose every child's cognitive state and to uncover what is behind the student's nontransparent face, as a male elementary schoolteacher stated:

> Interviewer: In your school, who is considered a teacher who goes beyond?
> Teacher: [This] is a teacher who takes the children with him everywhere, not physically, but in feeling and mind . . . a teacher who doesn't stop working as soon as the children go home . . . a teacher who analyzes the past day and thinks: "What do I need to do for that child or this child. Maybe they need reinforcement? What do I need to talk about with the child tomorrow? Should I call the parents and consult them, tell them about things that he saw or wants to hear about . . . if they know what's going on, if they connect to it." To call the parents about good things that happened also.

However, this attitude is contrasted with a few teachers in this study who flatly asserted that being sensitive to students' changes and needs and actively seeking to discover them is a mandatory part of the teacher's work.

Domain 2: The Classroom

This domain is composed of teacher OCB directed at the class as a whole or to a group of pupils. Of the major elements in this domain, indicated by the participants in this study are teachers' initiation and implementation of changes and innovations in teaching methods or curriculum, thorough and

comprehensive grading of academic assignments, and involvement in social events of the class.

Teachers' initiation and implementation of classroom changes. Despite large-scale reforms that encouraged teachers to change/innovate their work (e.g., Fullan, 2000; Murphy, 1992), changes in teaching methods, the use of a wide variety of teaching methods, creative preparation of teaching materials, and changing or devising curriculum were considered by most participants to be expressions of teacher OCB. A female supervisor defined the teacher who is engaged in OCB as one who

> won't just take the material and teach by the book, or teach the material as it appears in the book or the workbook. She will want to express her own voice. She will always try to express her voice and will initiate new areas of study, not wait for someone to suggest it.

Teachers who resist traditional methods of teaching, such as lecturing, seated work, and question-and-answer methods and who bring in new and creative teaching methods into their classrooms are considered to engage in OCB. The discretionary aspect of creative instruction is highlighted in the next quote:

> If you teach history then it also includes geography, because you have to work with maps, and bible studies because you have biblical sources. . . . There are so many aspects. Sometimes there are nature studies and sometimes art. I ask the art teacher, if we are talking about Egypt then there is papyrus, and they make a lot of things. That makes it interesting. It's interesting for me also. . . . Just imagine if I came into class with things already prepared, old yellow pages, like my teachers had, and brought them to class. I remember we were sitting with friends over the weekend, and my friend said, "You know, I've had enough. I just read it out to them." Is that a way to teach? Poor students and poor teacher. (Female high school teacher)

In common with Germany, England, and Wales, Israel has a national curriculum that is required in state schools. But it was claimed by many participants that teachers who add new contents or write curricula are involved in OCB:

> I have teachers who develop excellent programs on the subject of space, or math, science subjects. This entails in-job training courses, going to Jerusalem, going to the Technion in Haifa, endless work in developing an almost unique program. These teachers teach things that aren't even in the curriculum, in or-

> der to stimulate the students, to attract them, to make school and the curriculum more interesting in the eyes of the students. (Male high school principal)

Thorough assessment of students' assignments. Whereas the evaluation of pupils' assignments is conceived of as a part of the teacher's formal role definition, many respondents assumed that a thorough and comprehensive assessment and follow-up, as well as giving a large number of assignments beyond those that are mandatory in school (which means more work for teachers), is in fact a form of OCB in teaching. When asked what teachers usually do beyond formal requirements in teaching, an elementary school teacher indicated that "[she] go[es] home and check[s] notebooks, workbooks, paying attention to every bit of work that students give [to her]." A female high school teacher was more insightful about this OCB:

> I give three exams per semester instead of two. This is really a voluntary act. I do it to make sure they are serious about the subject and also to give them a chance to improve their grade. Even if I hate looking at the stacks of exams. Not only is it not rewarding, it's intolerable at a human level in the long run. I'm teaching six classes this year, three exams per semester, with 40 students per class. You do the math how many exams I check each semester. It's insane. And I still do it because the student's best interests are what I think about. My colleagues tell me I won't be able to keep it up over the years. It's very tiring and difficult.

Participation in the class's social activities. School life is embedded with social events during the academic year, such as evening parties, "balls," activities for parents, and visiting a theater and the like, all activities after school, in which teachers were perceived not to be obliged to participate. An Arabic teacher attributed her initiation and involvement in a social evening for her Arabic class as part of the nonprescribed, voluntary aspects of her role:

> Interviewer: Looking at yourself, what do you do beyond formal obligations?
> Teacher: As a teacher of Arabic, I organized a very big Arabic night, with students and parents. It's not anything I was ever requested to do. It includes activity in groups, getting students and parents to take part in different activities like making plaster models of hands, learning how to play an Arabian drum, making coffee. Then we go into the dining room. I'm working with the students on a play in Arabic, and then the theme for the sixth grade is food. So we turn the dining room into an Oriental restaurant, and the children serve the menu in Arabic to the parents and the parents order in Arabic. It's a whole evening that must be organized. (Female elementary school teacher)

Domain 3: The Staff

Consistent with common constructions of employee OCB (e.g., Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Van Dyne et al., 1994), respondents in this study considered collegial and helping behavior among the staff as a sort of teacher OCB rather than a prescribed, formal teachers' obligation. Four forms of interstaff helping behaviors were referred to by the participants: providing teaching materials, professional help, helping teachers in administrative tasks, and emotional support. The last one was focused, chiefly, on senior teacher-novice teacher relationships.

The giving of teaching materials to colleagues. When teachers develop creative works (e.g., books, notebooks, exams, work sheets) and voluntarily share them with colleagues, the participants perceived their helping behavior as a form of teacher OCB. In doing so, they help other teachers improve their teaching practices and enjoy their expertise and experiences. A female elementary school teacher exemplified this stance:

> I produced a workbook to help me teach the subject in the fourth grade, because integrative subjects require finding and processing a lot of materials. You have to process them. My colleague said she didn't know what to do, so I said, "Here, take this workbook I have ready and study it." I gave it to her, she has it. But I told her, "Don't you dare lose it because I don't have it on the computer. My computer crashed and I lost it, so take care of it."

Professional assistance. Most of the participants we interviewed pointed to professional assistance to colleagues in general and to new teachers in particular as an expression of teacher OCB. When asked what actions she carries out at work that are not formally required, a female high school teacher highlighted her didactic assistance to the staff:

> I haven't even mentioned the special projects that I take on voluntarily in teams like a workshop on taking tests, how to behave during or before a test. So I need variety all the time. If I create or initiate something afterwards I pass it on. I spread my knowledge around. The minute I've done something I'm happy to pass it on. Like special subjects, like social competence. Teachers are most afraid of civics lessons.

This kind of interstaff helping behavior is assumed to be more significant with new teachers, as the literature on mentorial relationships has shown (e.g., Farrell, 2003; Kram, 1983). Teaching new colleagues how to teach a particular subject, guiding him or her in devising an exam, showing him or her how to check study assignments, and providing the novice with teaching

techniques and methods are all teacher behaviors that were perceived by the participants as nonprescribed, discretionary tasks in teaching.

Helping colleagues with administrative tasks. A growing part of the teacher's role today is related to administrative tasks (Helsby, 1999; Murphy, 1992). In this sense, teachers helping their colleagues in simple tasks such as copying student assignments, distributing written materials to students, and decorating their colleagues' classrooms are assumed to be going beyond formal role expectations. This is echoed in the next citation:

> In our school, teachers help a lot, even though nobody tells them to do so. There are people here who care a lot. I'll give you an example. When I got a class with 47 pupils, all the teachers said, "I'll help you." They helped with photocopies and all the small things—signs on the walls, decorations. They told me, "Don't bother with those things, we'll help you." (Female elementary school teacher)

Emotional assistance and attentiveness. Helping colleagues to release tension and handle personal crises, supporting a colleague in distress, and caring for their well-being, all interstaff behaviors observed in past research (e.g., Nias, 1999; Pollard, 1985), were perceived by our interviewees to be teacher OCB, particularly when they are directed at new teachers. Listening to a beginning teacher was consistently given by the participants as an example of teacher OCB. A male high school principal illustrated the voluntary aspect of supporting new teachers emotionally:

> When a young teacher comes in and needs assistance he'll always get it, but when he enters the staff room people will not come up to him and ask, "How do you feel, how is it going?" People from his team or people who are like that will ask.

It follows that actively caring for the novice's emotional state is discretionary in nature, leaving principals with almost no formal authority to force this kind of behavior on their staff.

Domain 4: The School Organization

Three teacher behaviors that are directed at the school level were indicated by the participants as expressions of OCB: teachers' participation in school events after the school day, participation in ad hoc school committees, and taking on unrewarded roles in school. Although reasonably attributed to teacher OCB, the occurrence of the last behavior is interesting given the materialist nature of the modern society.

Teachers' participation in school events and activities. One of schools' purposes worldwide is to develop social and civic skills of pupils (Braungart & Braungart, 1998; Ichilov, 1998). To this end, schools present a wide variety of activities such as festivals, an evening for the community, a carnival of food and clothing organized in the schoolyard, exhibitions on the school premises, and the like, all of which "consume much time and organizational energy," as an elementary school teacher indicated. For the participants in this study, teachers' involvement in these and related social activities out of school hours is a kind of teacher OCB for which teachers are not rewarded financially and are not obliged to do as part of their role definition. A male supervisor sharpened this point:

> Interviewer: What do you think can be defined as doing beyond [what is required]?
> Supervisor: Doing beyond is an extra contribution that the teacher gives. For example, participating in school activities—like special days—health days, road safety days, or going on delegations. It's not required by law, but when the principal or the senior staff requests it, I think they do it. It's an activity that benefits the school.

Teachers' participation in ad hoc school committees. Participation of teachers in ad hoc committees for managing a certain school project (e.g., parent-teacher forums, birthdays or excursion-planning committees, strategic planning meetings), as opposed to their attendance at annual staff meetings, is considered to be a sort of OCB in the teacher's role. The respondents stressed the lack of external rewards and the time dimension of their participation. A female elementary school principal clarified the voluntary aspect of teachers' participation in ad hoc committees in schools:

> There is a newspaper committee with two teachers who volunteer their time to be in charge, there is a birthday committee, two teachers who on their own time with no pay. There is a committee for active recess—the same thing. . . . All the teachers who are in charge of social activity committees volunteer their time . . . and it's important to me to explain. There are teachers who come independently and say, "I'm going to do this."

Taking on unrewarded roles in school. One of the most surprising findings in this study was teachers' report of being appointed to perform school functions and roles for which they do not receive extra wages. For them, this is a form of teacher OCB. Let us look at the following dialogue to illustrate the OCB underlying teachers' involvement in this unrewarded role in school:

TABLE 2
Determinants of Teacher Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

Group	*Determinants of Teacher OCB*
Personal determinants	A sense of calling
	Other-oriented personality
	High work commitment
School climate and atmosphere	Positive atmosphere
	Norms in favor of extrarole activities
Leadership features	Initiating changes and innovation
	Positive feedback to staff
	Democratic and participative leadership
	Display of positive emotion toward staff

Teacher: I'm also the coordinator for the protection program. There is a project called "protection" to reduce violence in school.
Interviewer: And is that coordinating role paid or voluntary?
Teacher: It's also voluntary. It's a program to reduce violence at school that we initiated last year. We brought in an external consultant, a psychologist who had organized it in several places around the country.
Interviewer: That's very interesting. Tell me, how much time do you devote to it?
Teacher: It requires a lot of work at home. . . . It requires all my recesses. I need to be present and walking around. I can't sit in the teachers' room drinking coffee. I need to be available in the project room. (Female elementary school teacher)

Taking on roles in school without being remunerated means, by and large, exerting much energy voluntarily, resulting in contribution to the school as a whole.

THE PERCEIVED DETERMINANTS OF TEACHER OCB

A major purpose of this study was to examine the personal and contextual determinants considered by the teacher group to have some influence on teacher OCB. Here I explore some of the major determinants perceived by the teachers that encourage them to be engaged in OCB. The determinants identified are categorized into three groups: personal, organizational, and leadership influences (see Table 2).

Personal Determinants

Three major teacher characteristics were subjectively related to teacher OCB: a sense of educational calling, other-oriented personality, and professional commitment.

A sense of calling. A sense of calling in teaching, like in religion, was claimed to increase one's commitment to a certain service (Hansen, 1995). Similarly, teachers constructed a link between their sense of calling in teaching and frequent engagement in OCB. The issue is further explained by a female elementary school teacher who extends the meaning of educational calling:

> Interviewer: What motivates you to go beyond?
> Teacher: Teaching for me is perfection. It's my calling, I wouldn't choose to do something else. But I think there are a lot of teachers like me. Maybe I see it that way because I enjoy it, I feel "high" the whole year. . . . I get excited from every lesson that the children do. I am excited every lesson—they arrive at the beginning of first grade and I start teaching them letters, and by second grade they are doing so many things and writing. I look back and think how only a few months ago they were taking their first steps and I see how they progress and it's very satisfying.

In the respondents' view, teaching resembles police work, parenthood, and military roles, a kind of occupation where "you can't go home and put work in the back of your mind . . . you are a teacher every hour of the day, it never ends," as a male high school teacher stated. To some extent, the teachers' educational calling in this study corroborates the terms *spiritual teaching* (Falmer, 1999) or *spirituality in education* (Dillard, 2000), which refer to the spiritual purpose of teaching (e.g., teaching as the meaning and purpose of the teacher's life, becoming a teacher for reasons of the heart), education that is a liberating work, and teaching as a relationship of reciprocity and care for the individual student.

Other-oriented personality. Many teachers pointed to an other-oriented personality as a dispositional variable that brings about high degrees of teacher OCB; that is, teacher OCB is a result of a general disposition toward altruism and helping others everywhere and not particularly at school and in class. This disposition and its impact on teachers' OCB is demonstrated by a 47-year-old high school teacher:

> Interviewer: What makes you take more things upon yourself at work?
> Teacher: I was educated to help people in the best possible way, to contribute as much as possible. As well as you can. Something likes a personal instinct. I guess that is the main motivation to help children, to assist a colleague.

And a 54-year-old male teacher commented,

> Even if I see someone driving badly I'll say something. My friends tell me to "stop trying to educate the whole world." It's inside, in my blood. When it's in you, so true, as I grow older I try to stop because someday somebody will get out of his car and beat me up, but I can't help it. You cheat yourself if you don't do it.

This kind of disposition is characterized by a willingness to give, to contribute, to care for others' needs, and to help others, be they colleagues, friends, family members, or society as a whole.

High work commitment. Consistent with past research on OCB (e.g., Podsakoff et al., 2000; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000), work commitment was indicated by respondents in the present study to be connected to teacher OCB. Teachers typically reported having a moral obligation to perform in the best way they can due to high moral values in life.

> Interviewer: What motivates you to do beyond, to act the way you do?
> Teacher: It depends on a high moral standard, high inner discipline. . . . I come to school with the feeling that I need it more than it needs me. All day I think about how I need to prove myself anew. . . . I think it's a matter of education, you need to know that you work and are paid and need to do your work. (Female high school teacher)

Moral values and high commitment to work effectively and thoroughly or, in other words, to meet the high work standards they set for themselves, seem to lead teachers to adopt OCBs at work, as is reflected from the next quote:

> When I was at the seminary we had a very tough pedagogic instructor, and she always said one thing that I really appreciated, she said, "Every time you prepare a worksheet for a child think if you would want your child to get it. Every time you prepare a lesson think whether you would want your child to participate in that lesson." And you know what? Maybe it affected me too much, or I took it to the wrong level, but today I can't think otherwise. I can't work any other way, I feel guilty if I try to work differently. (Female elementary school teacher, 28 years old)

School Climate and Atmosphere

The second group of determinants revolves around organizational factors affecting teacher OCB. Thus, school climate, including positive interteacher communication, a good atmosphere, and norms supporting OCBs, was indicated to have some influence on teacher OCB. Generally speaking, school climate in terms of positive collegial interactions and a sense of belonging was explicitly connected by the respondents to teacher OCB. Teachers emphasized the emotional aspects of their workplace, using phrases such as *our staff room is like a family*, *family atmosphere*, and *warmth*. An elementary school teacher drew a connection directly between teacher OCB and this kind of emotion-embedded atmosphere:

> Interviewer: What do you need to have in school so that you want to go beyond what is required?
> Teacher: A good atmosphere. A positive atmosphere of support. You need a good staff, people who are warm and fun to work with. We have social gatherings in the afternoon, but you always return to work, even when you get together socially. It's really important to have warm staff and superiors.

Consistent with Kidwell and colleagues (1997), who showed that group cohesion was positively related to OCB in industrial organizations, the teachers believed that norms and values at the school level (as part of the school culture) in favor of hard work and supportive relationships among school staff promote teacher OCB. A high school teacher drew a connection between OCBs among teachers and their colleagues' wide variety of OCB:

> Interviewer: What atmosphere must a school have for teachers to go beyond?
> Teacher: An atmosphere of action. When everyone acts, then even people who don't do anything at first eventually act because they see it isn't giving too much. They see it is the norm. When you see others helping students during the breaks, and afternoon on the phone, and during the holidays, with the whole school focused on action, then teachers who previously did nothing will also act because they see that is the way it should be and there is no other way.

Leadership Characteristics

A large part of the teachers' reference to the determinants of teacher OCB was dedicated to the key role of the principal in promoting or discouraging teacher OCB in his or her school. Past research on OCB (described at length in the introduction of this article) has generated findings consistent to a

certain degree with those that follow. According to my data, principals' behaviors or leadership styles that are strongly related to teacher OCB are change initiation, positive feedback, democratic leadership style, and emotion-based leadership.

Initiating and innovative principals and increased teacher OCB. Social, technological, and organizational changes have been previously acknowledged as facilitators of personal growth and renewal (Hall, 1986; Oplatka, 2003). Along the same lines, Fullan (1991) asserted that "if the change works out it can result in a sense of mastery, accomplishment and professional growth" (p. 32). Thus, keeping in mind the key role of the principal in school changes (Fullan, 1991), he or she may facilitate professional growth and development among schoolteachers.

This study revealed that a principal who initiates changes and innovations in school and in teaching is perceived by teachers as implicitly encouraging teacher OCB, because this kind of principal usually promotes an atmosphere of changes in the staff room. This, in turn, is assumed to trigger changes in teaching methods, lessons, and content, that is, to enhance teachers' engagement in OCB. A male high school teacher clarified the link between innovative principals and their teachers' OCB:

> Interviewer: How can the principal make teachers go beyond?
> Teacher: I think it's very hard to make someone go beyond his role expectations. It's a part of personality, not something someone can force you to do. But in general, the principal can create an atmosphere that encourages and allows for making changes. Demonstrating teachers' initiatives may encourage contribution. . . . When I encourage my students' interests and flow with them, if it doesn't fit in with the general plan, the principal may not like it that much, but it's important for her to show, and for other teachers also, that she is open to initiative.

It is apparent that principals are less capable of forcing teachers to change their teaching habits or to stay after official school hours. But by initiating innovations, they are likely to challenge some teachers to take part in new educational projects, which means being involved in OCB due to the unrewarded nature of teachers' participation in new projects, as is evident in this article. The meaning of these innovations is noted by a female elementary school teacher:

Interviewer: What challenges the teachers to go beyond her role obligations?
Teacher: What challenges the teachers to act, first of all the new projects in the system, there is no initiative suggested by the Ministry of Education that hasn't been adopted here. Every project of educational initiative, "book march," a competition of presentations, every little thing and idea, [the principal] has lots of idea, God bless her. Every new thing that arrives must immediately be adopted by us, it gives us the taste for innovation.

Past research on OCB, both in industry/services (e.g., Schnake, 1991; Wong et al., 2003) and in teaching (Dipola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001) provides support for this subjectively held link between dynamic principals and teacher OCB.

Positive feedback and teacher OCB. Consistent with research findings suggesting that task feedback was strongly correlated with employee OCB (e.g., Podsakoff et al., 2000), teachers constructed a link between principals' positive feedback and teacher OCB. In other words, they emphatically noted the key role of principal feedback in their work performance and motivation, an influence that was found also among effective principals (Blasé & Blasé, 1994; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinback, 1999). A female junior high school teacher expressed this subjectively held connection:

It's enough that she (the principal) knows that I did it and says thank you. That's enough. No more is necessary. It's nice to know that someone knows what you've done and someone appreciates it, that it isn't taken for granted that you have to do it, that you have to donate your time and give it to the whole world, because we don't have to.

Feedback given in the form of direct, positive messages addressed to teachers either privately or in front of other teachers, praising teachers for a successful performance, and written notes sent to teachers were reported to have differentiated between teachers who go beyond what they are formally required to do from their colleagues.

Conversely, a lack of positive feedback or consistent negative feedback from principals are not assumed necessarily to discourage teacher OCB, although it may arouse frustration and lessen teacher motivation and enthusiasm at work. A female high school teacher explained,

[In my school] teachers who go beyond don't receive feedback. I pulled an 85% average in a class whose average had been 70%, and I haven't heard a word till this day. I think I should have received some feedback by now.

Having said that, she stressed the noncritical aspect of positive feedback in her work:

> It's less important to me, I can manage without it. I think that the principal appreciates me a lot, but I don't need to be shown too much, although it is pleasant. I won't stop acting if I'm not appreciated.

Democratic leadership and teacher OCB. Democratic and delegating leadership in education was found to relate to effective principalship (Blasé & Blasé, 1994), resulting in teacher revitalization and growth (Brock & Grady, 1997; Oplatka, 2004). My data demonstrate that providing teachers with professional autonomy and democratic procedures of decision making in school is believed by teachers to increase teacher OCB, a link supported also by past research on teacher OCB (e.g., Somech & Bogler, 2002). Many of the teachers interviewed in this study postulated that teachers' participation in decision making engenders a sense of belonging and influence in the school, which in turn motivates teachers to go beyond what is formally expected in their role. This potential link is echoed in the following citations:

> Teacher: [When a principal] chooses things to develop in school and he does it with the aid of the staff and doesn't decide by himself, it gives the teachers a sense of belonging that they are part of the decision-making process. The staff moves with the principal, moves forward. When the principal decides all the important things and leaves the teachers to do the dirty work, that's how the school looks. If the principal adopts projects that the staff isn't interested in, to promote himself, and people don't feel part of the decision, part of the choice, then they aren't part of the action, and they only do what they have to do. If you choose things that aren't suitable for the student population, and they say that but they are ignored, they won't go beyond. (Female elementary school teacher)

> Interviewer: What makes the informal formal, as you said, in this school?
> Teacher: We love the place we work. I think it's our second home. We feel like partners, every last person in school. We are partners, we aren't ordered from above, we are consulted and things are discussed and we are listened to. I will never be ordered to do something without discussing it first. I feel I am listened to always; I can approach with any idea or any problem. (Female elementary school teacher)

Very reasonably, a teacher will devote extra time and exert much unrewarded effort for projects and tasks he or she believes are of high importance.

Emotional leadership and teacher OCB. The last principal characteristic considered to be related to teacher OCB by the teachers in the current study concerns displays of emotion by principals. Consistent with past research that found a connection between supportive and caring leadership and employee OCB (e.g., Schnake, 1991; Wong et al., 2003), respondents claimed that positive displays of emotion, attentiveness to teachers' needs, and individual consideration by principals might increase teacher OCB. A support for this subjectively constructed link comes from the literature on emotion management. Accordingly, managers' positive emotion displays can initiate positive emotions among employees, leading, among other things, to positive perceptions of individual task performance (Ashkanasy, Zerbe, & Hartel, 2002).

The respondents in this study claimed that a sensitive, emotional, and empathic principal encourages teacher OCB because he or she establishes a cozy and supportive relationship with the staff members, which connects them emotionally to the school. The link is accounted for by a female elementary school teacher:

> Interviewer: What is the principal's place in getting teachers to go beyond?
> Supervisor: To encourage, to direct, to listen, to provide an example. There is a huge influence by how a principal acts with his staff. If my principal shows acceptance and hugs and sympathy, so I'll want to emulate that behavior. The whole school looks up to the principal. He shows the way. A principal who is a unique and authoritarian figure, not just authority based on force, allows people to align accordingly.

Attentiveness to and interest in a teacher's life and work seem to generate an emotional bond between principals and teachers, which in turn increases teachers' readiness to exert much time and effort voluntarily, a view that is supported by teachers in this study:

> Interviewer: How can the principal make teachers do more than required?
> Teacher: When you feel he cares, everything I do for the students he cares about, he cares about my home situation and my work situation. He cares about how I feel in school and what happens with the parents. He feels everything I am feeling, as if we were one person and that encourages me to continue. (Female elementary school teacher)

> If management doesn't listen to the teachers' needs and teachers ask for something because they are in trouble and can't cope, they need support. If they don't receive support or recognition from above, then they won't give back.

> You give what you get. It's the same with the students. (Female junior high school teacher)

A kind of emotional relationship between principals and teachers is argued to motivate teacher OCB, first and foremost, because teachers are more emotionally attached and committed to the school. This attachment is further intensified when they feel their principal is considerate and empathic to their needs and conditions.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

A review of the findings points out that many teachers' role behaviors (e.g., innovative and creative instruction, thorough student assessment, out-of-school activities, helping behaviors, displays of emotion, etc.), already discussed in the literature as part of the teachers' moral and ethical commitments (e.g., Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990; Hargreaves, 1998; Socket, 1993; Zehm & Kottler, 1993), are attached by Israeli teachers and superiors to the nonprescribed side of teaching. Furthermore, although many of these tasks were ideally constructed to be part of a teacher's extended role definition in the large-scale reforms of the 1990s (Fullan, 2000; Levin, 2001), interestingly, they are considered to be out of the formal role definition of teaching by its role incumbents.

Generally speaking, the elements of teacher OCB indicated by the respondents in this study are consistent with major dimensions of employee OCB appearing in the available literature: helping behavior, civic virtue, individual initiative (Organ, 1988, 1997; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Schnake, 1991; Van Dyne et al., 1994). However, in contrast to the existing literature on OCB, the participants did not construct teacher OCB in terms of organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, or sportsmanship. It is likely that sticking to the rules or refraining from complaining about the work are perceived to be an integral part of teachers' ethics, not a part of their OCB as was indicated in several conceptualizations of this construct.

Despite some similarity between the respondents' subjective construction of teacher OCB and past conceptualizations of this behavior, this article provides insight into the expressions of this organizational phenomenon in school. "Caring for students in distress," "thorough assessment of assignments," "taking unrewarded roles in schools," and "pedagogical assistance to students out of formal school hours," all elements of teacher OCB found in this qualitative study, are recommended to be included in future scales/measures of teacher OCB.

Similarly, although most of the determinants indicated by the teachers in this study have already been identified in past research on employee OCB (see the introductory part of this article), the current study sharpened our understanding of the subtle influences of personal and organizational features on teacher OCB. For example, although leadership was already linked with OCB, this study emphasized the significant role of emotional leadership or the principal's innovative attitude in enhancing the degree of teacher OCB in school.

It is worth noting that despite the positive notion of teacher OCB arising from the participants' accounts in this study, and although it is not the focus of this article, OCB also has potentially negative outcomes and meanings. This kind of outcome was indicated by some of the participants. For example, some OCB-oriented teachers narrated negative responses of their colleagues to their initiatives or negative emotions toward them (e.g., jealousy, anger). Few others emphasized their physical and emotional energy depletion and increased work-family conflicts brought about by their OCBs. Because of a shortage of data on this issue, it is left for further inquiry.

A number of insights can be provided by the findings of this study. First, teaching is a boundaryless and messy profession, an assumption shared by many scholars (e.g., Barnett, 1994; Lieberman & Miller, 1984), and any attempt to define its formal, prescribed tasks remains incomplete, leaving many teachers' professional activities and behaviors out of role definition of the teacher. For example, should teaching also include helping behaviors? If the answer is negative, it means that many helping behaviors taking place in school depend on teachers' discretion rather than management decision and planning. The findings emphasize the subjective nature of the teacher's role definition that is based relatively on the personal perceptions of teachers rather than on formal regulations.

Second, the effectiveness of externally imposed changes on teachers is questioned, not merely due to resistance to changes of this kind, as was observed in many cases (Evans, 1996; Fullan, 1991), but because teachers do not necessarily perceive involvement in school changes as part of their role obligations. Teachers in this study assumed that they had no formal obligation to participate in new instructional projects. To the contrary, they stressed the discretionary aspect of any teachers' involvement in instructional or school change. Teacher OCB in this respect was related to teachers' belief in the importance of the change; otherwise, they would be less likely to devote much unrewarded time and effort to performing the tasks related to this change.

Finally, as opposed to the notion arising in the literature on emotions in teaching (Hargreaves, 1998; Nias, 1989), many teachers in this study

consistently shared the assumption that attentiveness, caring, and emotion displays in teaching are actually discretionary, nonobligatory role elements. Display of emotion in teaching is not perceived as a mandatory task or as part of the teacher's role description. A failure to display emotions cannot lead to any formal sanction. I elaborate on this issue elsewhere (Oplatka, in press).

IMPLICATIONS

Practical Implications for Schools and Principal Preparation Program

Drawing on the data gathered in the current study, some tools and recommendations for encouraging and facilitating teacher OCB in school are suggested here. Put differently, how can principals encourage teacher OCB? What should principals refrain from doing to not obstruct teacher OCB? And what areas should be emphasized in training principals to promote teacher OCB?

Based on the significant place given by the teachers in this study to the principal in increasing teacher OCB, principals need to give positive feedback to teachers, provide them with professional autonomy, share managerial decisions with them, and support them emotionally if they wish to raise the degree of teacher OCB in their school.

Positive feedback. Principals need to praise their staff verbally, either individually or in front of school staff, provide them with nonfinancial rewards (as this usually is in the hands of MOE in many countries), give high scores to their initiatives and extrarole activities, and the like. In so doing, the principal gives his or her staff members a sense of being cared for, which may in turn encourage them to invest much time and effort that are not part of their role obligations, just because they feel their actions, tasks, and behaviors are seen as significant by their principal.

Professional autonomy and participative decision making. When teachers are offered a chance to participate in decision-making processes in school (regarding implementation of educational projects, new teaching methods, or changes in the curriculum), they are motivated, to a certain extent, to carry out these projects/changes that usually take place out of school hours and formal work time. Their involvement in the decision making appears to intensify their commitment to the success of these projects, even though it means higher levels of OCB in their work.

Emotional support for the staff. Above all, principals are strongly urged to support their staff emotionally and to create an emotional bond with them. Thus, by listening to teachers' needs; being attentive to their desires, distress, or dilemmas; or supporting them emotionally in difficult times or in professional difficulties, principals might create an emotional bond that, in turn, promotes trusting relationships and a commitment to contribute to the school and class. Teachers may even feel a sense of discomfort if they are not doing much more for the school as a whole and their classroom, just because of their emotional-based relationship with their principal.

Recruiting candidates in favor of OCB. Principals need to give priority to OCB in hiring teacher candidates through open conversation and focus groups with the candidates. On these occasions, the principal, the human resource personnel, and other role incumbents in the school may want to carefully glean information about the candidates' subjective view of the teacher's role, personal expectations from teaching, the candidates' personal constructions of teaching based on their own school days, and the like. Of particular significance, they need to identify the candidates' construction of teacher-pupil relations, the scope of the teaching tasks, the relationships in the staff room, and the place of emotions in the teacher's role. Despite this, when trying to identify those OCB-oriented candidates in teaching, the principal ought to be aware of the limited definition of teaching among preservice teachers and their propensity to focus on instruction and classroom management.

Obviously, principal preparation programs and in-service trainings for principals should address this issue by emphasizing the large impact of the principal on teachers' work commitment and OCB. To this end, principal educators should discuss examples of teacher OCB, the sources of this behavior, the desirable conduct of principals in this respect, the ways to develop a pro-OCB school environment, and the like. Reflections on teacher OCB and on principal-teacher interactions could be of much help in sharpening the key role of principals in facilitating teacher OCB.

A second mechanism to promote teacher OCB is creating a sense of educational calling among the school staff. Educational calling includes a belief in the importance of education in society and in the key role of teachers in the development of the young generation for the sake of a better future society (Falmer, 1999; Hansen, 1995). Holding this kind of belief encourages teachers, for example, to contribute to the school's aims, participate in a wide variety of extrarole activities, and think of many creative teaching methods.

Thus, within-school workshops aimed at sharpening the goals of education and schooling and the ideal role of the teacher (e.g., Is teaching just like other professions in the world? Is the teacher a prophet or a technocrat? Can

we expect teachers to do more than just transmit subject matter?) may clarify these points for their participants (i.e., teachers) and allow them to ponder their professional beliefs, work attitudes, and activities and shape their work commitment in terms of educational calling. In addition, teachers who are known as presenting high levels of employee OCB could be part of this workshop, advocating their sense of educational calling and persuading other teachers to follow in their footsteps by developing positive attitudes toward education and its importance in any society.

Implications for Further Research on Teacher OCB

The current study is one of the few studies conducted worldwide on teacher OCB. As such, it should be looked at as an exploratory inquiry aimed at setting the stage for further studies that will increase our understanding of this organizational phenomenon in schools. Several implications for future research merit highlighting. First, there is a greater need for research exploring issues of employee OCB that are more suited to service organizations in general and schools in particular. A more systematic attempt to study these and other issues would help us understand how schoolteachers contribute to their school and perform tasks voluntarily, what factors lead teachers to adopt certain forms of OCB, and what the potential outcomes of this behavior are.

Second, subsequent research should examine the components of OCB revealed in this study, using statistical procedures such as factor analysis to measure the strength and likelihood of the factors of and their influence on each domain of teacher OCB presented in this study. Of much interest could be a study that compares the frequencies and the factors of OCB between teachers in public and private schools.

Third, as teacher OCB is seen also to be affected by cultural and social rules and scripts in any society, it would be important to explore patterns and types of teacher OCB in other countries. Additional qualitative inquiries are needed in various countries to explore the components of teacher OCB that are subjectively based on teachers, superiors, and stakeholders in these countries. An amalgamation of these international studies could yield substantive evidence concerning teacher OCB, leading to a development of systematic theories and models of this employee behavior in schools.

Finally, the few studies that examined OCB in the educational sector, including the current one, focused on compulsory education. Consequently, there is a greater need for research exploring the components and factors of OCB in higher education systems, including the research university and the college. Such research will shed light on the variability of OCB in educational institutions that range from strong service orientation (e.g., colleges,

teacher training programs) to norms of faculty self-interest that may be oppositional to OCB (e.g., research universities).

A comparison of the components, frequencies, and factors of OCB between research universities and colleges, between public and private colleges/universities, and between university departments/programs (e.g., undergraduate vs. graduate programs, small vs. big departments, social sciences vs. engineering) could extend our understanding of the contextual factors affecting the frequencies and structure of OCB in various educational settings. A replication of the current study in higher education institutions seems to contribute to our understanding of the concept of OCB in education.

REFERENCES

Ashkanasy, N. M., Zerbe, W. J., & Hartel, C. E. (Eds.). (2002). *Managing emotions in the workplace*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Allen, T. D., Barnard, S., Rush, M. C., & Russell, J. E. A. (2000). Ratings of organizational citizenship behavior: Does the source make a difference? *Human Resource Management Review*, *10*(1), 97-114.

Barnett, R. (1994). *The limits of competence: Knowledge, higher education and society.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Bienstock, C., DeMoranville, C. W., & Smith, R. K. (2003). Organizational citizenship behavior and service quality. *Journal of Services Marketing*, *17*, 357-378.

Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (1994). *Empowering teachers: What successful principals do*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *20*, 277-289.

Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors. *Academy of Management Review*, *24*(1), 82-98.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Braungart, R. G., & Braungart, M. M. (1998). Citizenship and citizenship education in the United States in the 1990's. In O. Ichilov (Ed.), *Citizenship and citizenship education in a changing world* (pp. 98-129). London: Woburn Press.

Brock, B. L., & Grady, M. L. (1997). *From first-year to first-rate: Principals guiding beginning teachers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Chhokar, J. S., Zhuplev, A., Fok, L. Y., & Hatman, S. J. (2001). The impact of culture on equity sensitivity perceptions and organizational citizenship behavior: A five-country study. *International Journal of Value-Based Management*, *14*(1), 79-98.

Christ, O., Van Dick, R., Wagner, U., & Stellmacher, J. (2003). When teachers go the extra mile: Foci or organizational identification as determinants of different forms of organizational

citizenship behavior among schoolteachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *73*, 329-341.

Day, C. (1999). *Developing teachers: The challenges of lifelong learning*. London: Falmer Press.

Diefendorff, J. M., Brown, D. J., Kamin, A. M., & Lord, R. G. (2002). Examining the roles of job involvement and work centrality in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(1), 93-108.

Dillard, C. B. (2000). The substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen: Examining an endarkened feminist epistemology in educational research and leadership. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, *13*, 661-681.

Dipola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership*, *11*, 424-445.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods of inquiry. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Third handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 23-42). New York: Macmillan.

Evans, R. (1996). *The human side of school change: Reform, resistance and the real-life problems of innovation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Falmer, P. J. (1999). Evoking the spirit. *Educational Leadership*, *56*(4), 6-11.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2003). Learning to teach English language during the first year: Personal influences and challenges. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *19*, 95-111.

Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teacher College Press.

Fullan, M. (2000). The return of large-scale reforms. *Journal of Educational Change*, *1*(1), 5-27.

Glaser, G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory.* Chicago: Aldine.

Goldscheider, C. (1996). *Israel's changing society: Population, ethnicity, and development*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Goodlad, J. I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. A. (Eds.). (1990). *The moral dimensions of teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodson, I. F. (1991). Sponsoring the teacher's voice: Teachers' lives and teacher development. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *21*(1), 35-45.

Graen, G. B., Novak, M., & Sommerkamp, P. (1982). The effects of leader-member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *30*, 109-131.

Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4, 249-270.

Hall, D. T. (1986). Breaking career routines: Mid career choice and identity development. In D. T. Hall (Ed.), *Career development in organization* (pp. 120-159). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hansen, D. T. (1995). *The call to teach*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1998). The emotional practice of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *14*, 835-854.

Hargreaves, D., & Evans, R. (1997). *Beyond educational reform: Bringing teachers back in*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Haworth, C. L., & Levy, P. E. (2001). The importance of instrumentality beliefs in the prediction of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59*(1), 64-75.

Helsby, G. (1999). *Changing teachers' work: The reform of secondary schooling*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Ichilov, O. (1998). *Citizenship and citizenship education in a changing world*. London: Woburn Press.

Iram, Y., & Schmida, M. (1998). *The educational system of Israel*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Jackson, P. W. (1986). *The practice of teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kidder, D. L., & McLean Parks, J. (2001). The good soldier: Who is s(he)? *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 22*, 939-959.

Kidwell, R. E., Mossholder, K. W., & Bennett, N. (1997). Cohesiveness and organizational citizenship behavior: A multilevel analysis using work groups and individuals. *Journal of Management*, *23*, 775-793.

Kram, K. (1983). Phases in the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*, *26*, 608-625.

LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinback, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Levin, B. (2001). *Reforming education: From origins to outcomes.* London: Routledge.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1984). The social realities of teaching. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.), *Teachers, their world, and their work*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

MacKenzie, S. .B., Podsakoff, P.M., & Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of sales performance. *Journal of Marketing*, *57*, 123-150.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1995). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Meyer, J. W., Scott, W. R., & Deal, T. E. (1992). Institutional and technical sources of organizational structure: Explaining the structure of educational organizations. In J. W. Meyer & W. R. Scott (Eds.), *Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality* (pp. 45-70). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ministry of Education. (1994). *The role incumbents in school: Definitions*. Jerusalem: Special Regulation.

Motowidlo, S. J. (2000). Some basic issues related to contextual performance and organizational citizenship behaviour in human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, *10*(1), 115-126.

Murphy, J. (1992). Changing role of the teacher. In M. J. O'Hair & S. J. Odell (Eds.), *Educating teachers for leadership and change* (pp. 311-323). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Nias, J. (1989). *Primary teachers talking: A study of teaching at work*. London: Routledge.

Nias, J. (1999). Primary teaching as a culture of care. In J. Prosser (Ed.), *School culture* (pp. 66-81). London: Paul Chapman.

Oplatka, I. (2002). The emergence of educational marketing: Lessons from the experiences of Israeli principals. *Comparative Education Review*, *46*, 211-233.

Oplatka, I. (2003). School change and self-renewal: Some reflections from life stories of women principals. *Journal of Educational Change*, *4*(1), 25-43.

Oplatka, I. (2004). The arrival of a new woman principal and teachers' self-renewal: Reflections from life stories of mid-career teachers. *Planning and Changing*, *35*(1/2), 55-68.

Oplatka, I. (in press). Managing emotions in teaching: Towards an understanding of emotion displays and caring as non-prescribed role elements. *Teacher College Record.*

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 L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior, 12* (pp. 43-72). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, *10*, 85-97.

Paine, J. B., & Organ, D. W. (2000). The cultural matrix of organizational citizenship behavior: Some preliminary conceptual and empirical observations. *Human Resource Management Review*, *10*(1), 45-59.

Paton, M. Q. (1990) *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Paton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation method.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pearson, A. T. (1989). *The teacher: Theory and practice in teacher education*. New York: Routledge.

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*, 513-563.

Pollard, A. (1985). *The social world of the primary teacher.* London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Ryan, J. J. (2002). Work values and organizational citizenship behaviors: Values that work for employees and organizations. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *17*(1), 123-132.

Schnake, M. (1991). Organizational citizenship: A review, proposed model, and research agenda. *Human Relations*, *44*, 735-759.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, *57*(1), 1-22.

Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*, 219-227.

Smith, A. C., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*, 653-663.

Socket, H. (1993). *The moral base for teacher professionalism*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Somech, A., & Bogler, R. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of teacher organizational and professional commitment. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *38*, 555-577.

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.

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, *12*, 269-292.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Thompson, H. B., & Werner, J. M. (1997). The impact of role conflict/facilitation on core and discretionary behaviors: Testing a mediated model. *Journal of Management*, *23*, 583-601.

Turnipseed, D. L. (2002). Are good soldiers good? Exploring the link between organization citizenship behavior and personal ethics. *Journal of Business Research*, *55*(1), 1-15.

Van Dyne, L., Graham, J., & Dienesch, R. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement and validation. *Academy of Management*, *37*, 765-802.

Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*, 525-531.

Wayne, S. J., & Green, S. A. (1993). The effects of leader-member exchange on employee citizenship and impression management behavior. *Human Relations*, *46*, 1431-1440.

Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, *40*, 82-111.

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, *17*, 601-617.

Wong, Y. T., Ngo, H. Y., & Wong, C. S. (2003). Antecedents and outcomes of employees' trust in Chinese joint ventures. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *20*, 481-499.

Zehm, S. J., & Kottler, J. A. (1993). *On being a teacher: The human dimension*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Izhar Oplatka *is a senior lecturer in the division of educational administration and policy in the Department of Education, Ben Gurion University, Israel. His current areas of interest are the career and career development of teachers/principals, gender and educational administration, school marketing, and school choice. His book* From Burnout to Renewal: The Life Stories of Women Principals in Israel *(2002) was the first book published in Hebrew about the lives and careers of female principals.*