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ABSTRACT

Leading a school is a multi-faceted and complex endeavor. The moral obligation and public expectation to provide students with a high quality education creates significant pressure for principals to continuously improve the educational program despite obstacles such as an ever-changing economy and parameters placed on workload due to job descriptions and union contracts. The reality of teaching is that educators cannot be bound by the limitations of these documents. Consequently, it would benefit a principal to nurture a school culture that embraces a mentality of going above and beyond.

Formally known as Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), this construct explains discretionary behavior that may or may not be formally recognized by a supervisor and which ultimately leads to the more effective functioning of an organization. This research study examined the role of the principal in motivating or inspiring OCB among teachers. Using a phenomenological approach and its subset, the Critical Incident Technique, the specific actions and behaviors of one principal at a high performing urban school with high levels of OCB were collected using semi-structured interviews. The data revealed eight critical incidents leading to teachers’ desire to engage in citizenship behaviors: showing interest and concern for personal life of staff, giving encouragement, consistently being visible and accessible to staff, providing resources, inviting staff to her home, giving recognition and appreciation, having a vision, and thinking like a teacher. Further analysis of these eight critical incidents elucidated that the principal’s interpersonal skills were at the core of her ability to inspire OCB.
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CHAPTER 1—INTRODUCTION

Given the ease with which state departments of education can now collect, analyze, and communicate test results, close scrutiny of public schools and school districts has greatly intensified. Understandably, the public expects students to graduate as 21st century learners who are prepared to thrive in today’s complex, technology-driven, and globalized world. As a result, educators are held accountable for increasing levels of learning and achievement, even as social, cultural, and economic realities challenge their capacity to deliver these desired results. Despite these challenges, the public remains exigent in its expectations. Educators not only face the complexities of the day-to-day operations of schools, but must also perform as servant, moral agent, social advocate, researcher, data analyst, and teacher. In sum, teaching within 21st century schools constitutes a multifaceted profession requiring effort that frequently extends beyond allocated time within the contractual day.

Background of the Problem

Rapid increases in poverty, non-English speaking children and families, and entry-level education requirements for well-paying jobs, combined with substantial education-related budget reductions, complicate and intensify the daily work of schools. Educators are faced with these difficulties and are expected to overcome them without a corresponding increase in instructional time, compensation, or resources. A closer look at these realities reveals a glaring truth: in order to attempt to answer the call for a first-rate education under these circumstances, teachers must go above and beyond.
Student and Family Facts

According to the Basic Facts About Low-Income Children (National Center for Children in Poverty [NCCP], 2013), the percentage of children living in low-income and/or poor families has increased from 40% in 2006 to 45% in 2011. In 2011, the federal poverty level was $22,350 for a family of four, $18,530 for a family of three, and $14,710 for a family of two (NCCP, 2013). In that same year, 10.9 million, or 45% of children ages 6 through 11 years, lived in low-income families; and 10 million, or 41% of children ages 12 through 17 years, lived under the same circumstances (NCCP, 2013).

Poverty affects a child’s education in a variety of ways. Children of poverty have parents with lower educational levels. Eighty-six percent of children with parents who have less than a high school degree live in low-income families, and the same is true for 66% of children with parents who have no more than a high school degree (NCCP, 2013). Less parental education poses a challenge for schools. When parents have difficulty assisting their children with schoolwork, teachers are faced with providing most, if not all, academic understanding. This may compel teachers to voluntarily go above and beyond the regular workday to provide extra assistance or tutoring for students.

Additionally, teachers will find themselves working extra time with parents who request assistance in understanding homework assignments, as these meetings must occur before or after school and beyond contracted hours.

Mobility. Children in poverty also have a higher mobility rate than those living in more affluent families. Twenty-one percent, or 6.9 million children in low-income families, moved in the last year, while only 11% of children in families with higher income moved in the same time period (NCCP, 2013). This higher mobility rate also
presents difficulties for schools, as the curriculum, or its pacing, is often not the same from one school to the next. Thus, there may be a period of adaptation for the child. The effect on the teacher is such that, if the child needs to “catch up,” the teacher may voluntarily stay after school to assist the child and will likely have to temporarily put extra planning time to differentiate instruction for the new student.

**Attendance.** Poverty also has an impact on school attendance and therefore standardized tests. A 2008 study by the National Center for Children in Poverty found that chronic absentees in kindergarten had the lowest academic achievement in first grade, and poor children who were chronically absent in kindergarten had the lowest performance in reading and math in fifth grade. Chronic absenteeism was defined as having missed 10% or more of the school year.

During the early elementary years, children are gaining basic social and academic skills critical to ongoing academic success. Unless students attain these essential skills by third grade, they require extra help to catch up and are at grave risk for eventually dropping out of school. (NCCP, 2008, p. 3)

This “extra help” often presents itself by way of teachers who provide support and assistance outside of the contractual day.

**Language.** According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2011 American Community Survey (ACS) results, between 1980 and 2010, the United States experienced a 158% change in the number of people speaking a language other than English at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). The 2011 ACS survey data revealed that 20.8%, or 60,577,020 of the U.S. population, spoke a language other than English at home. In California alone, 43.8% or 15,390,211 people fell into this category (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). As a
result, teachers must voluntarily work to achieve certification for teaching English Learners (ELs). For example, California teachers must attain the Cross-cultural, Language, and Academic Development certificate, authorizing them to teach ELs. Teachers pay for the program themselves and attend classes beyond the school day. Furthermore, teachers necessarily spend extra planning time when teaching ELs, as they are responsible for instruction in core content areas, as well as in a second language. Teachers are not generally compensated for the additional work.

**Budget Realities**

Ongoing budget cuts compel teachers to do more with less. According to the California Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO, 2012), districts have made notable reductions in spending since 2007-08. Specifically, per pupil spending has dropped by almost 5% between 2007-08 and 2010-11. Districts have reduced costs by employing fewer teachers and administrators, increasing class size, and by instituting furlough days.

Almost across the board, school districts in California have reduced staffing levels, as shown on Table 1. A reduction in teachers equates to an increase in class sizes as indicated on Table 2.

Finally, furlough days have become commonplace among a majority of districts in California. The 2012 report by the California State Legislative Analyst’s Office found: In 2008-09 almost all districts (98 percent) provided at least 180 instructional days per year. By 2010-11, that proportion dropped to only 61 percent, with about one-fifth of districts providing between 179 and 176 days, and about one-fifth having decreased to the statutory minimum of 175 days. Most districts maintained their shorter school years in 2011-12. (p. 9)
Table 1

**Staffing Levels From 2007-08 to 2010-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>Percent change 2007-08 to 2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>300,512</td>
<td>298,960</td>
<td>291,028</td>
<td>268,495</td>
<td>-11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time classified staff</td>
<td>158,080</td>
<td>158,033</td>
<td>153,749</td>
<td>148,598</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time classified staff</td>
<td>136,122</td>
<td>145,574</td>
<td>144,247</td>
<td>142,996</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil support service providers³</td>
<td>27,629</td>
<td>27,343</td>
<td>23,458</td>
<td>23,666</td>
<td>-14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>25,687</td>
<td>25,095</td>
<td>23,159</td>
<td>21,602</td>
<td>-16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


³Certified staff providing specialized services, such as counseling.

Table 2

**Average Class Size From 2008-09 to 2011-12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 4-6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite cuts in staffing, instructional days, and class size increases, teachers are still held accountable for the same high standards set by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Meanwhile, student factors, such as those previously described, have not improved and budget cuts create even more challenging educational circumstances. This equates to the need for teachers to go above and beyond the call of duty in order to meet the needs of all students and respond to public pressure.

A reduction in work year not only affects instructional time, but also professional development. The demands from societal influences necessitate the need for continuous educational reform and, by extension, professional development. For example, in 2009, the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) were completed, and as of 2013, they had been adopted by 45 states. Along with the CCSS comes a next generation assessment unlike anything schools have previously experienced. The reality of such a monumental change in standards and assessment demands an equally prodigious amount of professional development. And yet, many districts have either decreased or eliminated professional development days beyond the school year. The LAO (2012) found that at least one-third of districts decreased noninstructional staff-work days since 2008-09. These days were by and large used for professional development. Reduced time for professional development within contract hours means that teachers must take the initiative for their own professional growth beyond the contracted work day.

**Occupational Outlook and College Readiness**

Parents send their children to school with the expectation that they will gain the necessary knowledge and skills that will ultimately result in a future occupation that allows their children to live comfortably and independently. The following data from the
Occupational Outlook Handbook (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS], 2013) shows that a postsecondary education is now the norm if K-12 education is to meet these expectations:

- Of the 45 occupations that have a declining projected growth rate from 2010-2020, only five require an Associate’s degree, while the remaining occupations require the equivalent of a high school diploma or less.

- Conversely, of the 50 occupations that will experience a 29% or faster growth rate, only 7 do not require a high school diploma. Of these 7 occupations, 5 of them fall within construction, and do not offer higher wages. Sixteen of these growth occupations require at least a high school diploma, 2 require a postsecondary nondegree award, and 24 require an Associate’s degree and above.

- Ten of the 12 highest paying occupations ($55,000+) in the growth list require at least a Bachelor’s degree, while the other two require an Associate’s. Nine of the 21 mid-range paying careers ($35,000 to $54,999) allow for a high school diploma or less, while the remaining 12 require postsecondary education.

Putting these data in the context of income levels is also important to consider if students are to realize a comfortable and independent living. Given the data in Table 3 that describes the entry level education required by occupations that may provide a median to moderate income, it appears K-12 education must minimally provide students with a college-ready education. Such preparation requires an ample amount of schooling and preferably a longer school day or year; nevertheless, budget cuts have had the
Table 3

Income Levels for Largest Counties of California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income levels</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
<th>San Bernardino</th>
<th>Santa Clara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely low</td>
<td>17,950</td>
<td>20,250</td>
<td>17,350</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>22,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>29,900</td>
<td>33,750</td>
<td>28,900</td>
<td>23,450</td>
<td>23,450</td>
<td>37,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>47,850</td>
<td>53,950</td>
<td>46,250</td>
<td>37,550</td>
<td>37,550</td>
<td>59,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>45,350</td>
<td>61,050</td>
<td>53,150</td>
<td>45,500</td>
<td>45,500</td>
<td>73,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>54,450</td>
<td>72,250</td>
<td>63,750</td>
<td>54,600</td>
<td>54,600</td>
<td>88,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


opposite effect and many states or districts have instead decreased the school year (Yamamura, 2011).

Despite societal challenges, budget realities, and the college readiness needs presented by occupational outlook and desired income levels, teachers are receiving the message that they should do more with less. In order to accomplish this, it is apparent that teachers must be willing to go above and beyond their contract and job description.

**Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

In the 1980s, across the fields of sales, management, and manufacturing, “above and beyond” practices became known as Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). Dennis W. Organ (1988), who is credited with being the architect of OCB, defined it as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (p. 4). Since then, myriad studies have shown that OCB
positively contributes to organizational effectiveness (Nielsen, Hrivnak, & Shaw, 2009; Organ, 1988; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994, 1997; Walz & Niehoff, 1996). Related literature has further solidified the characteristics of organizational citizenship behavior, as well as its contributions to organizational effectiveness, including improved individual and group work performance and productivity (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994, 1997).

Within an educational context, researchers have studied OCB as it relates to organizational climate, trust, leadership, and student achievement (Burns & Carpenter, 2008; DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a, 2005b; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990; Tschannen-Moran, 2004). A strong relationship exists between school climate and OCB; specifically, a climate that emphasizes factors such as academic press, shared decision-making, and collaboration impact the presence and strength of organizational citizenship behaviors (Bogler & Somech, 2005; DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Correspondingly, these three factors are dependent upon the principal exhibiting specific leadership behaviors such as providing collaborative support, having a strong academic focus, and a vision for student achievement (Cotton, 2003; DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

Similarly, these extra-role behaviors can be encouraged through transformational leadership practices. Transformational leadership inspires employees to understand and appreciate organizational objectives such that they place the good of the organization above their own self-interests (Marks & Printy, 2003). Transformational leaders induce a desire to go above and beyond through actions such as setting high expectations, having
a clear vision, establishing a system of support, and encouraging participation in decision-making (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999; Marks & Printy, 2003; Podsakoff et al., 1990).

Interpersonal aptitude, especially as it relates to trust-building, affects the work environment and employee citizenship behaviors. Trust reduces conflict (Kacmar, Bachrach, Harris, & Noble, 2012) while promoting professionalism (Tschannen-Moran, 2009) and increasing OCB (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; McAllister, 1995; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999; Podsakoff et al., 1990). Trust in the school leader is determined by behaviors encompassed in transformational leadership, collegiality (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998), the 21 leadership responsibilities (Marzano et al., 2005), and 25 leadership behaviors (Cotton, 2003). Fairness, justice, and rewards are shown to make a difference in trust, commitment to the supervisor and, therefore, citizenship behaviors (Chiaburu & Lim, 2008; Moorman, 1991; Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010). Leaders who are fair and just cultivate trust which bears positively on OCB (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Moorman, 1991).

Educational leaders face challenges that may require employees to perform beyond the basic job expectations. Still, supervisors cannot force people to adopt organizational citizenship behaviors. Expecting or hoping for intrinsic motivation to suffice is both unrealistic and unreliable. Instead, leaders who aspire to develop efficient and effective organizations can promote OCB through specific leadership behaviors and actions.
### Purpose of the Study

This study applied a qualitative methodology, encompassing phenomenology and its subset, the critical incident technique. These methods probed the principal’s role in developing, nurturing, and maintaining organizational citizenship behavior. While quantitative studies in leadership behaviors and their effect on many aspects of school efficacy abound, this study specifically endeavored to achieve a detailed understanding about which specific leadership behaviors and actions afford teachers the impetus to aspire to go above and beyond.

### Research Questions

The following primary research question directed this study: What is the principal’s role in developing, nurturing, and maintaining organizational citizenship behavior?

Secondary research questions included:

1. Which specific leadership behaviors and actions promote organizational citizenship behaviors?
2. How do teachers perceive the principal’s role in developing OCB?

### Significance

It is unlikely that urban principals, faced with high levels of poverty and other similar adversities, will ever feel that they have an appropriate level of staffing to adequately serve students. To mediate these shortcomings, principals will need to do more with less; that is, to inspire staff members to go above and beyond the job description, engaging in organizational citizenship behaviors.
The body of research regarding organizational citizenship identifies several characteristics that motivate OCB; however, knowing the characteristics that encourage OCB does not necessarily provide leaders with an understanding of the specific behaviors or actions that relate to these characteristics. For example, trust is a characteristic that may inspire OCB, but the details of which specific behaviors build trust as it relates to OCB are not known. This study helped to identify specific actions and behaviors of principals who inspire high levels of OCB.

**Methodology**

Careful consideration of qualitative methods indicate that phenomenology and its subtype, the critical incident technique (CIT), were most appropriate for collecting the quality and depth of experiences that are sought by this study. Giorgi (2009) describes phenomenology as:

A philosophy that seeks to understand anything at all that can be experienced through the consciousness one has of whatever is ‘given’—whether it be an object, a person, or a complex state of affairs—from the perspective of the conscious person undergoing the experience. (p. 4)

Similarly, in the tradition of Husserl (1970), Moustakas (1994) offers a summary of phenomenology as:

[a] scientific study of the appearance of things, of phenomena just as we see them and as they appear to us in consciousness. . . . The challenge is to explicate the phenomenon in terms of its constituents and possible meanings, thus discerning the features of consciousness and arriving at an understanding of the essences of the experiences. (p. 49)
Organizational citizenship behavior is a phenomenon that is consciously experienced in different and personal ways. Merely quantifying the influencers of OCB fails to provide the depth of understanding desired by the present study. The tenet of phenomenology, to “know the experienced as experienced” (Giorgi, 2009, p. 69), provided more in-depth insight into the essence of a leader’s influence on organizational citizenship behavior.

In order to fully capture the participants’ experiences, an adaptation of the critical incident technique was utilized. Flanagan (1954), who is widely recognized as the architect of CIT, describes it as “a set of procedures for collecting direct observations of human behavior in such a way as to facilitate their potential usefulness in solving practical problems and developing broad psychological principles” (p. 1). This method provides a structured means to ascertain information about specific behaviors from people who are most qualified to provide such data (Flanagan, 1954). In the case of the present study, the unique leadership behaviors and actions that influence OCB were procured from the leader and the leader’s staff.

The participating school was selected based on its status as an urban school, academic achievement, and results from the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (DiPaola, Tartar, & Hoy, 2005). Once the school’s eligibility was determined, the principal, six classroom teachers, and two credentialed support staff were interviewed using a semi-structured interview format which allowed for a degree of flexibility in order to elicit specificity or clarity (Creswell, 2009). Analysis included categorization and classification of incidents followed by a detailed summary and description of the data.
The present study ensured the trustworthiness of the data through peer debriefing, member checking, thick description, journaling, and the establishment of an audit trail (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

**Limitations and Delimitations**

Proper reporting of limitations is an essential component of an exhaustive and credible study (Brutus, Aguinis, & Wassmer, 2013; Ioannidis, 2007). Expressly stated, “knowledge and discussion of limitations are essential for genuine scientific progress: they are useful for understanding a research finding, translating the importance errors involved, placing the current work in context, and ascribing a credibility level to it” (Ioannidis, 2007, p. 324). The possibility that a published study may be selected for replication requires a limitations section that is comprehensive and well-defined (Brutus et al., 2013; Ioannidis, 2007).

The proposed study was bounded by four main limitations. First, the researcher possesses background knowledge as a former school site administrator. As a former principal, the researcher may bring biases that affect the interpretation of data. Further, the researcher served as a principal at a school site with a similar demographic as that of the school under study. A reflective journal and counsel by the dissertation chair and a peer auditor will serve to curtail the researcher bias.

Second, the selected qualitative methods relied upon information gathered solely from interviews. The critical incident technique depends on information gathered through interviews; as such, the possibility of collecting faulty data exists. A lack of candor, inaccurate memories, and forgotten memories may affect the results of the study.
A third limitation is that the size of the sample and required school characteristics places limits on the study’s applicability to a wider readership. The selected school site was bounded by location that is limited to urban schools located in Southern California. Finally, the principal of the participating school site and the researcher have known each other professionally and personally for 15 years. In order to mediate any potential bias that might have emerged from this relationship, the researcher maintained a personal journal which was reviewed with her Chair as necessary.

This study was delimited to one district in southern California. Within this district, an additional delimitation was that only urban schools which have shown academic growth were considered for the study. Teachers who work at the school on a full-time basis were selected on a voluntary basis and credentialed teachers acting in a support capacity, such as Special Education Specialists, were also selected as part of an “other teaching staff” group.

With reference to the phenomenological aspects of the study, critics argue that its inherent subjectivity leads to difficulties in establishing reliability and validity. The rigorous and systematic process of confirming trustworthiness served to authenticate this study and to address the perceived limitations asserted by critics of phenomenology.

**Definitions of Key Terms**

*Academic press:* A learning environment that is orderly and serious and in which teachers and students alike are committed to intellectual and academic accomplishments (DiPaola et al., 2005).
Civic virtue: In OCB, the individual who sees himself as a part of the whole and actively participates in the functioning and decision-making of the organization he/she represents (Organ, 1988).

Collegial leadership: Characterized by the behavior of the principal that is supportive and egalitarian (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b).

Conscientiousness: “Impersonal contributions to the organization in such forms as exemplary attendance, use of work time, respect for company property, and faithful adherence to rules about work procedures and conduct” (Organ & Ryan, 1995, p. 782).

Courtesy: In OCB, coworkers voluntarily doing something for each other in order to prevent a problem from arising (Organ, 1988).

Discretionary: The freedom to decide what should be done in a particular situation without outside pressures.

Disposition: A person’s inherent qualities of mind and character (“Disposition,” n.d.).

Distributive justice: The fairness of the outcomes an employee receives.

Essence: Core meanings mutually understood through a phenomenon commonly experienced (Patton, 2002).

Helping: Behaviors that have the effect of helping other persons with organizationally relevant task or problem (Organ, 1988).

Interactional justice: The perception of the quality of treatment an employee receives when policies and procedures are implemented in the workplace (Bies & Moag, 1986).
**Interpersonal:** Relating to relationships or communication between people ("Interpersonal," n.d.).

*Organizational citizenship behavior:* Individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988).

*Procedural justice:* A climate reflective of procedural justice is one in which employees perceive that the processes by which decisions are made are fair.

*Sportsmanship:* In OCB, participants who demonstrate sportsmanship avoid negative behaviors such as complaining or making petty grievances (Organ, 1988).

*Transformational leadership:* A leadership style that stimulates and inspires followers to both achieve extraordinary outcomes and, in the process, develop their own leadership capacity (Bass & Riggio, 2008).

**Outline of the Research Document**

This dissertation consists of five chapters. The first chapter briefly informs the reader about all aspects of the research study, including a description of the background of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, the guiding research questions, the purpose and significance of the study, a synopsis of the methodology, limitations and delimitations, and definitions of key terminology.

The history of OCB and several studies around this construct are the foundation of Chapter 2. The organization of this chapter includes: the definition of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, OCB and organizational performance, attitudinal and dispositional antecedents of OCB, organizational citizenship in schools, OCB and student achievement, leadership and OCB, trust, fairness, justice, and rewards.
Chapter 3 presents the proposed methodology and research design for this study. Phenomenology and the critical incident technique are explicated along with a clear description of the procedures for establishing rigor and trustworthiness. This chapter also includes the particulars of context, participants, data collection, instrumentation, and ethical issues.

The data and results of the study are reported in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 encompasses the findings of the proposed study along with conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research on organizational citizenship behavior in schools.
The profound impact of effective leadership cannot be overstated. Numerous studies have found that principals play a pivotal role in school effectiveness, student achievement, and teacher motivation (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010; Marzano et al., 2005). The same studies have identified several ways that principals execute effective practices, as well as characteristics shared by such leaders. One outcome of these leadership dispositions is organizational citizenship behavior or going above and beyond the job description without corresponding pay or tangible rewards: a reality desired by building administrators who strive to achieve the high expectations of parents, politicians, and the public in general.

The review of literature begins with Organ’s (1988) seminal work on organizational citizenship behavior, exploring his definition of OCB and its five dimensions. A growing body of research and scholarship builds on this foundation, seeking to define OCB as an organizational phenomenon and more closely isolate its antecedents, consequences, characteristics, and leadership supports (Bogler & Somech, 2004, 2005; Deluga, 1995; DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b; DiPaola & Tschanne-Moran, 2001; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Somech & Bogler, 2002; Somech & Ron, 2007). Although this study seeks to understand the role OCB plays within schools as organizations, a thorough review of literature will necessarily include studies of OCB within the realms of psychology and business. This more expansive exploration provides further insight into this topic by exploring such issues as trust and motivation (Brower, Lester, Korsgaard, & Dineen, 2009; Deluga, 1995; Pink, 2009).
Defining Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is defined as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p. 4). Organ (1988) elaborated:

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)

Much of the interest in OCB comes from the belief that these behaviors result in improved organizational performance. That is, as employees engage in actions above and beyond their prescribed job duties, the organization experiences greater success in the form of quantity and quality of work (Kidwell, Mossholder, & Bennett, 1997; Nielsen et al., 2009; Podsakoff et al., 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994, 1997; Walz & Niehoff, 1996).

Five specific categories of discretionary behavior have been identified including helping, sportsmanship, courtesy, civic virtue, and compliance. These categories have been measured extensively as they correlate to OCB (Kidwell et al., 1997; Krebs, 1970; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994, 1997). Helping denotes behavior targeted at assisting individuals such as coworkers, supervisors, or customers, as well as helping others to prevent problems. For instance, in a school setting, helping may take the form of a veteran teacher who voluntarily assists a
beginning teacher with lesson planning. Sportsmanship constitutes those behaviors such as not complaining and keeping a positive attitude when changes or difficulties arise. An example of sportsmanship might be teachers who make the best of things despite an increase in class size due to budget cuts. A display of courtesy as OCB occurs when coworkers voluntarily do something for each other in order to prevent a problem from arising. An act of courtesy might therefore be a second grade teacher of a challenging student who seeks out the child’s third grade teacher to share her strategies for dealing with the student successfully. The individual who sees himself as a part of the whole and actively participates in the functioning and decision-making of the organization represents civic virtue. For example, a teacher who volunteers to serve on the School Site Council or Governance Team displays civic virtue.

Compliance, as a form of OCB, can become complicated within the educational system because of the presence of union rules. Teacher associations will often use strict contractual compliance during negotiations. Nevertheless, compliance has also been identified as a form of OCB (C. A. Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Examples of compliance include having good attendance, not engaging in idle chatter, or avoiding excessive breaks. Although these behaviors are often formally addressed within the job description, Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie (2006) suggest there is a discretionary dimension in “the degree to which individuals comply with the arrangements of workplace governance” (p. 21). For example, teachers are contractually guaranteed a number of sick days per year, but the rate at which those sick days are used varies greatly based on each teacher’s judgment of when it is necessary to stay home. While there are some teachers who feel compelled to go to work as long as they can stand, there are
others who may consider a slight headache sufficient reason to call in sick. Katz (1964) cautions that an emphasis on compliance can have the unintended effect of lowering expectations where the minimum becomes the maximum, and the desire to go beyond the job description is diminished.

In general the greater the emphasis upon compliance with rules the less the motivation will be for individuals to do more than is specified by their role prescriptions. The great weakness of a system run according to rules is the lack of the corrective factor of human enterprise and spontaneity when something goes wrong. (Katz, 1964, p. 135)

**OCB and Organizational Effectiveness**

Several studies have verified the effects that various dimensions of OCB have on organizational effectiveness. Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994) studied OCBs and organizational performance among insurance agents. Specifically, they investigated the dimensions of sportsmanship, civic virtue, and helping behavior. The results indicated that almost one-fifth of the variance (17%) in overall unit performance was accounted for by OCBs. Civic virtue and sportsmanship had a positive effect on unit performance; however, helping behavior had a significant negative impact on unit performance. In this case, the researchers presented a variety of possible explanations for the negative effects of helping behavior, but, ultimately, the design of the study was such that it did not enable them to analyze further. In a study of machine crews at a paper mill, Podsakoff and colleagues (1997) found that helping behavior and sportsmanship were positively related to the quantity of work crew performance, while helping behavior was also related to the quality of performance. However, civic virtue did not have a relationship with either
quantity or quality of work performance. At limited menu restaurants, Walz and Niehoff (1996) found a positive relationship between helping behaviors, sportsmanship, and civic virtue to a number of effectiveness criteria. Notably, the amount of variance explained by the OCB dimensions ranged from 15% for operating efficiency to 43% for food cost percentage and 39% for customer satisfaction.

Although OCB studies have not directly examined why organizational citizenship behaviors positively impact organizational effectiveness, there are several reasons that possibly explain this phenomenon:

OCBs may contribute to organizational success by (a) enhancing coworker and managerial productivity, (b) freeing up resources so they can be used for more productive purposes, (c) reducing the need to devote scarce resources to purely maintenance functions, (d) helping to coordinate the activities both within and across work groups, (e) strengthening the organization’s ability to attract and retain the best employees, (f) increasing the stability of the organization’s performance, and (g) enabling the organization to more effectively adapt to environmental changes. (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997, p. 138)

The vast majority of research on organizational citizenship behavior and its impact on effectiveness has been quantitative. Despite sometimes mixed findings about the relationship between some dimensions of OCB and organizational performance, evidence suggests statistically significant relationships do exist. In some cases, mixed findings resulted from limitations in research method or design. As a result, a qualitative study on OCB is a distinct and gainful approach to a deeper examination of citizenship behavior.
Attitudinal and Dispositional Antecedents of OCB

Given the discretionary nature of organizational citizenship behavior, attitude and disposition have been established as predictors of OCB. Despite a meta-analysis of decades of research that states the contrary, the general population has long believed that job satisfaction leads to better job performance (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985). Organ (1997) suggests that the way researchers have measured performance may have led to problems with the connection between OCB and job satisfaction. Traditionally, performance is quantified in objective ways that produce visible and measurable output. However, it may be important to consider how the layperson defines performance because “an organization is more than the sum total of the outputs of individual jobs or the composite of the individual task performances. Organized collective effort is efficacious precisely because the sum is greater than its parts” (Organ, 1997, p. 70). This assertion is particularly worthy of further exploration in the realm of education, because performance is generally measured by state tests. If one is to accept the research that job satisfaction leads to better performance, is one to assume that urban schools, which are historically underperforming, are filled with dissatisfied teachers who do not engage in organizational citizenship behaviors?

Bandura (1995) refers to self-efficacy as “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations. Efficacy beliefs influence how people think, feel, motivate themselves, and act” (p. 2). It stands to reason, then, that persons with a high level of self-efficacy might be more likely to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors. Todd and Kent (2006) investigated the direct and indirect effects of task characteristics on OCB by surveying 337 employees and
hypothesized that task autonomy, task significance, and job self-efficacy would have a positive effect upon OCB dimensions. The findings showed that job self-efficacy positively impacted helping behavior, conscientiousness, and sportsmanship. In terms of self-efficacy and its relationship to helping behavior, Todd and Kent (2006) inferred that when individuals feel confident about their abilities, they are more predisposed to want to help others. Thus, organizations may do well to provide its employees with strong training and mentoring programs. Such a focus would increase their feelings of competency or self-efficacy thereby increasing the chances of OCB especially by way of helping behaviors.

Organizational Citizenship in Schools

Given the demands of teaching, organizational citizenship behaviors in schools has necessarily gained attention in the last several years. In general, OCB has been divided into two broad categories: (a) OCBI-behaviors that benefit specific individuals and (b) OCBO-behaviors that benefit the organization in general. “The distinction between OCBI and OCBO is important because prior work suggests that these two forms of OCB activities can have different antecedents and because some research has not included both dimensions” (Williams & Anderson, 1991, p. 602). Group performance and OCB has been found to have a positive relationship; in other words, the more a group demonstrated OCBs, the better their performance. In one meta-analysis, the relationship between overall group OCB and performance was positive and significant ($\rho = .29$), with the strongest relationship being altruism ($\rho = .34$), and the weakest being helping behavior ($\rho = .19$, Nielsen et al., 2009, p. 566). Additionally, this same meta-analysis found that OCBO was more strongly associated with higher performance than OCBI.
Within the school setting, however, OCBO and OCBI become synonymous. DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) found that OCB in schools is actually a one-factor construct. The constructs OCBO and OCBI do not exist independent of each other, because educators work to help individuals and these actions, in turn, help the organization. As a service organization, “The distinction between helping individuals and furthering the organizational mission is blurred, because the mission is synonymous with helping people” (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001, p. 442). Likewise, Bogler and Somech (2005) found that the correlation between OCBI and OCBO was relatively high, implying that the two constructs share similar characteristics; “the more teachers exhibited OCBs toward individuals, the more they exhibited such behaviors toward the school as an organization” (Bogler & Somech, 2005, p. 428). These findings are in accord with the notion that the definitions of OCBs may vary depending upon the type of work environment.

A variety of conditions foster OCB in schools. DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) surveyed 664 teachers in 42 public elementary and middle schools, as well as 1,210 teachers in 97 public high schools. Results revealed a strong relationship between school climate and OCB. Specifically, collegial leadership, professional norms, and a strong press for academic achievement were positively related to OCB. Similarly, when DiPaola and Hoy (2005b) examined results taken from 1,300 surveys given to teachers at 75 middle schools, they ascertained the same findings for leadership and academic press. They also examined the relationship between trust and OCB, determining that “teacher trust in colleagues was positively related to the cultivation of citizenship behaviors in schools” (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b, p. 401).
Participation in decision making is another condition that relates to increased OCB. Teachers who feel empowered through shared decision making are more likely to exhibit OCB toward students, colleagues, and the school as a whole. In a study linking shared decision making and OCB, Bogler and Somech (2005) stated that “involvement in decision-making processes induces teachers to take on new roles and ‘go the extra mile’” (p. 430). Being part of the process gives teachers the responsibility and incentive to want to ensure that goals are met, thereby providing the motivation to do whatever it takes to succeed.

A collaborative environment also fosters teachers’ OCB. Somech and Ron (2007) collected survey data from 104 teachers at eight elementary schools and determined that there was a positive and significant relationship between collectivism and the overall scale of OCB. Furthermore, a study by Kidwell and colleagues (1997) also indicated “social context, as revealed through group cohesiveness, affects the amount of OCB displayed in work groups as well as relationships between affective work reactions and OCB” (p. 787).

The existence of organizational citizenship behavior is likely to be found in all schools to some degree; however, its effects on organizational performance will vary to the extent that the school’s climate facilitates high levels of group OCB. The aforementioned elements that contribute to OCB are influenced by school leadership. This study and its qualitative analysis about leadership behaviors and actions extracted more precise information on the manners in which school principals motivate organizational citizenship.
OCB and Student Achievement

In the current climate of high stakes, accountability school effectiveness is most often measured by student performance on standardized tests. As a result, schools are on a constant pursuit to either raise or maintain high levels of student achievement. Studies have found a link between OCB and student achievement; therefore, this relationship suggested the need for further exploration into ways that a leader can influence citizenship behavior.

In a study of 97 high schools, DiPaola and Hoy (2005a) asked, does OCB facilitate student achievement within a school? They found a significant and positive correlation between OCB of faculty and student achievement in reading and math, even when controlling for socioeconomic status (SES). Specifically, OCB and the percentage of students passing the 12th grade proficiency test were correlated for reading ($r = .30, p < .01$) and for mathematics ($r = .34, p < .01$) showing that the greater the level of OCB, the higher the levels of student achievement. When accounting for SES, once again there were substantial and significant results (partial $r = .28, p < .01$) in reading and (partial $r = .30, p < .01$) for mathematics. According to DiPaola and Hoy (2005a), “The conclusion was clear: Faculty organizational citizenship of a school is an important factor in the level of student achievement in schools” (p. 41).

Burns and DiPaola (2013) conducted a study to determine the relative and collective effects of organizational justice, OCB, and SES in explaining variance in student achievement. Their sample included 34 high schools and instrumentation including the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (DiPaola et al., 2004) and the Organizational Justice Scale (Hoy & Tartar, 2004). Student achievement was measured
by the Virginia Standards of Learning assessments in Biology, U.S. History, Reading, and Writing. Although the study did not find a significant relationship between organizational justice and student achievement, data from the correlational analysis indicated that OCB was significantly related to student achievement in Biology ($r = .57, p < .01$) and Reading ($r = .48, p < .01$). With a moderate positive correlation ($r = .32, p < .05$), OCB was also significantly related to writing. The only subject that showed no significant relationship was U.S. History.

The value of OCB as it relates to student achievement compelled a deliberate study that defined principal behaviors and actions that motivate citizenship behaviors.

**Leadership and OCB**

Research on leadership in schools supports the positive consequences of effective principals (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Cotton, 2003; Heck, 1992; Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2010; Marzano et al., 2005). In fact, a 6-year study on leadership effects confidently asserts that effective leadership is second only to classroom instruction in its positive effects on student learning (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2010). Furthermore, despite the existence of a variety of leadership styles, effective leaders categorically influence teaching and learning (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Leithwood et al., 2004, 2010; Louis, Dretzke, et al., 2010; Murphy, Elliot, Goldring, & Porter, 2007; Tschannen-Moran, 2009; Twigg, 2008).

Researchers have explained and analyzed school leadership in many ways, including the identification of specific leadership behaviors and styles such as transformational, transactional, instructional, and shared leadership. Given the nature and impact of OCB on organizational effectiveness, further study into its connection with
specific principal behaviors was a worthwhile endeavor. Likewise, a discussion about the transformational leadership style is particularly relevant, as it encompasses several behaviors that have been shown to influence organizational citizenship.

**Effective Leadership Behaviors**

Having examined 69 studies involving 2,802 schools, approximately 1.4 million students, and 14,000 teachers, Marzano and colleagues (2005) computed the correlation between the leadership behavior of the principal in the school and the average academic achievement of students in the school to be .25.

In their meta-analysis, Marzano and colleagues (2005) identified 21 principal behaviors that led to high student achievement. Similarly, Cotton (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of 81 research articles that ascertained 25 leadership behaviors of principals of high achieving schools. Table 4 compares Cotton’s 25 practices to Marzano and colleagues’ 21 responsibilities.

Table 4 shows that findings from Cotton’s (2003) meta-analysis overlap with those of Marzano and colleagues (2005). These researchers found similar behaviors, characteristics, and practices that had a strong relationship with high levels of achievement. Not surprisingly, connections can be made between these identified effective leadership behaviors and organizational citizenship. For example, DiPaola and Hoy (2005a) found that academic press individually produces an organizational environment that fosters OCB. It may be argued that academic press begins with the principal who maintains a strong focus (Marzano et al., 2005) and vision (Cotton, 2003) on student achievement. Similarly, a collaborative environment (Somech & Ron, 2007) and shared decision making (Bogler & Somech, 2005) result in high levels of OCB and
Table 4

*Cotton’s 25 Practices Compared to Marzano, Waters, and McNulty’s 21 Responsibilities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe and orderly environment</td>
<td>Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision and goals focused on high levels of student learning</td>
<td>Focus; Optimizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High expectations for student learning</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confidence, responsibility and perseverance</td>
<td>Ideals/Beliefs; Optimizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility and Accessibility</td>
<td>Input; Visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive and supportive school climate</td>
<td>Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and interaction</td>
<td>Communication; Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional and interpersonal support</td>
<td>Relationship; Visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent and community outreach and involvement</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rituals, ceremonies, and other symbolic actions</td>
<td>Contingent rewards; Affirmation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared leadership, decision making, and staff empowerment</td>
<td>Input; Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional leadership</td>
<td>Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, &amp; assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing pursuit of high levels of student learning</td>
<td>Focus; Optimizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm of continuous improvement</td>
<td>Focus; Intellectual stimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of instructional issues</td>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observation and feedback to teachers</td>
<td>Monitoring/Evaluating; Involvement in curriculum, instruction, &amp; assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cotton’s 25 practices</th>
<th>Marzano, Waters, and McNulty’s 21 responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support of teacher autonomy</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of risk taking</td>
<td>Change agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development opportunities and resources</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting instructional time</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring student progress and sharing findings</td>
<td>Monitoring/Evaluating; Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of student progress data for program improvement</td>
<td>Monitoring/Evaluating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of student and staff achievement</td>
<td>Contingent awards; Affirmation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role modeling</td>
<td>Knowledge of curriculum, instruction,&amp; assessment; Involvement in curriculum, instruction, &amp; assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


these, too, are practices employed by effective principals according to Marzano and colleagues (2005) and Cotton.

Heck (1992) examined the role of principal’s instructional leadership and school performance. He found that three instructional leadership behaviors were predictive of high student achievement including (a) the amount of time principals spend directly observing classroom practices, (b) promoting discussion about instructional issues, and (c) emphasizing the use of test results for program improvement. Likewise, Bamburg and Andrews (1990) conducted a study of instructional leadership, school goals, and student achievement. They concluded a positive relationship between these three. Specifically,
they examined instructional leadership as a set of interactions grouped into four areas. These included the principal as a resource provider, an instructional resource, effective communicator, and a visible presence.

Principals who display these characteristics may be creating an environment where teachers are more apt to engage in OCBs such as helping, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. For example, the principal who is visible doing classroom observations, gives feedback, and promotes discussion on instructional issues (Heck, 1992) might encourage helping and courteous behavior among the staff that will improve instruction through lesson planning, sharing of resources, and collaboration. A principal who is an effective communicator, a resource provider, and an instructional resource herself (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990) may model sportsmanship, as these qualities might reassure teachers that the principal is transparent and doing her best to support instruction. As a result, teachers would be “good sports,” no matter the situation. The nature of quantitative research has not lent itself to analyzing these suppositions; however, the present qualitative research study allowed for a more in-depth analysis to either support or refute these assumptions.

In a review of literature examining how leadership influences student learning, Leithwood and colleagues (2004) specified three categories of leadership practices that lead to student achievement. The first category, defined as setting a direction, includes developing and articulating a shared vision. According to human motivation theory, “people are motivated by goals which they find personally compelling, as well as challenging but achievable” (Leithwood et al., 2004, p. 23). The second category, developing people, requires instructional leadership, as well as a level of emotional
intelligence on the part of the leader. The latter involves forging strong relationships with people in order to leverage their strengths appropriately. Finally, redesigning the organization constitutes the third and final category of leadership practices. This category of leadership practices emerged from recent evidence about the nature of schools as learning organizations and the role professional learning communities play in advancing staff work and student learning. Such practices assume that the overall organizational culture, and structures within it, facilitate participants work to the degree they remain malleable. Effective leaders redesign and adjust according to the changing nature of the school’s improvement agenda (Leithwood et al., 2004). Leithwood and colleagues (2004) further specify that school leaders succeed in the current highly accountable policy context as they create and sustain a competitive school, empower others to make significant decisions, provide instructional guidance, and develop and implement strategic school improvement plans. All of these practices engender a sense of ownership and self-efficacy for teachers that may, in turn, result in a greater degree of their desire to engage in OCB for the greater good.

Murphy and colleagues (2007) conducted a review of literature examining leadership for learning in high performing schools. They delineated eight dimensions of effective practice, as follows: vision for learning, instructional program, curricular program, assessment program, communities of learning, resource acquisition and use, organizational culture, and social advocacy. Specifically, they identified the need to develop a vision for learning based on assessment and demographic data, as well as information on patterns of opportunity to learn. The dimension of instructional program emphasizes pedagogical knowledge, appropriate hiring and allocation of staff, identifying
and removing barriers that prevent teachers from doing their work well, timely feedback, and protecting instructional time. The third and fourth dimensions of effective practice involve principals being knowledgeable about, and deeply involved in, implementing a rigorous curricular program followed by assessment practices that are comprehensive and utilize a variety of formal and informal monitoring and data-collection strategies. With regard to communities of learning, successful principals value professional development, encourage professional community between and among teachers, and work to create collaborative structures. Additionally, high performing principals differ from their more typical peers in resource acquisition and use as they actively seek and acquire resources to advance school goals and meet student needs. The behaviors associated with this leadership style are noteworthy because aspects of organizational citizenship behavior have been positively linked to the characteristics of a leadership for learning style (Bogler & Somech, 2005; Somech & Ron, 2007).

There is much similarity among the characteristics or behaviors of effective leaders as described by the research (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Bogler & Somech, 2005; Cotton, 2003; Heck, 1992; Leithwood et al., 2004; Marzano et al., 2005; Murphy et al., 2007; Somech & Ron, 2007), yet detailed connections between these and OCB are sparse and quantitative in nature. The results of this study serve to begin to give specificity to the actions that are connected to these behaviors.

**Transformational Leadership**

A transformational leader “motivates followers by raising their consciousness about the importance of organizational goals and by inspiring them to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the organization” (Marks & Printy, 2003, p. 375). It is the
latter part of this statement that necessitates a closer look at transformational leadership in relationship to organizational citizenship behavior. Furthermore, transformational leadership has often resulted in findings of organizational improvement, as well as encouraging OCBs (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 2001; Marks & Printy, 2003; Purvanova, Bono, & Dziewczynski, 2006; Schippers, Den Hartog, Koopman, & van Knippenberg, 2008; Twigg, 2008). Podsakoff and colleagues (1990) describe transformational leaders as those who get followers to perform above and beyond expectations by articulating a vision, providing individualized support and intellectual stimulation, and expressing high performance expectations. Although studies of transformational leadership have more often been applied to in-role behaviors, by its definition, it has also become a source of interest on extra-role behaviors. A study of 477 insurance sales agents confirmed that transformational leadership behaviors influence employees’ extra-role behaviors of helping, sportsmanship, and civic virtue (MacKenzie et al., 2001). Similarly, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Bommer (1996) determined that the transformational dimension of individualized support is positively related to altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue.

Transformational leadership improves team performance through its influence on other positive team attributes, such as reflexivity and creativity. Team reflexivity includes actions such as reflection, communication around goals, and decision making. Given the positive impact of reflexivity on team performance, Schippers and colleagues (2008) hypothesized that transformational leadership behavior would enhance the development of a shared vision, which would be positively related to team reflexivity. The results showed that, in teams where leaders were rated as transformational, there was
a stronger shared vision and more team reflexivity. Consequently, there was also a positive impact on team performance because the increased reflexivity promoted reflection and communication about team progress toward their objectives, thus allowing them to make changes or adaptations along the way.

Creativity is another highly desirable attribute that can enhance employee performance. Shin and Zhou (2003) sought to discover if there existed a relationship between transformational leadership and employee creativity. They used regression analysis to test their hypotheses and found a significant and positive relationship between employee creativity and transformational leadership. Another study by Wang and Rode (2010), however, did not find the same positive relationship. Nevertheless, Wang and Rode explained a few key differences in their methods as a possible reason for the differing results. Furthermore, these researchers did find a significant relationship between the three-way interaction effect of transformational leadership, identification with leader, and innovative climate with employee creativity. That is, in a highly innovative climate, employees who had strong interaction with the transformational leader tended to be more creative. Consequently, Wang and Rode’s results are interesting to note and may be similarly applicable to education, given the highly interactive nature of a school setting and the fact that, in education, innovation is essential. Even though creativity is a highly desirable employee attribute, it is not one that is generally listed as essential on a teacher’s job description. Therefore, the connection between transformational leadership and creativity is also worth noting, because it can be argued that creativity is an extra-role behavior. A qualitative study may provide additional
insight on creativity and reflexivity as extra-role behaviors that positively impact teaching and learning.

Leithwood and Jantzi (1999) describe transformational leadership in schools along six dimensions: building school vision and goals, providing intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support, symbolizing professional practices and values, demonstrating high performance expectations, and developing structures to foster participation in school decisions. In their study of 1,762 teachers in a large school district in Canada, Leithwood and Jantzi found that transformational leadership effects had strong and significant direct effects on organizational conditions of purpose and goals, school planning, organizational culture, and structure and organization. In a later study, Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) studied the effects of transformational leadership on teacher motivation, capacities, work settings, and classroom practices. Motivation was defined as “qualities of a person oriented toward the future and aimed at helping the person evaluate the need for change or action” (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006, p. 206). Capacity was viewed as the actual ability to perform. Work setting was defined as “teachers’ collective practices relevant to the large-scale reform . . . and the collective efficacy of the staff” (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006, p. 207). Their results showed that school leadership, specifically the transformational model, had strong and direct effects on teachers’ work setting and motivation, along with weaker but still significant effects on teachers’ capacities. Likewise, transformational leadership had a moderate and significant effect on classroom practices. Interestingly, neither of these studies showed a significant relationship between transformational leadership and student engagement or achievement. The authors point out other possible reasons for this lack of connection, including a lack
of accountability for policymakers or a lack of empirical evidence on other variables such as family educational culture given that “a school is not a single variable” (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999, p. 125). Nonetheless, the effects of transformational leadership behavior on organizational conditions of schools are worthy of further examination within the realm of organizational citizenship behaviors given the connections between OCB, work conditions, and organizational effectiveness.

Quantitative investigations of transformational leadership and specific leadership behaviors have uncovered both direct and indirect relationships with conditions that may boost citizenship behaviors. Yet, these quantitative studies are limited in their ability to examine transformational leadership behaviors, leadership characteristics, and OCB as manifest in the day-to-day experiences of principals and teachers. The present qualitative study investigated leadership and its influence on organizational citizenship behaviors more intimately by probing the specific dynamics of principal-to-teacher and teacher-to-teacher communication and interaction within the context of daily school life and work.

**Interpersonal Competence**

The leadership behaviors and practices discussed above include affective dimensions that also have an impact on principal effectiveness. For example, among the 25 key principal behaviors discussed by Cotton (2003), she included communication and emotional/interpersonal support. In terms of communication, Cotton’s research revealed:

> Effective principals not only share information, but they also listen and take the suggestions of staff and constituents seriously, acknowledging that they do not have all the answers and . . . successful administrators use communication skills
to build close relationships with staff and use relationships to extend communication patterns. (p. 16)

She also found that principals of high-performing schools were described as having an ability to foster positive interpersonal relationships by being sensitive, supportive, and encouraging. Marzano and colleagues (2005) identified affirmation, communication, flexibility, optimizer, and relationships as four of the 21 effective principal behaviors. Principals who display these behaviors recognize and celebrate accomplishments, are easily accessible to teachers in order to maintain strong lines of communication, encourage people to express diverse opinions, inspire, and are aware of the personal needs of teachers (Marzano et al., 2005). Similarly, DiPaola and Hoy (2005b) discuss collegial principal leadership and the importance of those day-to-day behaviors that have an impact on school climate and, thus, OCB. They describe collegial principal leadership as “characterized by the behavior of the principal that is supportive and egalitarian. The principal is considerate, helpful, and genuinely concerned about the welfare of teachers” (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b, p. 391). At the same time, the principal is clear about his/her expectations and maintains high standards of performance. The collegial principal is also open-minded and willing to explore the thoughts and ideas of others and, because she is friendly and approachable, teachers feel comfortable making suggestions.

The role of interpersonal competence is also articulated within the construct of emotional intelligence (EI). The fundamentals of EI include self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management (Goleman, 2005). While the first two domains pertain to intrapersonal skills, they impact and influence the two latter domains which correspond to interpersonal ability. Goleman (2013) refers to
social awareness, particularly its subset empathy, as crucial for practicing resonant leadership, which is uplifting and inspiring. An empathetic leader is a good listener, has a keen ability to read the emotions of others, and understands diverse perspectives. The socially aware leader also demonstrates a high degree of organizational awareness and commitment to service, which keeps her visible and in touch with the emotional climate. An emotionally intelligent leader navigates relationship management with ease, resulting in her ability to inspire and influence. These leaders skillfully manage relationships with a strong and well-articulated vision; they understand the necessity for change and are able to navigate it in a compelling and sensitive manner. Similar to the leadership practice of developing others (Leithwood et al., 2004), the EI leader with strong relationship skills takes an active role in developing employees and does so with timely and constructive feedback. Finally, relationship management includes the ability to inspire a collaborative environment with a friendly and collegial atmosphere where conflict is dealt with empathetically and with a focus on common goals. Goleman (2013) describes an emotionally intelligent leader as one whose practices result in resonant leadership, which connects and inspires people to get things done, suggesting that EI may be compatible with and contribute to organizational citizenship behavior.

**Trust**

Although the definitions of trust have evolved over time, “what is common across the many definitions of trust, either explicitly or implicitly, is vulnerability. Where there
is no vulnerability there is no need for trust” (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999, p. 186).

Butler (1991) followed research by Jennings (1971) and Gabarro (1978) on the conditions of trust. His study used semi-structured interviews of 84 managers employed by diverse firms, and these revealed 10 conditions of trust including availability, competence, consistency, discreetness, fairness, integrity, loyalty, openness, promise fulfillment, and receptivity (Butler, 1991). Tschannen-Moran (2004) identified five facets of trust including: (a) benevolence (i.e., being considerate and sensitive), (b) honesty (i.e., keeping your word), (c) openness (i.e., disclosure and vulnerability), (d) reliability (i.e., dependable or predictable), and (e) competence (i.e., skillful and knowledgeable).

Because relationships are complex, not all of these facets may carry equal weight. Nevertheless, depending upon the situation and relationship, they are important and critical to building trust. A growing body of evidence suggests that trust not only plays an essential role in general organizational effectiveness but is also specifically related to OCB. Thus, this organizational condition is worthy of further consideration for the purposes of the current study.

**Trust and OCB**

Several studies have linked trust to OCB in a positive and significant way (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; McAllister, 1995; Pillai et al., 1999; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Robinson, 1996). Notably, trust in leaders has been shown to affect employee citizenship behaviors. In data collected from military supervisors and their subordinates, Deluga (1995) found that when “subordinates perceive a trusting interpersonal relationship in which, for instance, agreements are diligently followed, subordinates are dealt with candidly, and supervisors listen, subordinates seem willing to exceed formal job
requirements” (p. 12). Similarly, in a study of 172 employees and 39 managers of hotels and resorts, Brower and colleagues (2009) determined a positive relationship between trust in the manager and OCB when the manager highly trusted the subordinate. Further, when there were mutually high levels of trust between manager and subordinate, there were higher levels of OCB. Trust and OCBs also had a positive relationship in a study by Mayer and Gavin (2005), where data gathered from 288 surveys (86.2% response rate) at a small nonunion manufacturing firm showed a relationship between an employer’s trustworthiness and employee trust. Both trust in the plant manager and top management team were significantly and positively related to ability to focus, which was also significantly and positively related to citizenship behaviors at both the individual and organizational levels (Mayer & Gavin, 2005).

Kacmar and colleagues (2012) created a study around supervisor trust, conflict, and OCB. First, they hypothesized that supervisor trust would mediate the relationship between conflicts among leaders and followers and followers’ citizenship behavior. The results indicated that supervisor and employee conflict was associated with low supervisor trust, and this trust mediated the relationship between supervisor/employee conflict and OCBs. Specifically, conflict with the supervisor led to decreased citizenship behaviors. They also hypothesized that coworker conflict and organizational behavior is moderated by supervisor trust. The data showed that coworker conflict was negatively related to task-focused OCBs. Importantly, this negative relationship was strongest when employee trust in the supervisor was lowest. However, when employees trusted the supervisor, coworker conflict had almost no influence on task-focused OCBs. Allowing the possibility that conflict necessarily exists within school settings (Uline,
Tschannen-Moran, & Perez, 2003), its relationship to trust and subsequent effect on citizenship behaviors made trust an essential component of the current study.

An examination of the link between trust and OCB has primarily occurred outside of education; therefore, an investigation within a school setting was an appropriate next step. Given that leadership effectiveness is commonly measured by leadership behaviors such as those discussed in the previous section, it made sense to examine if and how those behaviors mediate trust and OCB.

**Trust in the Principal**

Results from a study of 2,741 teachers in 86 middle schools revealed that trust in the principal is determined primarily by the behavior of the principals (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). Specifically, trust in the principal came directly from the principal’s collegial behavior. Collegial leadership refers to principal behavior that is friendly, supportive, open, and guided by norms of equality. The principal is approachable, helpful, and genuinely concerned about both the social needs and task achievement of the faculty. He or she attempts to motivate by using constructive criticism and does not engage in constant monitoring of everything that teachers do. “The principal is not rigid nor domineering, and does not burden teachers with busy work. The principal sets the tone for high performance, setting an example of hard work, and letting teachers know what is expected of them” (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998, p. 343). Tschannen-Moran’s (2009) examination of the role of leadership orientation and trust on teacher professionalism is worthy of mention because “teacher professionalism refers to teachers’ perceptions that their colleagues take their work seriously, demonstrate a high level of commitment, and go beyond minimum expectations to meet the needs of
students” (p. 232). It is the latter part of this definition that presents elements of citizenship behavior. Professional orientation on behalf of the principal integrates a more flexible, collaborative, and less authoritative leadership style inclusive of shared decision making and grounded in trust. The guiding hypothesis of this study was that “the degree of teacher professionalism in a school would be related to (a) the professional orientation of principals in their exercise of administrative authority and (b) the trust evident among various actors in the school community” (Tschannen-Moran, 2009, p. 218). This study included 2,355 teachers within 80 middle schools who were randomly administered two surveys to reduce common response bias.

Bearing in mind the elements of citizenship behaviors implied within the definition of teacher professionalism, as indicated above, the results of this study have particular application to the proposed study. Specifically, bivariate correlations revealed that faculty perceptions of their colleagues’ professionalism were moderately related to faculty trust in the principal, teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ professional orientation were related to the level of trust in the school, and professional orientation of principals was strongly related to faculty trust in the principal (Tschannen-Moran, 2009). Multiple regression analysis examined the combined effects of professional orientation of principals, faculty trust, and faculty perceptions of teacher professionalism. Nonsignificant beta weights of trust in principal ($\beta = -.11$) in the regression analysis on the one hand, and moderate relationships in the bivariate correlations on the other, led the researcher to investigate further. When entered alone, faculty trust in the principal made a significant positive contribution to explaining teacher professionalism ($\beta = .45$, $p < .01$). Ultimately, Tschannen-Moran (2009) extrapolates that a professional orientation by
principals contributes to a culture of trust in schools and, therefore, teachers perceive
greater levels of professionalism on the part of their colleagues. Given that such
professionalism includes going beyond minimum expectations, the current study aspired
to similarly explore the connection between leadership, trust, and OCB using qualitative
methods.

Organizational Justice

Perceived fairness, justice, and rewards by leaders also impact organizational
citizenship behaviors (Walumbwa, Wu, & Orwa, 2008). Given that these are
characteristics that a school leader may or may not display, they are an important
consideration for this study. A climate reflective of procedural justice is one in which
employees perceive that the processes by which decisions are made are fair. Distributive
justice reflects fairness in the distribution of resources, and interactional justice involves
the interpersonal realm of treating people fairly through dignity and respect. Perceptions
about justice have been shown to result in employees’ inclination toward higher levels of
commitment to their supervisor and citizenship behaviors (Chiaburu & Lim, 2008;
Moorman, 1991; Organ, 1988; Organ & Moorman, 1993; Walumbwa et al., 2010).

Moorman (1991) conducted a study to test for a relationship between
organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. He examined distributive
and procedural justice while separating the latter into two factors: formal procedures and
interactional justice (Moorman, 1991). The first factor, formal procedures, includes
actions such as creating procedures designed to collect accurate information necessary for
making decisions, having all sides affected by decisions represented, applying standards
of consistency, and allowing for requests for clarification about decisions. The second
factor, interactional justice, includes more interpersonal behaviors on the part of the
supervisor, such as showing concern for employee rights, honesty, kindness and
consideration, and timely feedback. Moorman’s findings showed that perceptions of
organizational justice positively influenced OCB. Of particular consequence were the
results that showed interactional justice was most significantly related to OCB.

“Perceptions of the fairness of the procedures used to determine outcomes may rise or fall
depending only on the manner in which those procedures are enacted” (Moorman, 1991,
p. 852). These results may have considerable implications for educational leaders who
want to increase organizational citizenship behavior. High visibility, an indicator of
effective leadership, likely means that there are many opportunities for interactions with
teachers. Moorman’s findings would then support the need for the principal to be aware
of his actions as they relate to fairness. For example, are his interactions with teachers
somehow taking away from their instructional focus and time with trivial operational
issues or are the interactions meaningful, inclusive, and exhibit trust and transparency?

When the principal makes discretionary decisions, does he take the time to explain them
and the process by which he came to make such decisions or does he merely
communicate mandates? When he asks for an opinion in order to make a decision, does
he truly listen and contemplate teacher input, or does he consistently disregard opinions,
thereby giving the impression that he is only going through the motions of “shared
decision-making”?

Despite the existence of many educational procedures set forth by union contracts
and district policy, it is not uncommon for school leaders and teachers to show flexibility
in their adherence to these procedures or their approach toward following protocol. It the
leader’s *flexible actions* where fairness, especially as it relates to interactional justice, may impact levels of OCB (Farh, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990; Moorman, 1991; Organ & Moorman, 1993). Fidelity to instructional practices, professional development, and operational issues are just a few areas of concern that often result in procedural detours that may or may not seem fair to employees which may affect their decision to go above and beyond. Accordingly, the construct of organizational justice and fairness and their effect on citizenship behaviors were considered within the boundaries of this study. Further, a qualitative approach derived specific examples of leadership behaviors that represent teachers’ perceptions of organizational justice.

**Summary**

Organizational citizenship behavior defines those actions that go above and beyond the job description and sets the framework for the current study. Revealing itself through sportsmanship, civic virtue, helping, courtesy, and compliance, OCB has been shown to improve organizational performance in both the private and public sectors. Not surprisingly, the current demands of teaching, high stakes accountability, and limited resources, result in teacher behaviors that include those described by OCB. Despite contract regulations, teaching is not an 8-hour profession; however, the quantity and quality of discretionary behaviors can vary greatly. A growing body of research in OCB reveals that citizenship behaviors are influenced by leader behaviors, practices, and interpersonal competencies.

This review of literature includes investigations of discrete leadership behaviors that have varying effects on achievement (Cotton, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005) and OCB.
decision making were a positive impact on citizenship behaviors. In terms of leadership styles, transformational leadership was also explored as an impetus for citizenship behaviors. By definition, transformational leaders inspire employees toward altruistic behaviors for the good of the organization, and the literature described transformational leadership as leading to increased citizenship behavior in all or several of the dimensions of OCB (Mackenzie et al., 2001; Podsakoff et al., 1996). Furthermore, it improved team performance through extra-role behaviors of reflexivity and creativity (Schippers et al., 2008; Wang & Rode, 2010). The review of leadership behaviors and transformational leadership set the stage for the current study, which will qualitatively examine the specifics of principal leadership as it relates to teachers’ OCB.

As the review of literature progressed, it became clear that there exist affective elements that have a bearing on citizenship behavior. Interpersonal competence leads to trust building and perceptions of organizational justice and fairness. A leader’s ability to be perceived as trustworthy and fair has been shown to influence and motivate employee citizenship behaviors. Consequently, this study adds to the literature by considering the applicability of these constructs as they apply to a principal’s capacity to inspire organizational citizenship behaviors.
CHAPTER 3—METHODOLOGY

Qualitative research is a broad approach to the study of social phenomena (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 2). Accordingly, the study of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), a social phenomenon, was assessed qualitatively. Interest in the “experienced as experienced” (Giorgi, 2009, p. 69) called for a phenomenological approach while using the Critical Incident Technique (CIT) to gather stories from participants regarding their OCB experiences within a specific, social context (Query & Kreps, 1993). This chapter details the structure of the study and includes a comprehensive description of research methods that were utilized.

Introduction

School leaders often find themselves having to do more with less. Education is heavily dependent on people, yet there often seems to be a dearth of personnel to meet the high expectations held by the general public. Building leaders hope for, rely upon, and/or motivate staff to go above and beyond the call of duty. A construct such as organizational citizenship behavior, “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system” (Organ, 1988, p. 4), was therefore worthy of close investigation as it applies to a leader’s ability to inspire above and beyond behaviors.

Research on organizational citizenship behavior has, by and large, consisted of quantitative investigations. The results of these studies have provided fundamental understanding about the construct; however, detailed descriptions of leadership behaviors, informing greater incidences of OCB, are scarce. Research on OCB therefore benefits from an exploratory research method that provides such specificity. The current
study encompassed mixed methods with emphasis on the qualitative aspects of the study. In particular, a phenomenological approach, utilizing the Critical Incident Technique, was used to examine explicit critical incidents and from these were extracted specific leadership behaviors and actions that inspired OCB.

### Research Questions

Guiding research question: What is the principal’s role in developing, nurturing, and maintaining organizational citizenship behavior?

Secondary research questions:

1. Which specific leadership behavior and actions promote organizational citizenship behaviors?
2. How do teachers perceive the principal’s role in developing OCB?

### Research Design

At the core of qualitative research is the investigator’s interest in understanding how people interpret their experiences (Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Merriam, 2009; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Qualitative research, as interpretive research, “assumes that reality is socially constructed, that is, there is no single observable reality. Rather there are multiple realities or interpretations, of a single event” (Merriam, 2009, p. 8). Furthermore, these interpretations are constructed through interactions that people have with one another, as well as through the context of those individuals’ lives (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 2009).

### Qualitative Research

Creswell (2013) notes the ever changing and evolving definition of qualitative research. His current definition states:
Qualitative research begins with assumptions and the use of interpretive/theoretical frameworks that inform the study of research problems addressing the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem. To study this problem, qualitative researchers use an emerging qualitative approach to inquiry, the collection of data in a natural setting sensitive to the people and places under study, and data analysis that is both inductive and deductive and establishes patterns or themes. The final written report or presentation includes the voices of participants, the reflexivity of the researcher, a complex description and interpretation of the problem, and its contribution to the literature or a call for change. (Creswell, 2013, Kindle locations 1093-1098)

Creswell (2013) emphasizes the importance of the researcher’s understanding about philosophical assumptions, as well as the interpretive framework and its accompanying philosophical beliefs in qualitative research. Table 5 briefly summarizes the implications for practice of the four philosophical assumptions (ontological, epistemological, axiological, and methodological), the interpretive framework of social constructivism, and the approaches used in this study (phenomenology and critical incident technique).

Quantitative research has provided knowledge about organizational citizenship behavior such as the types of OCB, its contributions to organizational effectiveness, and related organizational structures that influence OCB; however, a qualitative approach served to extract the essence of this construct through an exploratory or discovery lens. Specifically, the use of a phenomenological approach best describes the type of specific insight necessary to investigate how leaders inspire OCB.
## Table 5

**Implications for Practice as Related to This Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretive Framework: Social Constructivism</th>
<th>Ontological (Reality)</th>
<th>Epistemological (Knowledge)</th>
<th>Axiological (Values)</th>
<th>Methodological (Process)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical assumptions in qualitative research</td>
<td>Researcher accepts that there are multiple realities and seeks to report these.</td>
<td>Researcher gets as close to participants as possible.</td>
<td>Researcher positions herself in relation to the study.</td>
<td>Researcher's logic is inductive, emerging and shaped by her experience in collecting and analyzing the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenology</td>
<td>Multiple realities are constructed through our lived experiences and interactions with others. (Creswell, 2013)</td>
<td>Reality is co-constructed between the researcher and the researched and shaped by individual experiences. (Creswell, 2012)</td>
<td>Individual values are honored and are negotiated among individuals. (Creswell, 2012)</td>
<td>Literary style of writing is used. Use of inductive method of emergent ideas (through consensus) obtained through interviews. (Creswell, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Incident Technique</td>
<td>Researcher reports how several individuals view their experience around OCB.</td>
<td>Researcher spends time at the school site. Conducts interviews at the site.</td>
<td>Bracketing/epoche. Researcher engages in disciplined and systematic efforts to set aside prejudgments regarding the phenomenon (Moustakas, 1994).</td>
<td>Researcher uses interviews around the phenomenon of OCB in order to understand the essence of this construct as it relates to a leader's ability to inspire OCB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenology</td>
<td>Researcher repeatedly interviews individuals to ascertain all the different ways in which they perceive the critical incident, OCB, at their school site.</td>
<td>Researcher uses information and direct quotes gathered from multiple interviews.</td>
<td>Researcher clearly reports biases, avoids subtle biases in questions, uses peer review to ensure subjectivity does not interfere.</td>
<td>Researcher uses transcribed interview notes to classify the critical incidents (inductive and subjective), then makes inferences or hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phenomenology

Phenomenology, as a qualitative approach, is most simply defined as a study of lived experiences and the ways people understand those experiences (Creswell, 2013; Giorgi, 2009; Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 1990, 2002). Phenomenology is based on the “assumption that there is an essence or essences to shared experience. These essences are the core meanings mutually understood through a phenomenon commonly experienced” (Patton, 2002, p. 106). While Eduard Husserl is considered the founding father of phenomenology, interpretations of the characteristics of this method include the epoche, phenomenological reduction, imaginative variation, and synthesis or essence (Creswell, 2013; Giorgi, 2009; Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 1990). A more descriptive explanation of each characteristic follows.

**Epoche.** One of the core processes of phenomenology is epoche. “In the epoche, the everyday understandings, judgments, and knowings are set aside, and phenomena are revisited, freshly, naively, in a wide open sense, from the vantage point of a pure or transcendental ego” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 33). This is a critical stage for scientific determination, especially when the researcher is somehow connected to the topic. In the case of the present researcher, she has been an educator for 20 years and a principal for 6 of those years. The construct of OCB is not technically a new one for the researcher and is of particular interest due to her desire to inspire her staff to go above and beyond. Responsible investigation will require the researcher to set aside her presuppositions, biases, predilections, and prejudgments by entering the interviews and the analysis of data with an open mind as though hearing and seeing it for the first time. In instances where the researcher suspected she may be allowing prior knowledge, beliefs, or feelings to...
surface, she reviewed her reflective journal and requested advice from her dissertation Chair.

**Phenomenological reduction.** Phenomenological reduction requires multiple acts of looking and describing. Moustakas (1994) describes this as:

Each looking opens new awarenesses that connect with one another, new perspectives that relate to each other, new folds of the manifold features that exist in every phenomenon and that we explicate as we look again and again and again—keeping our eyes turned to the center of the experience and studying what is just before us, exactly as it appears. (p. 92)

Moustakas characterizes this “looking” according to a process of horizontalization which occurs when the researcher reviews the interview transcripts across the various participants in search of significant statements, phrases, quotes, or words that illuminate how participants experienced the phenomenon (Creswell, 2013). Next, the researcher forms clusters of meaning by grouping statements into themes and removing overlapping and repetitive statements (Creswell, 2013; Moustakas, 1994). Then, the “what” of the participant’s experience is written through a textural description.

**Imaginative variation.** Moustakas (1994) describes imaginative variation as allowing the researcher to determine structural themes from the textural descriptions by stating, “through imaginative variation the researcher understands that there is not a single inroad to truth, but that countless possibilities emerge that are intimately connected with the essences and meanings of an experience” (p. 99). This allows the researcher to communicate the “how” of the experienced phenomenon using a structural description (Creswell, 2013; Moustakas, 1994).
Synthesis of meanings and essences. In this final step of the research process, the researcher intuitively reconciles and articulates the textural and structural descriptions, thereby revealing the essence of the phenomenon (Creswell, 2013; Giorgi, 2009; Moustakas, 1994).

The fact that phenomenology seeks to understand the crux of a shared experience, while acknowledging the participants’ and researcher’s realities, made it an ideal method to use for this study. Having made this determination, the researcher narrowed the methodology further. Phenomenology is an umbrella term that encompasses a range of research approaches such as the Critical Incident Technique (CIT). When the purpose of the research is to increase knowledge of a phenomenon about which relatively little has been documented, or to describe a real-world phenomenon based on thorough understanding, an approach such as CIT is particularly well suited to the task (Bitner, Booms, & Tetreault, 1990). Accordingly, a detailed description of CIT follows.

Critical Incident Technique

Much credit for the advancement of the CIT is given to John Flanagan (1954). Nevertheless, Flanagan acknowledges the studies in the Aviation Psychology Program (APP) of the United States Army Air Forces, during World War II, contributed to the origination of CIT (Flanagan, 1954).

Background. Initial studies of the selection and classification of air crews by the APP during World War II revealed a tendency on the part of interviewees to generalize or stereotype in their answers to questions. Researchers concluded that explicit observations, along with interviews, might mediate these tendencies and increase the validity of the data. They recommended that future inquiry contain procedures that would
focus respondents on specific incidents in order to increase the specificity and accuracy of their responses. Subsequent studies by the APP improved upon the collection of information about specific incidents, and these led to the formulation of critical job requirements. Following World War II, the American Institute for Research was established and upon extending the research of the APP, the CIT was formally developed and given its present name (Flanagan, 1954; Vianden, 2012).

The CIT is characterized by probing interviews meant to obtain a comprehensive narrative around specific incidents or experiences within a particular context (Flanagan, 1954; Query & Kreps, 1993). This study gathered detailed information about occurrences of organizational citizenship by school site staff. In CIT, these critical incidents are analyzed by following a rigorous process which ultimately leads to understanding the phenomenon. Critical Incident Technique was appropriate for the proposed study as it has most often been used in organizational settings for its ability to explain organizational behavior and utility in developing critical requirements for jobs or activities. In this study, the critical requirements for the activity (OCB) were focused on what a principal does to encourage or inspire this phenomenon. The following sections explain the processes involved in conducting research using the CIT and connections to this study.

**Description of CIT.** Flanagan (1954) describes five main steps of the CIT including: (1) identifying general aims; (2) establishing plans and specifications; (3) collecting the data; (4) analyzing the data; and (5) interpreting and reporting (Butterfield, Borgen, Amundson, & Maglio, 2005; Viandin, 2012).

**General aims.** Flanagan (1954) suggests that the researcher compose a general aim statement in order to convey a uniform idea to participants. The general aim of this
study was to determine the actions and behaviors of principals that inspire citizenship behavior.

**Plans and specifications.** Flanagan (1954) states that critical incidents be “defined as extreme behavior, either outstandingly effective or ineffective with respect to attaining the general aims of the activity” (p. 12). To ensure objectivity, the researcher followed a set of clear specifications, including descriptions of the situations observed, relevance to the general aim, and the extent of the effect on the general aim.

**Collecting the data.** Data collection occurred via semi-structured interviews. According to CIT, when using interviews as the procedure for data gathering, the researcher should follow a protocol that explains how and why the participant was selected, the purpose of the study, and reassurance of anonymity.

Interview questions are crucial to data collection, and the wording of questions should avoid subtle biases (Flanagan, 1954). Flanagan (1954) recommended that questions be asked to a sample of individuals who represent the intended study participants, providing opportunity to gather their interpretations of what they are being asked to do and revise the questions as necessary.

Generally, the criterion that the researcher might apply in deciding to include an incident in the study encompasses specific attributes. In the case of this study, the researcher considered the following: (a) are principal actions and/or behaviors that inspire OCB reported; (b) were these observed by the participant; (c) were all relevant factors in the situation given; (d) has the participant made a definite judgment regarding the criticalness of the principal’s actions; (e) has the participant made it clear just why s/he believes the principal’s actions were critical to OCB (Flanagan, 1954). The number of
collected incidents is dependent on the complexity of the issue being studied and whether the incidents represent acceptable coverage of the issue (Butterfield et al., 2005).

**Analyzing the data.** The purpose of the analysis stage is to efficiently summarize and describe the data so that they can be effectively used for practical purposes. As such, when classifying incidents, the researcher sets a frame of reference by considering how the data are to be used. Gathering information about leadership actions and characteristics that influence organizational citizenship behavior may provide useful insight and tools for building leaders who would like to inspire OCB; as such, this was the frame of reference upon which data analysis occurred.

Formulating categories from the incidents is a more subjective than objective process, the trustworthiness of which is improved when the researcher consults with a peer researcher (Flanagan, 1954). In this study, the peer researcher was the dissertation Chair. Finally, the researcher must determine the level of specificity or generality to be used for reporting the data (Butterfield et al., 2005; Flanagan, 1954).

**Interpreting and reporting.** When interpreting and reporting, the researcher should clearly report possible biases and implications of the decisions that were taken throughout the process of CIT. These limitations are important, but equally so is the researcher’s responsibility to report the degree of credibility and the value of the final results obtained (Butterfield et al., 2005; Flanagan, 1954). The researcher maintained a reflective journal in order to be aware of possible biases and the decision-making process.

**Rigor**

The tradition of establishing validity and reliability through quantitative methods has long been an issue that qualitative researchers have had to contend with, since these
methods are not compatible with quantitative investigations (Golafshani, 2003; Kreftig, 1992; Patton, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Nevertheless, processes for confirming comparable virtues exist in qualitative investigations and, some argue, they create stronger relevancy than quantitative methods (Carcary, 2009; Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Patton, 1990).

Validity and reliability refer to the degree with which the research method investigates its intentions and the degree to which the study can be repeated, respectively (Carcary, 2009; Creswell, 2009; Patton, 1990; Plano Clark & Creswell, 2010). Under these frames of reference, one can cite the positivist paradigm, which emphasizes facts and numerical data versus the naturalistic or interpretive paradigm, which acknowledges the researcher as an integral part of the research process (Carcary, 2009; Walsham, 1995, 2006). Walsham (1995) states,

> Interpretive researchers are attempting the difficult task of accessing other people’s interpretations, filtering them through their own conceptual apparatus, and feeding a version of events back to others, including in some cases both their interviewees and other audiences. In carrying out this work, it is important that interpretive researchers have a view of their own role in this complex human process. (p. 77)

Connections to phenomenology and, by extension, critical incident technique can be made to this description of the interpretive paradigm whereby the researcher, not numbers, is at the core of the entire research process.

While reliability is mainly concerned with consistency or the possibility to repeat a study, qualitative researchers understand that social context is difficult, if not
impossible, to replicate (Carcary, 2009). Validity’s emphasis on the accuracy of the instrument is an interesting notion within qualitative research, because the researcher is the instrument. Strauss and Corbin (1998) suggest a redefinition of the traditional canons of good science that “fit the realities of qualitative research and the complexities of the social phenomena that we seek to understand” (p. 266). For the purpose of this study, a naturalistic or constructivist approach to establish trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) was utilized as it defines processes that lend themselves to establishing evidence of a rigorous study, and it encompasses characteristics that correspond well with phenomenology and its subtype, critical incident technique.

**Trustworthiness**

In referring to the traditional canons of validity and reliability, Lincoln and Guba (1985) wonder:

> What is it that makes the conventional criteria inappropriate to the naturalistic paradigm? If they are inappropriate, what shall we substitute in their place?

There is no question that the naturalist is at least as concerned with trustworthiness as is the conventional inquirer. (p. 294)

In answering these questions, Lincoln and Guba posit that to establish trustworthiness it is necessary to substitute the benchmarks of internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity with credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability, as shown in Table 6.

**Credibility.** The process of authenticating credibility for this study included techniques as described by Lincoln and Guba (1985) beginning with persistent observation which helped to ensure credible findings and interpretations and allowed the
An activity that provided an external check on the inquiry process was peer debriefing, which occurred with the researcher’s dissertation Chair. This task served various purposes. First, the questions during the debriefing elicited candor and integrity. All questions were relevant and served to make the researcher well aware of her biases and processes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Second, the debrief gave the investigator an opportunity to justify, explain, or expand on her thinking as she formed hypotheses. Third, it was an opportunity for the peer debriefer to probe about the next steps. Finally, the debriefing session helped the researcher purge herself of thoughts, feelings, or emotions that may have been negatively impacting the study.

The final step in establishing credibility rests in member checks (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Member checking provides participants the opportunity to review the information that they volunteered, checking summaries of the interview, as well as any other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Positivist paradigm</th>
<th>Naturalistic paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truth values</td>
<td>Internal validity</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>External validity</td>
<td>Transferability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Dependability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutrality</td>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>Confirmability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

reconstructions made by the investigator. Throughout this process, members were encouraged to give feedback.

**Transferability.** Rather than establishing external validity, qualitative investigators provide sufficient “thick” description such that the reader or another interested researcher is able to determine transferability for him/herself. Lincoln and Guba (1985) summarize that “it is not the naturalist’s task to provide an index of transferability; it is his or her responsibility to provide the data base that makes transferability judgments possible on the part of potential appliers” (p. 316). The “applier” in the context of this study was the principal.


Thick description refers to the researcher’s task of both describing and interpreting observed social action (or behavior) within its particular context. It accurately describes observed social actions and assigns purpose and intentionality to these actions, by way of the researcher’s understanding and clear description of the context under which the social actions took place. Thick description leads to thick interpretation, which in turns leads to thick meaning of the research findings for the researchers and participants themselves, and for the report’s intended readership. (Ponterotto, 2006, p. 543)

Careful adherence to the objectives of phenomenology, CIT, and trustworthiness ensured that the researcher of this study provided “thick description” as conveyed by Ponterotto (2006).
**Dependability.** The constructivist researcher establishes dependability in place of the positivist’s reliability. Here, the process of the investigation is examined and well documented. Rodgers and Cowles (1993) state that “without comprehensive methodological documentation in which all inquiry decisions are identified, explicated, and supported, an accurate assessment of the dependability cannot be made” (p. 221). The development of dependability occurred via the audit trail, which will be explained in a subsequent section.

**Objectivity.** In quantitative research, objectivity is the criterion of neutrality (Kreftig, 1991). It refers to a degree of neutrality or the extent to which the findings of a study are shaped by the respondents and not researcher bias. Lincoln and Guba (1985) assert that the naturalist shifts the emphasis from the investigator stating, “The issue is no longer the investigator’s characteristics but the characteristics of the data: Are they or are they not confirmable?” (p. 300). Consequently, the objectivity or confirmability of the study was measured through the audit trail as discussed below.

**Confirmability: The audit trail.** Although popularized more extensively by Lincoln and Guba (1981, 1985), instructions for operationalizing the audit trail can be traced back to Halpern (1983). Much like a fiscal audit, the audit trail requires extensive scrutiny of data, including the methodology, findings, and conclusions (Carcary, 2009; Koch, 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Given the need for meticulous record keeping throughout the research process, the following categories of records were included in the present study: (a) raw data, (b) data reduction and analysis products, (c) data reconstruction and synthesis products,
(d) process notes, (e) materials relating to intentions and dispositions, and (f) instrument development information (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Rodgers and Cowles (1993) describe four types of documentation that comprise an audit trail. The first type is contextual documentation recording the activities and behaviors of the primary data sources, as well as descriptive accounts of observations, events, and other factors related to the context. The second form of documentation describes all methodological decisions and provides the rationale and support for all adjustments that are made throughout the study. The third type of documentation is analytic in nature, capturing the researcher’s thought processes in sorting, categorizing, and comparing data, as well as conceptualizing patterns that emerge as the data are examined and coded (Rodgers & Cowles, 1993). Rodger and Cowles insist that notes should be taken during and after each analysis session to document insights and speculations, “regardless of how trivial or even completely unrelated it may seem at the time” (Rodgers & Cowles, 1993, p. 222). Finally, they suggested that the investigator maintain personal response documentation, describing their self-awareness. These notes may serve to identify biases that may arise during the investigation so that they can be dealt with appropriately.

For this study, the researcher held the dual role of auditor, with support and advisement from the dissertation Chair and a committee member. Given the relative inexperience of the investigator with this research process, it was advantageous to the study to have an experienced reviewer who ensured sufficient, adequate, and scrupulous record keeping from the outset.
Journaling

The researcher created and compiled notes throughout the research process. Patton (1990) refers to these as field notes and stresses the importance of description, concreteness, and detail. He also asserts the need to include direct quotations, the researcher’s feelings and reactions, as well as her reflections about the personal significance of events. In addition, Patton advises the researcher to include her insights, interpretations, beginning analyses, and working hypotheses about all incidents.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest keeping a reflexive journal, “a kind of diary in which the investigator on a daily basis, or as needed, records a variety of information about self and method” (p. 327). Such a journal would, at minimum, include the daily schedule and logistics of the study; reflections about events as they relate to the researcher’s values and interest and for speculation about growing insights; and a methodological log which describes methodological decisions and accompanying rationales.

Throughout this study, the researcher maintained documentation as described by Rodgers and Cowles (1993). Specifically, the journal will contain the following information: (a) contextual documentation: descriptions of access, setting, observations; (b) methodological documentation; (c) analytic documentation: phenomenological reduction, imaginative variation, synthesis of meanings and essences; (d) personal response: epoche.

Context

The context of this study is an urban California school district with 44 schools, 28,500 students, and 1,443 certificated employees. The ethnic background of the student
population includes 68% Hispanic, 13% White, 11% Filipino, 4% African American, 3% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1% other. English Learners (ELs) comprise 35% of the population, and 47% of students are free/reduced lunch program recipients.

The participating school was selected because it meets the criteria of being an achieving urban school with high levels of ELs and socioeconomically disadvantaged students. Table 7 describes subgroup populations.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percent of total enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically disadvantaged</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with disabilities</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from School Accountability Report Card 2012-13: Find a SARC, by the California Department of Education (CDE), n.d.b, retrieved from http://www.sarconline.org/Home/Search
The current principal has been leading this site for 9 years. Table 8 shows that, during this time, the academic achievement of the school has shown steady and consistent improvement that is comparable or better than that of the district and state of California.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School site</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State of California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total API growth in 8 years</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from *Academic Performance Index (API) Report*, by the California Department of Education (CDE), n.d.a, retrieved from http://api.cde.ca.gov/reports/API/APISearchName.asp?TheYear=&cTopic=API&cLevel=School&cName=rohr&cCounty=&cTimeFrame=S

The student population, academic achievement under the principal’s tenure, and high level of Organizational Citizenship Behavior made this school an ideal selection for this study.

**Participants**

Currently, the credentialed staff at the participating school site includes the individuals outlined in Table 9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education grade level teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten/First</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth/Sixth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Teacher/Instructional Coach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>1 part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Pathologist</td>
<td>1 part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participation in this study was limited to all full-time credentialed staff which included a total of 15 potential participants. Although there are other credentialed staff members on site, such as a Speech and Language Pathologist and Psychologist, they are not at the school site on a full-time basis and were therefore not included as potential participants.

Eight people volunteered to be interviewed, including six classroom teachers and two certificated support staff members. Every grade level except for third grade was
represented by the participants. The number of years that participants have worked under
the current principal’s tenure ranged from 2 to 8 years, and the total years of teaching
experience among participants ranged from 4 to 19 years. The principal also agreed to be
interviewed, which brought the total number of participants to nine.

A consent form was provided to teachers and the principal (Appendices A and B),
participants were permitted to opt out at any time, and research findings were made
available to all participants upon request.

The researcher conducted one-to-one recorded interviews with each participant
(Appendices C and D). Eight of the participants elected to be interviewed at the school
site after school, and one participant elected to meet at a coffee shop on a weekend.

Data Collection

The data collection process began with a letter to the superintendent (Appendix E)
requesting access to the school in the district. Upon approval from the superintendent,
permission for participation was requested from the principal of the school (Appendix F).
The researcher then arranged to attend a staff meeting where she explained the study
(Appendix G), distributed and collected the survey instrument (Appendix H), and
obtained informed consent (Appendices A and B) from those who volunteered to
participate in the interview process.

Upon collection of the surveys the researcher computed the standard score
for school organizational citizenship behaviors using the following formula
100*(OCB-3.86)/.27 + 500 (DiPaola et al., 2005) to determine the school’s eligibility
based on the OCB Scale. Following the determination that the school was in fact eligible,
the researcher contacted the principal to inform her of the next steps for continuation of
the study, which included communicating with each individual participant to set up an appointment to meet for the first interview. The principal was not made aware of the names of those who had volunteered to participate.

**Instrumentation**

The Organizational Citizenship Survey is a 12-item Likert scale that measures the degree of OCB among teachers. The higher the score, the more OCB is present. Developed by DiPaola and colleagues (2005), the OCB Survey was tested for its effective measurement of OCB in High, Middle, and Elementary Schools. The results showed that the OCB scale is a reliable and stable tool with construct validity supported by factor analysis as shown in Table 10.

The predictive reliability of the OCB scale similarly was also strongly supported, as shown in Table 11.

Organizational citizenship in schools departs from most of the earlier research in that all aspects of citizenship fold into an integrated whole. . . . The distinction between helping individuals and furthering the organizational mission is blurred because in schools the mission is synonymous with helping student-clients—schools are people-helping organizations. (DiPaola et al., 2005, pp. 321-322)

Aside from its construct and predictive validity strengths, this survey was particularly suitable for this study because it focuses on the organization rather than on the individual. The survey is worded in such a way that it captures the aggregate sense of citizenship within the school.
Table 10

Comparison of Factor Structures for the OCBSS and OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCB item</th>
<th>High schools (n = 97) OCBSS</th>
<th>High schools (n = 97) OCB</th>
<th>Middle schools (n = 75) OCB</th>
<th>Elementary schools (n = 100) OCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher committees in this school work productively.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers begin class promptly and use class time effectively.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers make innovative suggestions to improve the overall quality of our school.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers volunteer to serve on new committees.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers give colleagues advance notice of changes in schedule or routine.</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers help students on their own time.</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers voluntarily help new teachers.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers arrive to work and meetings on time.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers waste a lot of class time.</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>-.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers volunteer to sponsor extracurricular activities.</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers give an excessive amount of busywork.</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>-.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers take the initiative to introduce themselves to substitutes and assist them.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers schedule personal appointments at times other than during the school day.</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are rarely absent.</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers leave immediately after school is over.</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance Explained</td>
<td>36.21</td>
<td>40.82</td>
<td>58.82</td>
<td>59.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Coefficient of Reliability</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from “Measuring Organizational Citizenship in Schools: The OCB Scale,” by M. F. DiPaola, C. Tartar, & W. K. Hoy, 2005, in W. K. Hoy & C. Miskel (Eds.), *Leadership and Reform in American Public Schools* (pp. 319-341), Greenwich, CT: Information Age, p. 325.
Table 11

Comparison of Correlations of Predictor Variables With OCB in Middle and Elementary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>Sample 1 Middle schools</th>
<th>Sample 2 Elementary schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Principal Behavior</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Professionalism</td>
<td>.92*</td>
<td>.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Press</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Mindfulness</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>.87*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\*\(p < .01\).

The questions asked during the interviews required deliberate and careful consideration because wording can have a deleterious effect if there are “subtle biases” (Flanagan, 1954). Prior to asking the interview questions, the researcher stated the general aim of the study and clarified the meaning of organizational citizenship behavior. Once the meaning of OCB was understood by the interviewee, a more accessible phrase—above and beyond—was utilized. The general aim of the proposed study was to determine the actions and behaviors of principals that inspire citizenship behavior. Correspondingly, the interview questions were tied to this aim.

Flanagan (1954) also states that there are generally certain criteria that should be applied to incidents as they are collected such as (a) is the actual behavior reported; (b) was it observed by the reporter; (c) were all relevant factors in the situation given;
(d) has the observer made a definite judgment regarding the criticalness of the behavior;
(e) has the observer made it clear just why he or she believes the behavior was critical.

Given these guidelines, the following interview questions were utilized:

- Think of a time when the principal has done something or behaved in a way that you feel motivated or inspired you and/or your colleagues to go above and beyond.
- Describe in detail what the person(s) were inspired or motivated to do that went above and beyond.
- How do you have knowledge of this event?
- Which action or behavior on behalf of the principal inspired the person/people to go above and beyond? When did this happen?
- How do you have knowledge of this event?

**Ethical Issues**

Trustworthiness in qualitative inquiry depends on credibility of the researcher which involves integrity and a code of ethic (Merriam, 2009). This study relied on interviews, and this practice carries potential risks, as well as rewards, for the participants (Merriam, 2009) since issues of privacy may arise as a concern for the interviewee. The researcher of the proposed study therefore applied Patton’s (1990) list of ethical considerations:

1. Promises and reciprocity. What’s in it for the interviewee? Why should the interviewee participate in the interview?
2. Risk assessment. In what ways, if any, will conducting the interview put people at risk?
3. Confidentiality. What are reasonable promises of confidentiality that can be fully honored? Data will not contain names of participants.

4. Informed consent. What kind of informed consent is necessary for mutual protection?

5. Data access and ownership. Who will have access to the data? For what purposes? Who owns the data in an evaluation?

6. Interviewer mental health. How will interviewers be affected by conducting the interview? What will they hear or see that may merit debriefing and processing?

7. Advice. Who will be the researcher’s confidant and counselor on matters of ethics during a study? (p. 356)

The benefit to the school principal in agreeing to have her school participate is that she would gain insight on his/her actions and characteristics that inspire OCB. This information may be useful to the principal because it provides awareness about their role in a phenomenon that enhances his/her organization’s effectiveness. The benefit to staff may be improvement in their school’s efficiency, as well as academic achievement of students (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b).

The risks of participating in this study may have included the participating staff having a fear that the principal or other colleagues might see their names alongside the data and might be ostracized, embarrassed, or punished. The principal might have feared that results would reveal OCB that is not to be attributable to their actions or characteristics. The fear of being identified was addressed by informing participants that pseudonyms would be assigned to all involved. The principal’s apprehension was also
assuaged by knowing that the school would also be assigned a pseudonym. Should the principal have expressed concerns about the limitations of his/her contribution to OCB, the researcher offered to make the literature review accessible, as it would help to allay these fears.

The nature of the critical incident technique may present a predicament in terms of reported data. In some cases, reported critical incidents may be so specific as to make the identity of the individual known. Knowing this might have prevented a participant from complete candor. To address this possibility, the researcher made it clear that the objective of the study is to present data about actions that contribute to OCB, rather than those which negate it. Should the participant fear that they would have a slip of the tongue with a critique about what the principal should have done, or what they did wrong, such data would be excluded, as it would automatically fail to meet the criteria of a relevant critical incident for this study. The researcher also put this in writing in the written informed consent.

Should they ask for it, participants had access to data that they have contributed to the study. Given the subject, it was not anticipated that the researcher would experience adverse negative reaction to the interviews. Nevertheless reflective journals, and counsel from the dissertation chair were integrated throughout the process of the study. Similarly, the Chair was also available for advice on matters of ethics.

Summary

This chapter described the methodology and qualitative research design of this study. Given the research questions, a phenomenological approach and the critical incident technique were thoroughly explicated as the appropriate methods for this
particular study. Validity and reliability in qualitative research is not approached in the
traditional sense as that of quantitative research. The rigor of this study was therefore
explained and was approached via the actualization of trustworthiness.

This study occurred at an achieving urban elementary school site in southern
California. Selection of the school was based on its urban status, student population,
academic achievement under the current principal’s tenure, and high levels of
organizational citizenship behavior as measured by the OCB Survey (DiPaola et al.,
2005). Participants from the school included full-time staff comprised of six classroom
teachers, two certificated support staff members, and the principal. Participation was
voluntary and consisted of semi-structured interviews. The interviews emphasized recall
of critical incidents, and the resulting data were categorized and classified. Ethical
considerations as outlined by Patton (1990) were utilized. The following chapter presents
the data and findings of the study.
CHAPTER 4—FINDINGS OF DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The scope of an educator’s work is difficult, if not impossible, to fully capture in a simple job description. The act of ensuring a relevant, 21st century education for all children requires, at minimum, an effort to perpetually stay informed and knowledgeable about the complexities of learning styles, teaching techniques, standards and curriculum, societal changes, and human development. To capture the fine points of the work involved for a teacher to know and respond effectively to each of these important matters would require a job description of herculean proportions. Instead, teacher job descriptions either omit or skirt the edges of these heavy topics without providing specificity. Nevertheless, the public remains unwavering in its expectations that a teacher act as servant, moral agent, social advocate, researcher, data analyst, and educator. Under the protection of a union contract, teachers do not technically have to work outside of their job description; but in order for a school to function effectively, efficiently, and successfully, it would benefit a principal to motivate and inspire his or her staff to go above and beyond.

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is defined as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p. 4). Organizational citizenship behavior embodies the desired state of affairs in effective and achieving schools. This qualitative study, conducted at an achieving school with high levels of OCB, investigated the principal’s role as a motivator of citizenship behaviors. Instances of teacher citizenship behavior, as well as perceptions of the critical incidents that inspired people to go above and beyond, were collected.
through one-to-one semi-structured interviews. A phenomenological process utilizing the Critical Incident Technique (CIT) drove the analysis of data in order to conceive the essence of this phenomenon.

The organization of this chapter includes:

- a description of the school and research participants
- the school’s results on the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Survey
- a summary of the OCBs as described by participants, along with a discussion about the dimensions of these incidents as they relate to the construct of OCB
- critical incidents leading to citizenship behavior
- a discussion of major trends that emerged.

**District and School Contexts**

Laurel Elementary, led by Principal Lopez, is located in an urban and diverse southern California school district. Fair City Elementary School District is comprised of 44 schools, 28,500 students, and 1,443 certificated employees. The ethnic background of the district’s student population includes 68% Hispanic, 13% White, 11% Filipino, 4% African American, 3% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1% other. English Learners (EL) comprise 35% of the population, and 47% of students are free/reduced lunch program recipients. As Figure 1 shows, during the last 3 years of the California Standardized Test (2011-2014), Fair City Elementary School District consistently maintained an Academic Performance Index (API) in the high 800s, which was higher than that of the county and state.
Laurel Elementary

Currently, there are 321 kindergarten through sixth grade students enrolled at Laurel Elementary. Figure 2 shows the breakdown of students by grade level.

Laurel Elementary was selected because it meets the selection criteria of being an urban school with high levels of English Learners and socioeconomically disadvantaged students. The ethnic demographics of the school are shown in Figure 3.

Other relevant populations include Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students, English Learners, and Students with Disabilities. Figure 4 shows the composition for these demographics.
Figure 2. Percentage of students at each grade level.

Figure 3. Ethnicities represented at Laurel Elementary.
Laurel’s academic growth under Principal Lopez’s tenure was also used as criteria for its eligibility to participate in this study. Over the last 7 testing years, the school saw steady and positive academic growth. From 2006-07 to 2012-13, Laurel’s Academic Performance Index (API) grew from 712 to 821, totaling 109 point increase. In comparison, the district grew from an API of 782 to 863 in the same time period, for a total growth of 81 points. California’s API grew from 726 to 790, for a total growth of 64 points in the same time period. Figure 5 shows the API for the school, district and California from 2006 to 2013.
Staff

Credentialed staff at Laurel includes the principal, 11 general education teachers, two special day class teachers, one resource specialist, one resource teacher/instructional coach, one part-time psychologist, and one part-time speech pathologist. Participation in this study was limited to full-time credentialed staff, which resulted in a total of 16 potential participants. A total of nine staff members, including Principal Lopez and eight teachers, volunteered to be interviewed. Of the eight teachers, six are classroom teachers and two are certificated support staff members. Teacher participants represented every grade level, with the exception of third grade. The number of years that participants have worked under Principal Lopez’s tenure range from 2 to 9 years, and the total years of teaching experience ranges from 4 to 19 years.

Principal Lopez has been an educator for 36 years and has held several positions across two school districts including classroom teacher, literacy coach, project specialist.
Data Collection: Organizational Citizenship Survey

Upon receiving approval for the study from the Institutional Review Board, the district superintendent, and Principal Lopez, the researcher made arrangements to attend a staff meeting. The purpose of this meeting was threefold. First, she presented a 15-minute overview of the study, which included giving background on the topic of OCB, explaining the purpose of the study, and reviewing informed consent. Second, she requested volunteers for the interviews, and third, the staff completed the Organizational Citizenship Survey, a 12-item Likert scale instrument that measures the degree of OCB among teachers. The higher the score, the more OCB is present.

Developed by DiPaola and colleagues (2005), the OCB Scale was tested for its effective measurement of OCB in Elementary, Middle, and High Schools. The staff was informed that participation in all aspects of the study, including the survey, was voluntary. The survey took approximately 10 minutes to complete. All staff members present at the meeting returned usable questionnaires. A copy of the presentation slides, consent forms, and the survey were left for two staff members who were absent on the day of the meeting. Both teachers later filled out the survey, and the researcher retrieved them at the school site the following week.

The OCB scale is a reliable and stable tool with construct validity supported by factor analysis, as shown in Table 10 (Chapter 3). DiPaola and colleagues (2005) conducted the factor analysis of the OCB scale using data from 109 elementary schools in
Texas. These schools were located in urban, suburban, and rural areas, and only those with a faculty of 25 or more were eligible for the study (DiPaola et al., 2005).

The Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale consists of 12 statements with answers including strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree, agree, and strongly agree. Item number 1 received the most robust response with 93% of teachers selecting agree or strongly agree. Items number 3, 6, 9, and 10 received the next strongest response, with 87% of teachers indicating agree or strongly agree for items 3, 6, and 9, with item 10 reverse scored. Items number 7 and 8 revealed 80% of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with those statements. Seventy-three percent of respondents selected agree or strongly agree for items 2, 11, and 12, with item 12 reverse scored. Item 4 received 67% agreement or strong agreement, and item 5 received 60%.

Table 12 summarizes the results of the survey.

Item analysis of the survey shows that the average school item scores (ASIS), calculated by adding each of the item totals and dividing by the number of participants (15), ranged from 4.73 to 5.40 out of a possible 6.0. The overall school item score, which was calculated by adding all of the ASIS and dividing by the number of items (12), resulted in a score of 4.93. Table 13 shows these results.

To calculate the Organizational Citizenship behavior score, the researcher had to convert the school score to a standardized score with a mean of 500 and a standard deviation of 100 using the formula \[100\times(OCB-3.86)/.27\]+500. The researcher therefore computed the difference between Laurel’s OCB score and the normative sample (OCB - 3.86), then multiplied the difference by 100. Next, she divided the product by the standard deviation of the normative sample (.27) and finally, added 500 to the result.
Table 12

Results of the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale at Laurel Elementary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers help students on their own time.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teachers waste a lot of class time.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers voluntarily help new teachers.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teachers volunteer to serve on new committees.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teachers volunteer to sponsor extracurricular activities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teachers arrive to work and meetings on time.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teachers take the initiative to introduce themselves to substitutes and assist them.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teachers begin class promptly and use class time effectively.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teachers give colleagues advanced notice of changes in schedule or routine.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teachers give an excessive amount of busy work.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Teacher committees in this school work productively.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers make innovative suggestions to improve the overall quality of our school.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

**OCB Scale: Item Totals, Average School Item Score, Overall School Item Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2 (RS)</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10 (RS)</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>totals&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average school item score&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall school item score&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Reverse scored.
<sup>b</sup>Sum of all participant responses for each item.
<sup>c</sup>Average School Item Score equals each item total divided by number of respondents (15).
<sup>d</sup>Overall School Item Score equals total of Average School Item Scores (59.2) divided by number of items (12).

The results of the survey at Laurel elementary were very strong, with a score of 896. The range of possible scores is shown in Figure 6. The score of 896 therefore placed the school’s level of citizenship behavior higher than 99% of the normative sample.

**Data Collection: Semi-Structured Interviews**

Once the survey result determined that Laurel Elementary was an excellent candidate for this study due to its high level of OCB, the researcher contacted each of the teachers who had volunteered to be interviewed and proceeded to set face-to-face appointments for interviews. Participation in the study was confidential. The researcher did not make the principal or other teachers aware of who was or was not participating. Teachers were given complete control over the place and time, as long as it did not interfere with classroom time. All but one participant elected to meet in their classroom after school. The meeting with the principal also occurred after school in her office.
If the score is 200, it is lower than 99% of the schools.
If the score is 300, it is lower than 97% of the schools.
If the score is 400, it is lower than 86% of the schools.
If the score is 500, it is average.
If the score is 600, it is higher than 84% of the schools.
If the score is 700, it is higher than 97% of the schools.
If the score is 800, it is higher than 99% of the schools.

Figure 6. Range of possible scores on the OCB scale.

One participant elected to meet on a Saturday at a local coffee shop. Prior to starting the interview, the researcher reviewed informed consent in case the participants had further questions. She then reminded the participant about the purpose and topic of the study. The researcher reviewed the definition of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, its five dimensions and provided the participant with examples of OCB within each dimension (see Appendix C). The reason for providing this support was to prompt varied examples because the definition of OCB and each of the dimensions is very broad. By providing examples, the participants would have a better understanding of the range of behaviors they could share resulting in a rich data set.

Once the background of the study and OCB were established, the interview began. The semi-structured interviews were focused around two main questions: Think of a time when your principal has done something or behaved in a way that motivated or inspired you and/or colleagues to go above and beyond. What did you and/or your colleagues do that went above and beyond? Which action or behavior on behalf of your principal inspired you and/or your colleagues to go above and beyond? The semi-structured format
allowed for a degree of flexibility in order to elicit specificity or clarity (Creswell, 2009). For example, when participants used abstract ways to describe the principal behaviors such as, “She has a positive demeanor,” the researcher followed up with a question such as, “Can you give one or two examples of how that [positive demeanor] specifically presents itself?” Interviews lasted from 15 minutes to an hour and yielded 76 pages of transcribed text.

The researcher analyzed each of the transcriptions and created a spreadsheet where she placed each example of OCB along with the corresponding critical incidents that inspired the citizenship behavior. Next, each OCB was labeled according to the five dimensions of citizenship behavior including helping, courtesy, sportsmanship, civic virtue, and compliance. This allowed for a summary of the citizenship behaviors and their relationship to the five dimensions. Additionally, it made visible any patterns or trends that emerged from this information. For example, it allowed the researcher to see if any of the five dimensions had a stronger showing than the others. Finally, the principal actions and behaviors that inspired the OCBs were analyzed to eliminate repetition and to extrapolate the critical incidents that served to inspire citizenship behaviors at Laurel Elementary.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior at Laurel Elementary

Thirty-five examples of organizational citizenship behavior were described by eight teacher participants. A discussion of these citizenship behaviors and their relationship to the five dimensions of OCB follows. In addition, a consideration of OCB at Laurel Elementary as a one-factor construct is also reviewed.
During the interview, teachers were asked to recall the times when, having been somehow inspired by Principal Lopez, they or their colleagues had gone above and beyond. Participants were not limited to one incident and all collected examples were later reviewed for relevancy to the study. In a few cases, the researcher found that the example of OCB was not directly linked to principal behavior. For example, one teacher stated that she went above and beyond when she returned to the university to attain a master’s degree. Upon further probing, the researcher found that Principal Lopez did not directly inspire this example of OCB. Therefore, it was not included. The researcher carefully considered each OCB event in this manner and included only those events that were motivated by principal actions or behaviors.

**Patterns of Citizenship Behaviors**

Five specific categories of discretionary behavior have been identified within studies of organizational citizenship. These categories, or dimensions, have been measured extensively as they correlate to OCB (Kidwell et al., 1997; Krebs, 1970; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994, 1997). The five dimensions include:

- **Helping**: behaviors that have the effect of helping a specific other person with an organizationally relevant task or problem (Organ, 1988).
- **Sportsmanship**: participants who demonstrate sportsmanship avoid negative behaviors such as complaining or making petty grievances (Organ, 1988).
- **Courtesy**: coworkers voluntarily doing something for each other in order to prevent a problem from arising (Organ, 1988).
• Civic virtue: the individual who sees himself as a part of the whole and actively participates in the functioning and decision-making of the organization represents (Organ, 1988).

• Compliance: “impersonal contributions to the organization in such forms as exemplary attendance, use of work time, respect for company property, and faithful adherence to rules about work procedures and conduct” (Organ & Ryan, 1995, p. 782).

Citizenship behaviors described by teachers at Laurel initially revealed a tendency toward the dimensions of helping and civic virtue. Fourteen out of 35 citizenship behaviors corresponded to the category of helping, and 11 were examples of civic virtue. However, once the researcher grouped similar examples of OCB within each dimension, this grouping resulted in 11 distinct helping behaviors, and 4 specific behaviors related to civic virtue. Figure 7 displays the total number of citizenship behaviors by dimension once repetition was considered.

**Helping.** Fourteen total examples of citizenship behaviors that fall within the dimension of “helping” were described in the interviews by six of the participants. After accounting for repetition, the following 11 unique types of helping behavior emerged:

1. Making the principal look good when the superintendent visits
2. Agreeing to teach a new grade level
3. Modeling lessons for other teachers
4. Choreographing for the dance festival
5. Volunteering to be the teacher for groups of students with an Individualized Education Plan
6. Collaborating on instructional planning
7. Sharing resources
8. Providing classroom coverage when no substitutes are available
9. Translating for each other
10. Organizing clubs for students
11. Volunteering to do miscellaneous duties as necessary.

Two participants specifically wanted to help Principal Lopez make a great impression on the superintendent when he visited the school. One participant stated, “I planned out a really thought out lesson. So not that I don’t usually, but I just made sure it was extra and like I said, ‘I wanted to do it so she would shine’” (Participant 3). Teachers also shared that they put in extra time to assist with special events, helping each other
plan lessons, covering classrooms when a substitute was not available, assisting with translations, and generally taking on extra miscellaneous responsibilities as necessary. Another participant shared, “[I help by] putting up signs, taking on different tasks, watching certain kids or keeping an eye out for certain kids, or raising worms” (Participant 9). Other helping behaviors included the sharing of resources, modeling lessons, and being agreeable to a grade level change. There are also two instructional aides who voluntarily run music and knitting clubs. Teachers were described as going above and beyond when they volunteered to take students who have an Individualized Education Plan because this is considered to result in additional workload. As the interviewee elaborated, “That again is putting a little more effort because we have to collaborate, and then they have to attend IEP meetings, and we have to coordinate our parent teacher conferences” (Participant 7).

Civic virtue. Eight participants shared examples of OCB that fell within the dimension of civic virtue. Initially, 11 separate incidents of civic virtue were described; however, once the examples were sorted by similarity, a total of four distinct types of civic virtue emerged:

1. Participating in instructional ad hoc committees
2. Involvement in the school garden
3. Participation in the School Site Council
4. Involvement in student classroom placements (special education).

Six of the eight participants described spending considerable time on instructional ad hoc committees, such as curriculum planning around the Common Core State
Standards, planning for integration of instructional technology, or serving on the Instructional Leadership Team. One teacher shared:

I was thinking about a time where I and a group of other teachers assisted in launching a couple different types of technology plans for our school. Particularly Edmodo and Ten Marks, and it was a lot of effort in that and a lot of it was definitely outside of contract hours getting trained, practicing, and doing stuff outside contract hours. (Participant 2)

Another teacher explained:

She [Principal Lopez] motivated me to start unit planning with a curriculum mapping. Two of us were the ones to start that and you know . . . I’d come up on the weekends. There’ve been Saturdays here where I’ve been here for 5 hours. (Participant 5)

The school garden was also a source of citizenship behavior as was indicated by one teacher who said:

We’ll soon have our garden planting day, so we just had a meeting a couple of days ago after school, and everybody will take a little responsibility so somebody has to make phone calls, another person has to buy things, somebody else has to coordinate something. (Participant 7)

One participant agreed to serve as secretary on the School Site Council, which she referred to as “time consuming and sometimes stressful” (Participant 5). Finally, the resource specialist takes an active role in improving operations and instruction by helping to place students with IEPs in the most appropriate classroom setting. The teacher emphasized the extra work involved by saying:
I look at the whole group and individual student, and I say, “This student needs this teacher for whatever reason.” So I say, “Ok, how does that work with the group?” And then I say, “Yeah, that would be a good fit.” And I create my list. So that takes time. It would be easier for me to just say, oh whatever teacher she chooses, and I’ll just go [teach them]. (Participant 7)

**Courtesy.** Three participants shared three distinct examples of courtesy including:

1. Volunteering to take an additional student on her roster
2. Agreeing to watch students after school
3. Taking challenging students when they need a time out.

One teacher described a situation where a parent was demanding that her child be moved to a different classroom and threatening to go to the district offices if her request was denied. This teacher wanted to help the principal avoid further problems, so she volunteered to take the student, even though she had more students on her roster than the other teacher. She explained:

   And I was listening to it, and I could see my principal was just kind of trying to work with the parent and the parent wasn’t getting [it] and I said, “If you need to put her in my class, I’m fine with it.” (Participant 1)

Another participant shared an occasion when she agreed to keep an eye on students who were in an after school club so that a credentialed employee was always present; she did this for a few weeks without compensation. In her words:

   If she asks for me to stay after and watch the GATE kids for an after school program for an hour, I have no problem doing that. So going above and beyond,
think just last year she asked if, it was once a week on Thursdays, if I could just stay from three to four to just keep an eye on the after school program with the GATE students. . . . So that’s one incident, you know, hours, I didn’t get paid for those hours, it was after contract time. (Participant 4)

The third example of courtesy came from a teacher who is willing to take challenging students whenever they require a time out from their classroom.

Compliance. Two interviewees described three examples of compliance. One reference to compliance was teachers wanting to be among the first to turn in their report cards. Another form of compliance is that teachers try to avoid scheduling appointments during school hours, as is evidenced in the following quote:

Nobody ever leaves [early] because they want to go get their hair done or something. She [principal] tells us, “Try and schedule your appointments out of work hours, but, if you can’t, then do it as close to the end of the day as possible.” And people do. (Participant 1)

A third participant made reference to the fact that all teachers at Laurel attend staff meetings. She specifically compared this behavior to that of a former school where staff meetings were not taken seriously, and only a few people showed up.

Sportsmanship. One teacher gave two examples of sportsmanship. The first example was in relation to staff meetings that occasionally go beyond contract time. She stated that neither she nor other teachers get up and leave as soon as the clock strikes 3 o’clock. The same teacher referenced the dance festival as an event that has lost popularity among many of the teachers but is generally accepted because it means so much to the principal.
Table 14 presents the dimensions of OCB and corresponding examples and quotes from the interviews.

**Organizational Citizenship as a One-Factor Construct**

Research has shown that, within the school setting, OCB toward the organization (OCBO) and OCB toward an individual (OCBI) become synonymous. DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) found that OCB in schools is actually a one-factor construct. OCBO and OCBI do not exist independent of each other, because educators work to help individuals and these actions, in turn, help the organization. As a service organization, “The distinction between helping individuals and furthering the organizational mission is blurred, because the mission is synonymous with helping people” (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001, p. 442). Analysis of the collection of OCBs at Laurel supports this finding.

The majority of examples of citizenship behavior served to positively impact the organization and its vision of creating a challenging and nurturing instructional environment.

All of the behaviors described under the dimension of civic virtue had an effect on the school as a whole. For example, there was an emphasis on the instructional work that occurred among several teachers and which was later applied throughout the school. Additionally, the work around the school garden was also described by participants as one that positively affected the entire school including teachers, students, and parents alike. The compliant behaviors also benefitted the organization since teacher participation at staff meetings serves to promote the effective operational and instructional functioning of a school. Teachers’ compliance with appointment scheduling outside of school hours is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Number of incidents</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Helping         | 11                  | • I have definitely helped out colleagues being a model teacher. They would come in with Principal Lopez to observe for certain lessons.” (Participant 5)  
• Volunteering to take students with an IEP. “I have teachers that’ll say ‘me, me.’ That would be an example of going beyond. They don’t have to, they can take whatever is assigned to them but they go, ‘No, no, I’ll do it.’ That is putting a little more effort because we have to coordinate our parent teacher conferences so it’s not just sitting down and just taking whatever is dished out to you.” (Participant 7)  
• “We rely on each other even across grade levels. There’s not that band of you know it’s just fourth or just fifth, it’s maybe the second grade teacher collaborates with the third or maybe the sixth grade will have some words of wisdom for fourth grade.” (Participant 7)  
• “People are pretty willing to give their ideas or resources or copies even. [They’ll say] ‘I’ll make you copies and just put them in your mailbox.’” (Participant 9) |
| Civic Virtue    | 4                   | • “There were a couple of us 2 years ago that took on developing writing curriculum for the Common Core, which is a really big deal, and it was a lot of outside, of our time work. . . . and then we shared it with our grade levels. For the whole year, it was very time consuming. It was nighttime and on the weekends.” (Participant 3)  
• “We have a group called the Mathematics Improvement and Implementation Committee. We ended up having to meet over the summer. It was like midweek, and they all sat through webinars and trainings and nobody’s getting paid.” (Participant 1)  
• “I volunteer on committees. The SSC . . . I’m the secretary for her, taking notes, although it’s not my strength.” (Participant 9) |
| Courtesy        | 3                   | • “One example of going above and beyond is taking some of the problem students that we have in the school, and she would ask for them to sit in my class. And so because it’s Principal Lopez, because we have this relationship, because I think she would for me, so I want to reciprocate.” (Participant 9) |
| Compliance      | 3                   | • “When I did my student teacher [at another school] it was like, ‘Oh really, staff meeting?’ and like four people showed up. Here we all go. We always go.” (Participant 7)  
• End of year dance festival. “It’s a lot of work, and I think this last year she asked for a vote on who wanted to continue it and it was like half and half. I think those of us who don’t want it have reached the conclusion that we’re just going to keep doing it because she [Principal Lopez] loves it so much. When something means this much to someone then you think, ‘Okay, I’ll do it.’” (Participant 4) |
| Sportsmanship   | 2                   | • “If our meeting on Fridays goes over, after 3 o’clock,” the teachers do not get up and leave. (Participant 4)  
• End of year dance festival. “It’s a lot of work, and I think this last year she asked for a vote on who wanted to continue it and it was like half and half. I think those of us who don’t want it have reached the conclusion that we’re just going to keep doing it because she [Principal Lopez] loves it so much. When something means this much to someone then you think, ‘Okay, I’ll do it.’” (Participant 4) |
also beneficial to the site, as it can be disruptive to cover a classroom if teachers consistently leave early.

The majority of helping behaviors described by teachers, such as collaborating on planning, sharing resources, and assisting each other with translations or classroom coverage, typically benefitted either the entire organization or several individuals within the school. Furthermore, a reluctance to engage in any of these behaviors would generally have an overall greater negative impact on the school than on any one individual.

It is worth noting that there were two examples of OCB that might be viewed as benefitting an individual rather than the organization. Two participants stated that they specifically wanted to help make Principal Lopez look great whenever the superintendent visited the campus. Their emphasis on wanting to help the principal would suggest that this is citizenship behavior that was targeted toward an individual. On the other hand, it may also be argued that if the superintendent walks away with a positive impression of the principal, he is by extension, also walking away with a positive impression of the school which may be a benefit to the organization.

The other example came from a teacher who specifically stated, “One thing I’ve done for Principal Lopez, that I wouldn’t have done normally, is moved to kindergarten from fifth grade” (Participant 5). Similar to the previous example, her specificity about doing this for the principal also suggests OCB targeted at an individual; however, if this teacher was in fact the most capable of successfully teaching kindergarten, one might argue that by agreeing to teach this grade level, the teacher is positively impacting more
than just the principal. Her success as a kindergarten teacher would positively impact the school’s academic performance and future teachers of her students.

**Critical Incidents Leading to Organizational Citizenship Behaviors**

The Critical Incident Technique is characterized by probing interviews meant to obtain a comprehensive narrative around specific incidents or experiences within a particular context (Flanagan, 1954; Query & Kreps, 1993). Furthermore, Flanagan (1954) states that critical incidents are “defined as extreme behavior, either outstandingly effective or ineffective with respect to attaining the general aim” (p. 338). In this case, the general aim of the study was to determine the actions and behaviors of a principal that motivate or inspire citizenship behavior. This section presents the eight critical incidents that emerged from the interviews.

Fifty-four examples of principal behaviors and actions were initially described by the eight teachers as having motivated their desire to go above and beyond. Principal Lopez identified 26. However, once the researcher grouped these according to similar themes, the following eight critical incidents attributable to Principal Lopez emerged:

1. Showing interest and concern for personal life of staff
2. Giving encouragement
3. Consistently being visible and accessible to staff
4. Providing resources
5. Inviting staff to her home
6. Giving recognition and appreciation
7. Having a vision
8. Thinking like a teacher.
Critical Incident 1: Showing Interest and Concern for Personal Life of Staff

Research suggests that principals who have strong interpersonal skills and show genuine interest and concern for the lives of teachers are able to inspire greater levels of OCB. In his research study of determinants and components of teacher organizational citizenship behavior, Oplatka (2006) found that emotional support for the staff by the principal is a contributor to OCB and states, “Principals are strongly urged to support their staff emotionally and to create an emotional bond with them . . . being attentive to their desires, distress, or dilemmas; or by supporting them in emotionally difficult times or in professional difficulties” (p. 417). Similarly, DiPaola and Hoy (2005b) found a significant and positive correlation between OCB and a collegial leadership style, which they describe as being “considerate, helpful, and genuinely concerned about the welfare of teachers” (p. 391). Responses from the current study revealed that Principal Lopez possesses these characteristics and that teachers at Laurel Elementary strongly value the actions and behaviors displayed by the principal as a result of this interpersonal strength. This view is supported by comments from teachers:

- I have found that her strength is relating to us on a personal level, which is motivating in itself. (Participant 5)

- She’s inquisitive about my family or my home life or how my weekend was. And you can get that, “Hey how’s your weekend?” which is kind of not sincerely asked. But hers is real where she’ll stop, and I think that’s the key. She’ll stop and show you that she has time . . . and she’ll look you in the eye and listen. It makes you see that it’s more than just a job or you’re more than
just an employee. That she does have some feelings or consideration of how
your life is beyond the school. (Participant 9)

Principal Lopez’s tendency toward empathy is another factor that is highly
regarded by teachers and which inspires them to go above and beyond, as evidenced by
the following comments:

- She cries when we cry. If we’re sad about something, even when it’s home
  life. There’s people that vent with her about their home life and she listens.  
  And she’ll stay there and she won’t say, “Oh I gotta go.” She really listens.  
  (Participant 1)
- She really asks about things, and when my mom passed away she was calling,  
  checking, telling me, “Don’t worry. Don’t even think about work, you go and
  you be with your family.” (Participant 5)
- She understands what it’s like to still be a mom and what it’s like to still be 
  a teacher. And I think that’s important because I don’t feel that all
  administrators are like that, so it does make you want to work hard for her.  
  (Participant 3)
- It’s that willingness [of Principal Lopez] to bend and say, “I understand that
  you have a life, and you have health, and you have children, and you have a
  family, and you might have a parent. I understand that.” (Participant 1)

Respondents were also motivated to engage in citizenship behaviors because the
principal’s awareness, interest, and concern for teachers resulted in flexible behaviors that
allowed staff to take care of personal family needs when necessary, such as providing
coverage for their classroom if they needed to leave early for an appointment.
Several studies have linked trust in the leader to OCB in a positive and significant way (Brower et al., 2009; Deluga, 1995; Kacmar et al., 2012; Mayer & Gavin, 2005). Furthermore, a study about faculty trust in principals by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (1998) found that trust in the principal came directly from the principal’s collegial behavior. Given Principal Lopez’s strong tendencies toward collegial leadership and the citizenship behaviors that are inspired by such behavior, it may be surmised that there are high levels of trust at Laurel Elementary.

Critical Incident 2: Giving Encouragement

Transformational leaders pay particular attention to employees in ways that enhance their productivity, appreciate their strengths, and inspire them to perform beyond their own self-interest. One component of transformational leadership is individualized consideration, which is “practiced when new learning opportunities are created along with a supportive climate” (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 7). Similarly, Leithwood and colleagues (2004) refer to the term ‘developing people,’ which requires instructional leadership, as well as a level of emotional intelligence on the part of the leader. The latter involves forging strong relationships with people in order to leverage their strengths appropriately. Six of the eight participants made reference to Principal Lopez’s consistent efforts to provide encouragement in order to motivate or support professional learning and growth. Two teachers recalled the following instances as examples:

- She’s just really encouraging, and she just really believes in you, like “you can do this . . . .” She wants me to be the coach right now, like the resource coach, and she’s kind of trying to push me like, “You need a change and . . . I think
you need this for your career” so she’s really good at motivating.

(Participant 3)

- Just this summer, she really wanted me to apply for this position at the district office . . . she said, “I think you’d be really good for it.” And so then I went ahead and I thought, “Okay, normally I wouldn’t but because she is encouraging me and she’s confident in me”, so I applied. (Participant 4)

Teachers’ willingness to go above and beyond by working on instructional planning on their own time was also credited to Principal Lopez’s encouragement and praise as evidenced by the following comment:

I don’t feel intimidated by her. She’s encouraging with positive feedback. She says, “This is wonderful, this is great, we’re in awe.” She sends emails with like a brief evaluation of what she saw and it’s a lot of positives, even if there’s something she would like to see changed, she’ll say it kind of positively. It’s never been overwhelming intimidating, and I feel there’s a level of appreciation for me. She’s getting it done without having to be unusually mean.

(Participant 2)

Another teacher described the extra work she did in bringing educational technology practices to the school and stated that when she presented her ideas to Principal Lopez, she responded by saying, “This sounds great. But I want to leave it in your hands and I trust . . . I’ll support you. Tell me how I can help.” The teacher added, “She was very, very, very helpful and trusting. I mean, that’s huge. And when I know my principal trusts me, I don’t want to disappoint. I want to make sure I make her proud” (Participant 1). In this case, Principal Lopez not only inspired this one teacher to assume
responsibility for this work, but the instructional practices that emerged from this
endeavor were implemented throughout the entire school, while much of work to make it
happen necessitated the participation of several teachers outside of regular work hours.

Principal Lopez also referred to encouragement as a potential motivator for
citizenship behavior. She understood the importance of supporting teachers to reach their
full potential and did this with encouragement so that they wanted to remain at the school
site. This was evident in her comments:

I notice that there are certain teachers who have qualities of being maybe
prospective administrators or they have special talents, so I give them extra
responsibilities. I give them extra challenges. I know that if I want to keep them
in my school, which I do because they’re usually the ones that have the best
scores, I have to feed them; academically, emotionally, spiritually. I have to feed
them. And so I give them extra tasks. I will take them to conferences. I will
acknowledge them by saying, “We’re going to have an off-campus Instructional
Leadership Team meeting and that meeting is at my house.” So I’ll invite them to
my house. And they think they’re in heaven because they’ve never been off
campus on a work day and they’re being paid. And all you do is just have regular
stuff . . . but you have to feed them, because otherwise they’ll go somewhere else.
And I don’t want to lose those people.

However, Principal Lopez also acknowledged the importance of her role in preparing
them for advancement in their careers. On this aspect of encouragement, Principal Lopez elaborated:
But eventually I know that’s my main job, to let them go because I want them to take my chair when I leave, when I retire. So I put them under my wing and I’ve said, “This is what you’ve got to do,” and I counsel them.

Principal Lopez demonstrated a keen awareness and respect for the professional capabilities of her staff and routinely encouraged them to utilize those strengths in ways that benefitted the individual and, by extension, have benefitted the school. In line with several aspects of transformational leadership, Principal Lopez’s encouragement seems to promote employee feelings of self-efficacy, empowerment, and a desire to “transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the organization” (Marks & Printy, 2003, p. 375), which manifests itself in organizational citizenship behaviors.

**Critical Incident 3: Consistently Being Visible and Accessible to Staff**

Principal Lopez maintains high visibility and accessibility, which participants identified as a motivator for going above and beyond. This behavior made the teachers feel valued, acknowledged, and significant. It is worth mentioning that the teachers’ examples of the principal’s visibility seemed to focus on the literal meaning of visibility or the act of being seen around the school. In contrast, Principal Lopez’s examples emphasize her understanding about the importance of the meaning behind what she is doing when she is practicing visibility. Teacher examples included:

- She’s out and about when we’re out and about. At recess she’s out there to talk to us. Morning’s she’s out there. After school she’s out there. She’s not in her room, in her office away from us as her staff. She comes through [the classroom] sometimes just to say “Hi.” (Participant 5)
• All of us have her cell number. We can text her and she replies. She’s always available or sets up a time to make herself available. (Participant 1)

• She encourages discussion. So when we’re in the lunch room she comes in and sits with us and she joins us. And she joins people in conversations. So she’s not in the office all the time, unseen. She’s actually among us, and she is carrying on conversations with us. (Participant 9)

Teachers also appreciated and were motivated to do more when Principal Lopez showed interest in their work by visiting classrooms or dropping in on their meetings:

• She comes in often. She does walk-ins more than once a week in the classroom, in every classroom. Snapping pictures and sending us emails “good job doing this” or questions, but mostly it was positive when they were informal walk-throughs like, “Oh I noticed you did, you were showing the students how to divide fractions. That was awesome,” Or “I liked your enthusiasm when I walked in on blankity blank day.” (Participant 1)

• She’ll walk into the meeting and say, “Can I take a few pictures? Can I video for a little bit?” (Participant 1)

One teacher also commented on the interest and visibility that Principal Lopez maintained with students: “She didn’t have to, but sometimes she would come and see the kids practicing after school and watch them; so she showed the kids she was interested in what they were doing.” (Participant 6)

Principal Lopez also gave examples of her visibility and accessibility. On the topic of visibility she felt that she was impacting an above and beyond mentality when she got in the trenches along with staff. For example, she stated, “I know that I’ve, on the
weekends, came when we were building the garden. I helped with the garden whether it
was shoveling some things, but I had to model that. I had to be a team player.” In
addition:

[I]f we have a movie night after school and things spill on the ground, well, I get
the mop and I mop, because I’ve always told everybody, “You know what? We’re
all equals. We might have different responsibilities but we’re all human beings.”
So I have no shame in picking up the mop. No job is below me. And I think I do
it not because I’m, . . . I think I’m a humble person. And I think it’s just good.
 We all have to pitch in.

In reference to teachers who voluntarily ran after school clubs, Principal Lopez
speculated that perhaps her participation may have helped to inspire them to do this type
of extra work. Specifically, she stated, “I’ve sat in on the chess club. I’ve sat in and said,
‘I’m going to be a student because I don’t know how to play chess.’ So I’ve
participated.”

Concerning accessibility, Principal Lopez also suggested that her receptiveness
may play a role in citizenship behaviors, as evidenced by communications she receives
from teachers at all times of the day. She explained, “I just am constantly getting texts
and emails from teachers, and they’re talking about a certain child. And I guess maybe
it’s my openness that they feel they can text me at home.”

Leaders of high achieving schools do not succumb to operational issues that keep
them trapped within the confines of their office. Cotton (2003) asserted, “On the
contrary, the researchers find them to be unvaryingly present and approachable in the
everyday life of the school” (p. 14). Research has often identified visibility and
accessibility as quality indicators of effective leadership (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Cotton, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005) and, as evidenced by teachers in this study, they are also key factors for inspiring citizenship behaviors.

**Critical Incident 4: Providing Resources**

Participants appreciated Principal Lopez’s disposition toward providing resources, and they reciprocated with citizenship behaviors. Furthermore, her provisions manifested themselves in a variety of ways, which also demonstrates a sharp level of awareness. One of the teachers who worked on Common Core curriculum planning stated, “She bought us some materials that she didn’t have to buy us. She bought us Common Core Maps books, she bought us things to work with” (Participant 3). The teacher who led the work of technology integration explained:

She walks into our meetings and . . . because we were working so much, she got us a sub yesterday and said, “So you guys don’t have to stay after for the next meeting. I know you stay after for a few hours. I’m gonna get you guys a sub and you guys can plan for this program and do the next session.” (Participant 1)

The school has what one participant described as special education cluster classes. Being one of these cluster teachers is perceived as requiring more time and effort. Principal Lopez is credited with taking into consideration the extra work involved and providing resources in the form of time and classroom coverage for IEP meetings during the school day as described by the teacher:

I think what also helps is that once a teacher becomes the cluster teacher, she
[principal] supports. It’s like, whatever we do, becomes a priority. So our
schedule is respected. She takes into account that the teacher might have to attend
several IEP meetings. She makes sure that, she facilitates things. Things just become easier. (Participant 7)

Principal Lopez has also provided resources to the instructional assistants who voluntarily run the music and knitting clubs. Specifically:

The principal gives them a room, sets up a time, gives a reminder on the loud speaker, sends a School Messenger [announcement] home, gets permission slips. If there’s a field trip that she can help put together, she’ll do that . . . like the music club going to go watch the orchestra. (Participant 1)

Principal Lopez values her role as a resource provider and the influence it may have on teachers’ motivation and, by extension, the desire to practice OCBs. She reported asking herself, “How are my teachers feeling? Did I not give them the books? If I didn’t give them the resources, they’re going to feel all frustrated.” She also commented that she thinks the teachers know that she has a “never-ending ambition for the school.” When probed further about this statement, she elaborated:

I think they know that I’m constantly, let’s say, writing for grants. They know that I’m looking for resources. And I was really happy to get $200,000 in the last couple of years. And, I think that’s good for a single grant writer whose never written a grant in her life. So they know that I’ll be creative and looking for whatever ways to have, bring in, make the school successful.

Her search for resources extends to the community and business partners, as well. Principal Lopez does not hesitate when it comes to searching for any and all ways to support the school as demonstrated by the following remarks:
I have a lot of contacts with our business partners, so I’m constantly looking for ways to bring community people, [like the] senior police department, to come here. [The teachers] they’re going “What is she doing?” Well, I guess it’s examples that I’ve just been looking for ways to give everybody a hand. Maybe it’s those resources. It’s those resources and maybe it’s little incentives. If I say, “Hey technology corporation, can you come to our school and bring us something for our garden?” So it’s a little incentive. [The teachers] they know “Oh wow, somebody’s coming and giving us freebies.” Or, even if it’s [recruiting] volunteers. I guess volunteers would be kind of like a resource too. Counseling, working with the parents. “Parents, go and help in the classroom.” So I think the teachers know that I have ambition.

The leadership literature has determined that effective or high achieving principals are resource providers (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Cotton, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005; W. F. Smith & Andrews, 1989), describing a resource providing principal as one who “marshals personal, building, district, and community resources to achieve the vision and goals of the school. . . . Opportunities for new resources are sought by the principal—grants, workshops, professional conferences, inservice training, college courses, and volunteer services” (W. F. Smith & Andrews, 1989, p. 9). According to the data from this study, it appears that this characteristic may also serve to inspire staff to go above and beyond.
Critical Incident 5: Inviting Staff to Her Home

Teachers repeatedly made reference to the family-like or community atmosphere created by Principal Lopez and they specifically attributed this to her practice of opening her home to the staff as evidenced by the comment:

We’ve had a few meetings at her house, for school meetings or before school meetings, and it seems more personal. It’s a house gathering rather than in an auditorium or what not. It’s less formal. We get a chance to actually mingle as well as meet, so it’s a social meeting with an agenda. . . . Like prior to school beginning, we all met at her house. After school, like the Christmas party or end of school, we might meet that Friday. People can go home but they seem to all show up, because we have this sense of community towards one another.

(Participant 9)

In addition, the following comments show that participants also seemed to be affected or moved by the fact that Principal Lopez always cooked for the staff when she invited them to her home.

- She always says it, “We’re a family.” She always says that. One really nice thing that she does is she likes to take care of us, so, at the end of a quarter, she’ll invite us to her home. She’ll cook. She’ll provide everything, so it’s a time when we get together. (Participant 7)

- She’d have us over for breakfast sometimes at her house to work on things. I mean, we even went to a staff development, just a few of us, over summer break. We didn’t get paid for it but she’s like “I really want you guys to learn about this computer program. I want you to use it in your classroom.” So she
invited us to breakfast in her house during the break. . . . She knows, “I can’t pay you” but come in my house and I’ll feed you guys. (Participant 3)

- At [previous school] all of our parties were at restaurants. Everybody paid their own way, you know, it was always like that. Here, all our big parties are at her house. She makes the food and everybody brings drinks . . . and some people bring food, too. But it’s that idea, we’re going to a home. We can sit down and relax. We’re going to sit on a couch. We can get someone to pick us up, if we want. We don’t have to go and be worried about, “Oh well, what was my tab.” It’s a home. Maybe some principals wouldn’t be okay with that, with people going to their home. I think some principals wouldn’t be okay with making their staff food. (Participant 1)

Principal Lopez’s tendency toward showing hospitality to her staff in such a personal manner may stem from her strong familial beliefs, as indicated by her repeated references to family during her interview. For example, she described having a family-like atmosphere at the school within the first three sentences of her interview. Likewise, when commenting that many of her staff members go above and beyond by volunteering for committees, she said, “So why is it they’re just volunteering? I think I have that sense of family . . . .I think that’s one thing.” Interestingly, when Principal Lopez did mention her hospitality, she also made a second reference to ‘feeding’ where the emphasis was not as literal as that of the teachers. Instead, she stated, “I have to feed them—academically, emotionally, spiritually. I have to feed them.” Her metaphorical word choice seems to suggest a multi-faceted understanding about the importance of nourishing and supporting people in order to build strong relationships.
Critical Incident 6: Giving Validation Through Public Recognition or Appreciation

Organizational citizenship behaviors at Laurel are inspired by Principal Lopez’s validation which manifests itself through recognition or appreciation. Specifically, teachers mentioned her public recognition of staff who worked above and beyond:

- She gave kudos to the teachers at our flag assemblies. She would announce, “And the teachers are working very hard to do tech integration.”
  (Participant 1)
- She’ll put on the bulletin, “Great seeing so and so on the weekend.”
  (Participant 1)

When a group of teachers met at Principal Lopez’s home to plan, she took a picture of them, “And she even posted it on Facebook just saying, ‘Look at these teachers, they’re so committed, they’re even meeting during the summer.’” (Participant 1)

Another interviewee commented that the third grade team consistently meets after school to plan, and Principal Lopez recognizes this because “during regular conversations she’ll bring up how hard they work. So, she gives them credit for that.” (Participant 7)

At other times, Principal Lopez’s validation is evident in less public expressions of appreciation. These private gestures and communications are also important to teachers. They feel validated by the different ways she demonstrates her appreciation for their work, as evidenced by the following examples:

- This week I had to cover a fourth grade class and leave everything I was doing and be a substitute. And at the end of the day, in comes the health assistant with one of those Venti iced lattes . . . just those little recognitions that she does all the time. I’ve seen her do that with other teachers. (Participant 1)
• She’s just a very appreciative person and she really gives you a lot of positive reinforcement. She writes me notes all the time. Like I have on my little board over there, she just writes me little notes. I just save them all, because they’re so nice. And when she appreciates something, she’ll jot it down like “Thank you so much.” (Participant 3)

• Every quarter she does something for us. . . . She opens her house, and we go and spend time together and we laugh, and it’s those little things that just feel good. You feel appreciated, and you feel like someone cares. (Participant 6)

Sometimes her appreciation is less tangible than the examples above, but it is still valued and credited as a motivating factor for OCB. One participant recalled a time when he had received a pink slip, and Principal Lopez took the time to talk to him about it, alleviate his stress, and express her desire to keep him on staff. He interpreted these behaviors as showing appreciation when he stated, “She really does appreciate and think about me, rather than just [treating me like] an employee who could be there 1 year and gone the next” (Participant 9).

The focus of feedback and its impact on instruction has been found to be an effective leadership practice (Cotton, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005; Murphy et al., 2007). However, in one interview where instructional feedback was mentioned, the participant equated it with feeling appreciated. She stated:

Sometimes she’ll send emails . . . like a brief evaluation of what she saw, and it’s a lot of positives, even if there’s something that she would like to see changed. She’ll say it kind of positively . . . in a way that doesn’t sound so much like “What do you think you’re doing? Don’t do this again.” It’s not like that. It’s more like,
“I notice this. Why don’t you make sure this is up to date.” . . . It’s never been overwhelmingly intimidating, and I feel there’s a level of appreciation for me. (Participant 2)

This comment underscores the affective impact of instructional feedback, which then contributes to the desire to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors.

Principal Lopez acknowledged that she uses recognition and appreciation as a means of valuing her staff. For example, she explained:

I want to congratulate them when they’re doing good, and I think they like that I acknowledge them. In the bulletin, I always make sure that I write thank you. That’s my number one thing. I put that at the very top, my thank you and congratulations.

In addition to providing recognition and appreciation to her staff, Principal Lopez takes it one step further by encouraging them to behave in a similar fashion and by creating opportunities for them to do so. She said:

And then I even teach my teachers to congratulate each other, so sometimes we’ll start off our meetings with a “Gotcha.” They thank somebody with a candy bar, and the next month the next person has to thank somebody with a candy bar. And, I get these bars called Hundred Grams or one of those corny things, but they like that. They look forward to it, and they really are thoughtful about who they are going to congratulate or thank.

Contingent rewards, recognition, or rewards that are performance based, have been identified as a behavior of effective principals of high achieving schools (Marzano et al., 2005; Podsakoff, Todor, & Skov, 1982). Consistent with the leadership literature
on this topic, Principal Lopez demonstrates the use of contingent rewards which, in turn, inspire citizenship behaviors among her staff.

**Critical Incident 7: Having a Vision**

The literature on effective leadership places great emphasis on having a vision (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Cotton, 2003; Leithwood et al., 2004; Louis, Leithwood et al., 2010; Marzano et al., 2005; Murphy et al., 2007). In reference to vision or direction-setting and its importance in relation to theories of motivation, Leithwood and colleagues (2004) stated, “According to such theory, people are motivated by goals which they find personally compelling, as well as challenging but achievable” (p. 24). Three teacher participant comments about Principal Lopez supported the connection between vision or direction-setting and the motivation to engage in organizational citizen behaviors:

- She’s also dedicated to the students, and I think that just has a way of rubbing off on people. She’s offering something that she knows is going to benefit the kids if we get trained on it and implement it correctly and that makes us want to do it. . . . I sense that she’s dedicated with a lot of the suggestions she gives, or the things we talk about as far as professional development. It’s for the good of the students. (Participant 2)

- She wanted this [the garden] and she had a vision and you know she’s excited about it. (Participant 3)

- It’s built into our community and to our school that we are there for one reason. And she makes it very, very clear. We are not there for adult comfort. We are there for students. (Participant 1)
About half-way into her interview, Principal Lopez underscored the nonnegotiable aspects of her leadership as a principal. Up until that point, much of what she described was centered on interpersonal or soft skills, but when asked if there was anything else she could think of that she does to inspire people to do more, she clarified and expanded by saying, “I mean, those are the soft kinds of things but the other stuff. It helps to have a clear vision.” After initially making this statement, she went back to describing interpersonal behaviors, but then caught herself and returned to the issue of vision and accountability by stating, “So going back again with the vision, I guess I do have to say that I try to ask the teachers to discipline themselves. They have to be accountable for what they do.” She further elaborated on her approach to vision by relating it to the change process suggesting that managing change is a necessary part of making a vision become reality. She turned around to a small bulletin board behind her desk and removed a chart that showed a framework for thinking about systems change (Knoster, Villa, & Thousand, 2000). This framework depicted the elements that are necessary for bringing about complex change, including developing a vision, building skills, offering incentives, identifying resources, and developing an action plan. According to this model, when all five elements are present, the result is change. If any of these are missing, the results are counterproductive to change. The model is shown in Figure 8.

Principal Lopez went on to explain:

If you have your vision clearly stated, and you give everybody the skills, and the resources, and I’m acknowledging them with incentives, we have a clear plan, then we’re going to have change if all these pieces are here . . . I look at that and I go, “You know what? I have to have all those pieces.”

A couple of days after the interview, the researcher received an email from Principal Lopez who had been pondering her answers, and she added:

That chart that I pulled out is huge for me. It constantly reminds me if the teachers are feeling safe to venture onto more new changes of their practice, it will account for academic growth. I hadn’t realized how important the chart was until we talked about it. I know that change must be well thought out in our era of educational reform.

Similar to the literature that identifies effective principals as those who possess and communicate a clear vision, it is evident from these data that having a principal who communicates the vision, and holds people responsible for their roles and functions in realizing the vision, is an important contributor to organizational citizenship at Laurel Elementary. It is also worth distinguishing how the principal and teachers differ in their interpretations. Ultimately, research participants understood that having a focused vision
benefitted students and their achievement. However, while the teachers spoke about
Principal Lopez’s vision as it related to students, Principal Lopez discussed vision as it
related to the teachers; her starting point for discussion of vision was around its impact on
teachers.

**Critical Incident 8: Thinking Like A Teacher**

Two participants used similar language to describe a characteristic of Principal
Lopez, which motivated them to engage in citizenship behaviors. They both stated that
she was a principal who thinks like a teacher:

- She’s a teacher principal. She still remembers what it’s like to be a teacher
  and you don’t always get that in an administrator . . . because I think she
  knows we’re overwhelmed with assessments or we’re overwhelmed in the
  classroom or what’s coming down; she allows us to take a step back
  sometimes like, “Okay, let’s really look at what we need to do and what we
  can take out.” She’s really good about doing that. (Participant 3)

- She always says, “I’m a principal, but I think like a teacher.” And in many
  little actions, I see that that is true. [For example] team collaboration time.
  It’s like she puts herself in our shoes, and she thinks, “Okay, what would I
  want if I were in the classroom and this was presented to me?” (Participant 7)

Their statements suggest that by thinking like a teacher, Principal Lopez shows empathy
for their workload, causing her to look for ways to either reduce the workload, or at least
make it more manageable. In fact, this empathetic behavior seems to have the opposite,
yet positive, effect of making the teachers want to work harder.
Principal Lopez did not make any direct references to thinking like a teacher. Her self-described emphasis on finding resources that “give everybody a helping hand” might originate from her own experiences as a teacher and remembering what it was like to need books or volunteers or supports.

**Major Trends**

A noticeable trend in the data occurred within the examples of organizational citizenship behaviors. Examples in the helping dimension greatly outnumbered any of the other dimensions. Upon examination of the critical incidents associated with the OCBs, it is not definitively clear that any specific critical incident led to this abundance of helping behaviors. Instead, examples of principal behavior that pertained to helping OCBs were widely distributed across the eight critical incidents.

It is possible that the nature of education as a helping profession brings to mind mainly instances of helping when people think of ways they go above and beyond. Additionally, most of the examples of OCB related to working beyond contract hours. The dimensions of sportsmanship, courtesy, and compliance seemed more difficult for the teachers to grasp, despite being provided with definitions and examples. As such, one might surmise that this finding may be attributable to either the helping nature of educators, or a lack of understanding and awareness of those behaviors that may be considered to be above and beyond.

Another major trend can be seen in the number of principal behavior examples that are dependent on the strength of a person’s interpersonal skills. The specific examples that comprise critical incidents numbers 1, 2, 5, and 6 are highly dependent on what the principal, herself, described as soft skills. Thirty-six of the 54 principal
behavior examples fall within these four critical incidents. It may further be argued that
critical incident number 8, thinking like a teacher, would also fall in the interpersonal
realm, as the examples that were shared show Principal Lopez’s empathetic nature.

Adding to the trend that highlights interpersonal skills was the language used by
every teacher participant, which emphasized the caring disposition of Principal Lopez:

- We work above and beyond because she loves us, she cares about us. She’s
  not like the mom. More like the aunt. A young aunt wanting to make sure
  that we’re happy and that we’re good when we’re with her. (Participant 1)
- You believe this person [Principal Lopez] actually cares, and I think that goes
  a long way with your staff if you’re a leader. (Participant 2)
- I love her. She’s great. She really cares about us, and it’s nice to be in that
  environment. (Participant 3)
- Because she’s nice and so flexible on other things. This means so much to
  someone. (Participant 4)
- I have found that her strength is relating to us on a personal level, which is
  motivating in itself. But she’s also kind and that’s really who she is. That’s
  who she is. (Participant 5)
- You feel appreciated and you feel like someone cares. (Participant 7)
- I feel that we’re closer than principal/teacher. . . . Even if you didn’t like her,
  you still get a sense that she cares about the job, the position, you.
  (Participant 9)

Participant 6 used the word supportive to describe Principal Lopez seven times
throughout her interview.
Finally, the notion of not wanting to “let her down” or wanting to “make her look good” was conspicuous and noteworthy, as half of the teacher participants referenced these sentiments:

- It’s almost like I don’t want to be a let-down for her. . . . I really don’t want to be a let-down. (Participant 2)
- Of course I want to give back in return. I don’t want to let her down. (Participant 9)
- I just remember vividly that I wanted to make sure she [Principal Lopez] looked successful. (Participant 3)
- When the superintendent comes through, everybody wants to be perfect . . . they want her to look good. (Participant 1)

Given the context of working in a benevolent environment that was created by Principal Lopez, these comments can be attributed to her exceptional interpersonal skills, which were consequently having a positive impact on OCBs.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to understand the lived experiences and the way people understand those experiences around the construct of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. This chapter described the data gathered from surveys and from semi-structured interviews around organizational citizenship and the principal behaviors that inspired OCB. The study took place at a school site that has demonstrated significant academic growth under the tenure of the current principal. The first section of this chapter explained the context of the district and school site. The second section described the results of the Organizational Citizenship Survey administered to the teachers at
Laurel Elementary School. Survey results determined that Laurel Elementary enjoyed especially high levels of OCB. The third section summarized the citizenship behaviors manifested at Laurel. These behaviors were disaggregated according to the five dimensions of organizational citizenship. Detailed examples of OCBs were provided within their respective dimension. The fourth section consisted of principal actions and behaviors that were identified by teachers as having motivated or inspired the OCBs. These principal behaviors were analyzed, categorized, and presented as critical incidents. Eight critical incidents leading to citizenship behavior emerged from the nine interviews. Each of these incidents was explained and supported with specific examples from participants. The final section consisted of a brief discussion on major trends.

The following chapter presents a discussion of primary findings organized according to the research questions. The chapter also addresses the implications of these findings for future research and practice, revisiting the significance of the research to both.
CHAPTER 5—DISCUSSION

The job description of a teacher fails to capture the true magnitude of the profession, especially as it relates to workload. A plethora of negative media attention on the work of teachers’ unions also serves to perpetuate fallacies about teacher workload. For example, comments from the general public regarding time on the job often indicate a misconception that teachers have it easy, because they do not seem to have an 8-hour work day, and they enjoy long vacation periods. In fact, the demands placed on schools to prepare all students to compete in an increasingly interconnected world and global economy has added to the complexity and workload of teachers. Nevertheless, the reality is that the extent to which a teacher goes above and beyond the job description remains a choice—their choice. Yet, choices can be influenced. As leaders of schools, principals can inspire a climate or culture of going above and beyond. The literature has defined such practices as Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). Specifically, OCB is defined as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p. 4).

Summary of Findings

This aim of this study was to ascertain the specific actions of a principal who inspires citizenship behaviors at her school. The context of this study was an urban elementary school that has experienced significant student achievement during the term of its current principal. Initially, the Organizational Citizenship Survey (DiPaola et al., 2005) was utilized to determine the level of OCB at Laurel Elementary. Results showed a very high level of OCB and, therefore, qualified the school for participation in the
study. Interview data were collected, analyzed, and reported using a phenomenological approach and its subset, the critical incident technique. Semi-structured interviews with eight teachers and Principal Lopez yielded numerous examples of citizenship behaviors which were then categorized according to the five dimensions of OCB: helping, sportsmanship, courtesy, civic virtue, and compliance. In conjunction with the examples of OCB, participants also gave specific examples of Principal Lopez’s actions and behaviors that contributed to these citizenship behaviors. From the examples emerged eight critical incidents that serve to summarize and explain the role of a principal in motivating or inspiring organizational citizenship.

The following primary research question directed this study: What is the principal’s role in developing, nurturing, and maintaining organizational citizenship behavior? In order to determine the answer to this question, two secondary questions served as the point of origin from which the interviews were derived:

1. Which specific leadership behaviors and actions promote organizational citizenship behaviors?
2. How do teachers perceive the principal’s role in developing OCB?

This chapter organizes the primary findings according to these secondary questions.

**Which Specific Leadership Behaviors and Actions Promote Organizational Citizenship Behaviors?**

Chapter 4 revealed eight critical incidents (CI) that emerged from the question, “What did the principal do to motivate or inspire you or colleagues to go above and beyond?”
1. Showing interest and concern for personal life of staff.

2. Giving encouragement.

3. Consistently being visible and accessible to staff.

4. Providing resources.

5. Inviting staff to her home.


7. Having a vision.

8. Thinking like a teacher.

The interpersonal leader. Interpersonal intelligence is “the ability to understand other people: what motivates them, how they work, how to work cooperatively with them” (Goleman, 2005, p. 39). Accordingly, critical incidents 1, 2, 5, 6, and 8 can be attributed to Principal Lopez’s strong interpersonal skills. A discussion pertaining to each of these critical incidents follows.

CI 1: Showing interest and concern for staff. Teachers sensed that Lopez was genuinely interested and cared about their personal well-being because she habitually asked about their family and remembered details about their personal life. Importantly, when teachers experienced challenges related to family issues, Principal Lopez showed compassion and did whatever was in her power to help alleviate the situation. She understood that family is a great motivator for her staff and also realized that these challenges would likely impact how they work. Consequently, she was empathetic to the personal needs of teachers as evidenced by her behaviors which included listening to their problems, being flexible with schedules, and taking the initiative to seek out individuals to make sure they were well. Lopez’s actions were in keeping with the notion that
principals of high-performing schools have an ability to foster positive interpersonal relationships through their emotional support and sensitivity (Cotton, 2003). Furthermore, the data suggest that a byproduct of these supportive behaviors was a sense of gratitude and a desire to reciprocate in the form of citizenship behaviors.

**CI 2: Giving encouragement.** Lopez also nurtured strong relationships through her encouragement, which she extended in a personal, generous, and caring manner. Moreover, the encouragement materialized within several aspects of daily school life, which demonstrated a keen awareness of everyone’s needs. When teachers spoke of instructional improvement, they did so within the sphere of Principal Lopez’s supportive disposition. As such, their emphasis was on her benevolence rather than on the instruction; yet her nonthreatening manner made teachers want to put in the extra effort to improve instructionally. In other words, Lopez’s reliance on encouragement as her approach toward instructional improvement created a more open school climate where the teachers focused on her supportive principal behavior and specifically noted that she was not a directive or restrictive principal (Hoy, Hannum, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998).

Adding to the atmosphere of encouragement, whenever challenges arose, Principal Lopez maintained an optimistic stance (Marzano et al., 2005) and made teachers feel that there would be a positive outcome. More importantly, they felt that she would be alongside them to find a solution. The generous aspect of her encouragement was evidenced by her frequent attempts to support teachers in advancing their career—even when they were reluctant to do so. Principal Lopez admitted that while she worked hard to make the great teachers want to remain at Laurel, she also felt a moral obligation to prepare them for bigger and better opportunities. In its totality, Lopez’s encouraging disposition was
consistent with developing people, a characteristic of effective leadership that involves forging strong relationships with people in order to leverage their strengths (Leithwood et al., 2004) and in this case, to also inspire OCB.

**CI 5: Inviting staff to her home.** Principal Lopez’s practice of inviting staff to her home and cooking for them seemed to have made a profound impression on teachers. The frequent invitations to her home, whether it was for a party or an instructional planning meeting, greatly added to the sense of family that was often described by participants. This seems to be a unique enough phenomenon that it is not generally discussed in the literature; however, the personal nature of this practice affirms the impact of effective leadership behaviors that showcase Principal Lopez’s interpersonal, collegial, and relationship building strengths (Cotton, 2003; Hoy et al., 1998, Marzano et al., 2005), which motivated teachers to regularly go above and beyond.

**CI 6: Giving recognition and appreciation.** Consistent with leadership behaviors such as providing contingent rewards and affirmation (Marzano et al., 2005), Principal Lopez frequently, but sincerely, extended recognition and appreciation to her staff. She remained aware of what was happening around the school, especially as it pertained to teachers who were performing extra tasks. Lopez gave both public and private recognition, which included writing what one participant described as “awesome” thank you notes, making announcements at the school morning meeting, recognizing staff on the weekly bulletin, and giving teachers small gifts of appreciation for their extra work.

**CI 8: Thinking like a teacher.** When teachers stated that Principal Lopez thinks like a teacher, they referred to her inclination toward empathizing with their workload and
wanting to lessen their burden. In describing the characteristics of Emotional Intelligence (EI), Goleman (2005) includes empathy as a key component of EI. He states, “The root of altruism lies in empathy, the ability to read emotions in others; lacking a sense of another’s need or despair, there is no caring” (Kindle location 282). Consequently, when Lopez asked herself, “What would I want if I were a teacher?” she was demonstrating to teachers that she cared about their work. She wanted to help streamline their workload, because she understood that an overwhelmed teacher cannot function to the best of their ability. Furthermore, if teachers feel supported by a principal who empathizes and attempts to ease the bureaucracy or disruptions, they have more time and are more inclined to work beyond the minimum requirements as evidenced by these teachers.

**The instructional leader.** The following discussion associated with the remaining critical incidents refers to behaviors that are most closely aligned to what the literature describes as instructional leadership (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Heck, 1992; W. F. Smith & Andrews, 1989).

**CI 3: Consistently being visible and accessible to staff.** W. F. Smith and Andrews (1989) describe the principal as a visible presence when she “interacts with staff and students in classrooms and hallways, attends grade-level and departmental meetings, and strikes up spontaneous conversations with teachers” (p. 18). Data from the teacher interviews indicated that they are inspired to engage in citizenship behaviors due, in part, to Principal Lopez’s visibility and accessibility, which occurs in the ways described by W. F. Smith and Andrews.
Teachers reported that she was not a principal who remained locked in her office. Furthermore, she used her visibility to be accessible to her staff by being among them during recess or lunch and engaging them in personal and professional conversations. Participants appreciated that Lopez showed interest in both teacher and student endeavors by dropping in on teacher work sessions and student activities. Similarly, Lopez mentioned her participation in student events, such as sitting in on the chess club to learn the game. Strongly associated with student achievement, and a common practice of Principal Lopez, was her regular presence in the classroom (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Heck, 1992; W. F. Smith & Andrews, 1989). These visits, followed by specific feedback, contributed to the teachers wanting to “do more.”

Accessibility was also a contributing factor to OCB. All teachers at Laurel had Principal Lopez’s cell phone number and, as indicated by one teacher and the principal, teachers felt free to and did contact her at all hours. Visibility and accessibility has consistently been found to positively impact student achievement (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Cotton, 2003; Heck, 1992; Leithwood et al., 2004; Marzano et al., 2005). The present study suggests that these actions also serve to motivate and inspire organizational citizenship behaviors.

**CI 4: Providing resources.** Instructional leaders who function as resource providers “marshal personal, building, district, and community resources to achieve the vision and goals of the school” (W. F. Smith & Andrews, 1989, p. 9). In the present study, being a resource provider also reinforced teachers’ willingness to engage in citizenship behaviors. Examples of this practice included Principal Lopez’s accommodation of schedules in order to facilitate teacher participation at IEP meetings.
during the school day. This is worth noting because, traditionally, IEP meetings are held before or after school hours. As such, the resource she was providing is one that teachers treasure—time. Similarly, when Lopez noticed that teachers were working hard on planning for technology integration after school, she offered to provide substitute coverage in order that they could continue their work during regular school hours. She also purchased materials for teachers who were engaged in professional learning that was not technically required at the time. Furthermore, Principal Lopez made it her business to help facilitate activities or events whether or not she initiated them. This included setting up a time and location for the teaching assistants to voluntarily run after school clubs, sending out reminders on their behalf, and helping to arrange field trips for these groups.

Principal Lopez realized that being a resource provider was an important role for her to fill. At a practical level, she mentioned that if teachers needed books, she would purchase them, because, according to the elements deemed necessary in managing complex change, a lack of materials leads to anxiety (see Figure 8, p. 119). In line with the literature that extends the definition of providing resources beyond materials (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Cotton, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005; W. F. Smith & Andrews, 1989), Lopez also understood that the people she hired were an important resource she was bringing into the school, as evidenced when she stated, “I have hired the right people, and I am surrounded by talent.” And in her pursuit for resources, she extended her reach beyond the school by requesting support from businesses, capitalizing on community and district resources, such as the senior police department, and applying for grants. In fact, she shared that in recent years she had obtained $200,000 in grant funding from four different sources.
Cotton (2003) stated that “principals of high-achieving schools are adept at finding and providing resources—financial, human, time, materials, and facilities—for all kinds of instruction-related needs” (p. 36). As a component of instructional leadership, being a resource provider clearly has a positive impact on student achievement and, as reflected in this study, Lopez’s role in this capacity also functioned as a factor for inspiring OCB.

CI 7: Having a vision. A plethora of research supports having and communicating a vision or direction as a crucial element for student achievement (Andrews & Soder, 1987; Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Cotton, 2003; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Leithwood et al., 2004; Marzano et al., 2005; W. F. Smith & Andrews, 1989). In the present study, this practice also emerged as an antecedent for citizenship behaviors by both teacher participants and Principal Lopez. Although teachers did not specifically articulate the principal’s vision, they nevertheless emphasized the clear tone that was pervasive at the school, underscoring that they were in the business of putting children first. It was evident in their responses that they deeply respected Principal Lopez’s dedication to students and her desire to provide them with a superior education. This message was most strongly stated by one teacher who said, “It’s built in to our community and to our school that we are there for one reason. And she makes it very, very clear. We are not there for adult comfort. We are there for students, for student success” (Participant 1).

Likewise, Principal Lopez made reference to the importance of having a vision and holding teachers accountable to that vision. She also related it to managing the change process, which she clearly values as an essential leadership role. This became
evident when she reached to her board and pulled a chart (Figure 8, p. 119) that showed the components for managing complex change. The first component was having a vision. Lopez (personal email communication, August 19, 2014) was emphatic about the importance of her role in ensuring that all of the elements on that chart were consistently present at Laurel, in order for her teachers to “feel safe to venture onto more new changes of their practice that would account for academic growth.”

Instructional leaders are those who judiciously allocate their time advancing the educational program in order to impact student achievement (W. F. Smith & Andrews, 1989). Academic achievement data for Laurel Elementary, along with interview data, suggest that Principal Lopez was an instructional leader whose practices not only improved students’ academic performance but also influenced employee performance as it related to OCB.

**The transformational leader.** As history repeatedly demonstrates, societal changes lead to the evolution of education. Not surprisingly, instructional leadership, the popular model of the 1980s, began to lose ground as the focus shifted to transformational leadership in the early 1990s (Hallinger, 2003; Leithwood, 1994). Hallinger (2003) described instructional leadership as “strong, directive leadership focused on curriculum and instruction from the principal” (p. 329) and Leithwood (1994) characterized it as control-oriented. While elements of instructional leadership emerged from the data, it is also clear that Principal Lopez was not perceived in the manner that instructional leadership is defined above. In fact, several of Lopez’s behaviors and actions fit within the transformational leadership model, which is described along six dimensions including building school vision and goals, offering individualized support, demonstrating high
performance expectations, rewards, providing intellectual stimulation, and modeling (Hallinger, 2003; Leithwood, 1994; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990). With respect to building a school vision and goals, this behavior emerged as a critical incident and was most strongly exemplified by her strong commitment to students and the implicit message that the adults are, first and foremost, there for the students.

Principal Lopez demonstrated particular efficacy in providing individualized support to teachers. One way she accomplished this was by maintaining high visibility and accessibility (CI 3). Teachers did not have to go in search of Lopez if they needed something, because she was regularly present throughout the day. Another means of providing individualized support stemmed from Lopez’s caring disposition. Her genuine interest and concern for her staff (CI 1) meant that she regularly engaged in both personal and professional conversations with teachers, which gave her the opportunity to find out when and if they required support. Similarly, her caring nature made teachers feel comfortable enough to openly communicate with her when they were faced with challenging situations and needed her support.

Teachers at Laurel were frequently rewarded by Lopez, although most rewards were not tangible. Rather, she seemed to emphasize rewards from the heart in the form of encouragement (CI 2) that made teachers feel valued, as well as giving recognition and appreciation (CI 6). The specificity of her thank you cards seemed to make a great impression, and her words of encouragement made teachers feel highly regarded. There was also a sense that the regular invitations to Lopez’s home (CI 5), for both social and professional events, were regarded as a reward by the teachers. It made teachers feel special that she so freely opened her home to them.
Principal Lopez modeled her belief system in several ways. Her behavior reflected a belief about the importance of supporting people emotionally; therefore, acknowledgment was a practice that she regularly demonstrated. She also viewed these acknowledgments, provided through active encouragement (CI 2), appreciation, and recognition (CI 6), as serving a dual purpose. First, they were delivered because they were well-deserved. Second, these actions modeled behaviors she hoped would inspire teachers to do likewise, engaging with each other in a similar supportive fashion.

Another value, strongly espoused by Lopez, was the belief that adults who work in schools should place students’ needs first. She modeled this belief routinely as she remained highly visible and accessible (CI 3). Finally, she modeled her conviction that “we are all human beings, and we all have to pitch in” when she would engage in activities that might be considered unconventional for a principal, such as cleaning up, delivering books, and shoveling dirt.

The transformational leadership dimensions of providing intellectual stimulation and demonstrating high expectations were reported to a lesser extent across the interviews, but this may be explained by participants’ focus on Principal Lopez’s interpersonal skills. References to these dimensions were not completely absent, but they were also not repeated or emphasized enough to be considered critical incidents. As defined, providing intellectual stimulation means that the leader behaves in a way that “challenges staff to reexamine some of the assumptions about their work and to rethink how it can be performed” (Leithwood, 1994, p. 507). Principal Lopez briefly alluded to this type of behavior in reference to the schools writing scores which were low and required “revisiting.” If one is to interpret her support of teachers to follow their personal
interests for professional development as an indicator of intellectual stimulation, then Principal Lopez can further be credited for this dimension of transformational leadership. Finally, the gains in academic achievement realized under her leadership provide sound evidence that high expectations exist at Laurel Elementary. In fact, Lopez succinctly touched on her expectations when she stated that she holds teachers accountable and expects them to discipline themselves.

Despite the prevalence of OCB inspiring examples that emphasized Principal Lopez’s interpersonal strength, the evidence also spanned both instructional and transformational leadership styles. This finding is notable, because it suggests that an integrated style of leadership, conceived of strong relational skills, is likely to inspire teachers to go above and beyond.

**How Do Teachers Perceive the Principal’s Role in Developing OCB?**

Overall, there was a noticeable paucity of discussion on the part of teachers, and the principal at Laurel related to specific leadership practices that have been found to be predictors of OCB and student achievement, such as academic press, high expectations, collaboration, visioning, and shared decision-making (Cotton, 2003; DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Leithwood et al., 2004; Marzano et al., 2005). And yet, the significant, continuous growth in achievement, across Principal Lopez’s tenure (see Figure 5, p. 83), suggests a lack of discussion around these practices does not tell the full story. In fact, given these achievement data, it is likely that the aforementioned practices were present at the school. Further, because these practices were built upon strong relationships and delivered with such a high degree of benevolence, caring, and empathy, it was these attributes that greatly resonated with the
teachers and made them amenable toward citizenship behaviors. Teachers perceived her role in developing OCB primarily through her relational skills, which indirectly influenced other leadership practices that are pervasive in the literature. High levels of trust and organizational justice derive from strong interpersonal skills and are therefore discussed in the following sections.

**Trust.** Where trust is lacking between leaders and followers, so is the will to perform beyond minimum requirements. “Trustworthy leadership is at the heart of productive schools” (Tschannen-Moran, 2014, Kindle location 636), and citizenship behavior supports high degrees of productivity. Laurel Elementary enjoys a robust culture of OCB built on leadership behaviors that are linked to a high degree of trust between teachers and Principal Lopez.

Benevolence, honesty, openness, reliability, and competence have been identified as five facets of trust (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tschannen-Moran, 2014). Critical incidents numbers 1, 2, 5, 6, and 8 demonstrated Lopez’s interpersonal strengths, and they also highlighted these five characteristics.

**Benevolence.** Benevolence is defined as “a sense of the care or benevolence of another: the confidence that one’s well-being or something one cares about will be protected and not harmed by the person in whom one has placed one’s trust” (Tschannen-Moran, 2014, Kindle location 732). A preponderance of the examples that inspired OCB demonstrated that Principal Lopez inherently operates from a place of benevolence. This was especially evident by the number of teachers who commented on her interest in their personal lives, families, and well-being. Critical Incident 2, giving encouragement, and CI 6, giving recognition and appreciation, also contained myriad
examples of occasions when Lopez’s caring nature materialized. Additionally, Principal Lopez referred to her behaviors that she thought “made the teachers feel safe” and her desire to “protect her staff from the ugliness.” Finally, there was compelling evidence of benevolence found in the number of references that teachers made about feeling cared for by Lopez and how much that meant to them.

**Honesty.** Honesty concerns a person’s character, integrity, and authenticity (Tschannen-Moran, 2014). According to the teachers, Principal Lopez was an authentic personality in several ways. They appreciated the way that she listened to them with genuine interest, such as when she took the time to stop and look them in the eye when they engaged in conversation. Her attention to detail also served to support her authenticity, as demonstrated by her specific feedback, especially when she was showing appreciation for their good work. Teachers noted that her thank you notes did not feel contrived; in fact, one teacher saved them on her board, while another referred to them as “awesome,” “genuine,” and “specific.” Another aspect of honesty Principal Lopez demonstrated was her willingness to accept responsibility when something went wrong by reflecting on her clarity of communication and her efforts to protect her staff from outside disruptions.

**Openness.** This facet of trust refers to having an open exchange of communication which was exhibited most powerfully in the comfort level teachers described in their open communications with Principal Lopez. Several of her OCB inspiring behaviors arose from her flexibility when teachers were experiencing challenging situations. The fact that they felt so comfortable in having open communication with her about their problems, and trusting that she would help them as a
result, was reflective of Principal Lopez’s openness with them. One can argue that if she were not consistently forthcoming in her communication, they would be guarded in theirs, as well.

**Reliability.** Reliability combines a sense of predictability with caring and competence (Tschannen-Moran, 2014). Participants shared many examples across all critical incidents that served to support Principal Lopez’s reliability. As previously discussed, Lopez exhibits a consistently caring nature. As Participant 9 noted, “Even if you didn’t like her, you still get a sense that she cares about the job, the position, and you.” Her praise and/or encouragement was also consistent, as another participant commented that Lopez made it a point to notice and praise even those teachers who may not have regularly gone above and beyond. Lopez’s visibility and accessibility contributed to her reliability, because teachers knew that she was readily available to support them.

**Competence.** In referring to a study on high-trust and low-trust schools, Tschannen-Moran (2014) stated that “skills related to competence included setting high standards, pressing for results, solving problems, resolving conflict, working hard, and setting an example (Kindle location 959). Although the teacher interview data contained only a few direct references to the first two skills, setting high standards and pressing for results, the schools’ positive achievement data arguably demonstrates the presence of these behaviors at Laurel. In her interview, Lopez communicated that she expects teachers to discipline themselves and be accountable for what they do, but her approach to accountability emerged through her interpersonal nature, looking for moments to congratulate teachers for a job well done. It appeared that she fostered accountability for
results and high standards through positive reinforcement. Setting an example and working hard were evident when Principal Lopez rolled up her sleeves along with her staff, actively participating in less glamorous tasks, such as shoveling dirt in the garden or mopping up spills on movie night. Finally, the fact that teachers call or text her at all hours demonstrates that they rely upon her competence as an educator and seek her advice and counsel around the clock.

The literature on trust and its impact on leader/follower relationships and employee performance is bountiful (Brower et al., 2009; Butler, 1991; Deluga, 1995; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Gabarro, 1978; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tschannen-Moran, 2000, 2004, 2009, 2014; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). This study substantiates the impact of trust on organizational citizenship behaviors as demonstrated by the critical incidents leading to OCB and the specific examples associated with each CI. Principal Lopez embodied the five facets of trust; consequently teachers showed strong tendencies to go above and beyond. Tschannen-Moran (2014) stated, “Trust binds leaders to followers. Without that bond, a manager can enforce minimum compliance with contract specifications and job description, but that will not lead a team to greatness” (Kindle location 672). Given the academic achievement of Laurel Elementary (Figure 5, p. 83) under Principal Lopez’s tenure, it is evident that trust has led this team toward greatness.

Organizational justice. Perceived fairness, justice, and rewards by leaders impact organizational citizenship behaviors (Burns & DiPaola, 2013; Walumbwa et al., 2008). Specifically, the literature distinguishes between procedural and distributive justice, and studies have shown that the former is more strongly correlated to OCB
In the current study, justice emerged as a compelling factor, because critical incidents and the associated examples of Principal Lopez’s behavior suggest that procedural justice was a contributing factor to citizenship behaviors at Laurel Elementary. Procedural justice reflects an environment in which employees perceive that the processes by which decisions are made are fair. In his study on fairness perceptions and employee citizenship, Moorman (1991) further separated procedural justice into two categories: formal procedures and interactional justice. Principal Lopez’s actions strongly reflect the latter category, and these seemed to resonate with teachers who were inspired to go above and beyond. Moorman described interactional justice as that which includes more relational behaviors on the part of the supervisor, such as showing concern for employee rights, honesty, kindness and consideration, and timely feedback. In fact, these behaviors were previously described at length and are highly reflective of Principal Lopez’s interpersonal skills and her actions that likely built a high level of trust. Furthermore, the current study supports Moorman’s findings that procedural justice and, more specifically, interactional justice is a strong contributor to citizenship behaviors. Principal Lopez’s actions and behaviors as described by teacher participants clearly depicted an interactional form of justice, resulting in reciprocity by way of OCB.

**Implications for Practice**

This study endeavored to capture the phenomenological essence of how teachers at an achieving urban school perceived their principal to have inspired organizational citizenship behaviors. Day in and day out, teachers work within a helping profession that requires, at minimum, hard work, and, at most, a desire to give 150%. Their experiences
with and perceptions of their leader impact the extent to which teachers are willing to
go above and beyond. At Laurel Elementary, it was evident that, throughout
Principal Lopez’s tenure, her interpersonal skills, trustworthiness, and fairness have
permeated all aspects of the instructional program and are the essence of her role as one
who successfully inspires and motivates high levels organizational citizenship behavior.

Measuring One’s Strengths and Needs

This study suggests that educational leaders who desire to motivate a culture of
OCB might consider reflecting upon their interpersonal skills and how these impact the
level of trust they have established with teachers, as well as their demonstration of
fairness. One way a school leader might begin his journey might be by taking an
Emotional Intelligence survey. Such a tool may provide the principal with an objective
analysis of his strengths and areas of need. Similarly, a leadership inventory or
360-degree feedback instrument might also yield important perceptions about his
interpersonal skills from the perspective of employees. These tools would be a useful
starting point for the principal, but would not suffice. As quantitative measures, the
picture that they capture remains limited to the questions that were written on paper.
Consequently, a principal might contextualize her interpersonal strengths,
trustworthiness, and fairness by gathering qualitative information.

It is highly unlikely that a principal would be able to qualitatively measure how
her employees perceive her trustworthiness and fairness by simply asking them for
feedback. Such actions, honorable as they may be, would not guarantee an honest and
thoughtful assessment from every employee. Thus, at a practical level, it becomes the
principal’s job to self-assess through other means, such as engaging in daily written reflection. Such reflection might include asking oneself:

1. Who did I interact with today? What was the interaction about?
2. How many interactions were of a personal nature? What did I learn about the person?
3. How many interactions were of a professional nature? Was my assistance required? If so, how was I able to assist?
4. How much time did I spend in my office today?
5. When I was out of my office, what was I doing?
6. How did I show appreciation or encourage someone today?
7. Was I wrong about something? How did I handle it?
8. Did I have a difficult conversation? What approach did I take, and what was the outcome? What might I have done differently?

Findings from the current study related to the positive relationship between interactional justice, and OCB also support these activities because, as Moorman (1991) suggests, the behaviors associated with interactional justice emerge from a strong interpersonal base. Therefore, these reflective practices would also serve to inform the principal of his approach to fairness.

**Trust**

Building trusting relationships at the school site is the responsibility of the school leader. As evidenced by the five facets of trust (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tschannen-Moran, 2014), interpersonal skills contribute to trust building, but
Tschannen-Moran (2014) suggests that it is also useful to consider the five functions of instructional leaders: visioning, modeling, coaching, managing, and mediating.

As part of the reflective process, a principal might consider asking himself the following questions:

**Visioning.** Have I been forthcoming with my personal vision and worked to developed and nurture a collective vision? In the current study, the teachers indicated clarity of purpose for their daily work, which inspired them to work harder.

**Modeling.** Am I setting the example? Do I walk my talk? Principal Lopez was unequivocally egalitarian when it came to rolling up her sleeves to serve the interests of students, even if it meant literally getting her hands dirty.

**Coaching.** Am I “creating circumstances that foster a greater sense of purpose and competence” among my teachers (Tschannen-Moran, 2014, Kindle location 4473)? Am doing so with the right amount of pressure? Principal Lopez’s propensity for giving encouragement, recognition, and appreciation served to make her a trustworthy coach who inspired teachers to perform above and beyond.

**Managing.** Am I being a micromanager? Am I undermanaging to avoid uncomfortable situations? One example of Principal Lopez’s management skills emerged from her belief that she had a moral obligation to find the strengths in teachers and help them use those strengths to further their careers. By virtue of this belief, Lopez knew that she could not be a micromanager and that she had to delegate control in order to properly mentor teachers.

**Mediating.** How do I handle conflict? Tschannen-Moran (2014) states that “trustworthy school leaders not only are skillful themselves in the use of conflict
management strategies but also create the structures and provide the training for others to improve their skills in this realm as well” (Kindle location 4520). In the present study, Lopez’s skill at conflict resolution did not emerge among the examples of behaviors that inspire OCB. On the other hand, the fact that conflict was not mentioned may indicate that Principal Lopez is adept at mediating conflict.

The implications of this study suggest deep consideration of human behavior and qualities that some might argue are inherent, while others might argue can be developed. Findings from this study do not necessarily support either side of the argument, nor do they suggest that all principals adopt the behaviors and qualities manifest in Principal Lopez’s leadership practice. This wholesale adoption would be inauthentic and would likely fail to yield higher instances of organizational citizenship behaviors. Rather, the suggestions offered here may serve to remind the reader of those abilities that reside within, so that he or she can authentically leverage those capacities and benefit their school by inspiring citizenship behaviors among teachers.

**Leadership Preparation**

The results of this study indicate that future school leaders would benefit from leadership preparation programs that underscore relationship building and interpersonal development. Principal Lopez demonstrated the balance that was necessary to improve academic achievement, while nurturing the types of relationships that inspired her staff to routinely engage in OCB. Aspiring administrators should be well aware of the impact that a climate of trust and fairness has on extra role behaviors and how they can cultivate such an environment. Although reading about these concepts is important, experiencing them would make a lasting impression. Ideally, leadership programs would specifically
seek out principals with strong interpersonal skills and a proven record of academic achievement so that students could shadow these leaders and gain a first-hand understanding of the power of great relationships. Yet another meaningful experience would be for programs to invite teachers who work under such leaders to share how they perceive their principal and how that perception impacts their work. Finally, taking steps to be reflective and self-aware of interpersonal skills need not wait until one becomes a school administrator; therefore, leadership programs should also have students engage in activities such as the ones described earlier in this section.

**Implications for Future Research**

Studies on organizational citizenship behavior within the context of school settings are relatively new to the field. Furthermore, qualitative studies, such as the present one, are few and far between, even outside the school context. As a result, this study has served to advance the conversation around this construct, especially as it relates to a leader’s influence on OCB. In fact, it may be likened to an appetizer before one enjoys a hearty meal, as there is a feast of knowledge to be learned about leadership’s influence on OCB in schools.

Organizational citizenship behavior’s contribution to the overall efficiency of organizations has been repeatedly established (Podsakoff et al., 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Walz & Niehoff, 1996), as has its positive effects on student achievement (Burns & DiPaola, 2013; DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a). Attitudinal dispositions (Organ & Ryan, 1995), job satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983), trust (Tschannen-Moran, 2004), fairness (Moorman, 1991; Organ & Moorman, 1993), and climate (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001) have been examined as
predictors of OCB; but where the influence of leaders is concerned, understandings related to specificity of action is lacking. Although this study took steps toward attaining and identifying specific actions and behaviors of OCB-inspiring principals, its scope was limited to one principal in one school. Therefore, there is a need for more qualitative research that expands the number of schools under study. This would allow for a larger collection of detailed examples, which would enable an expanded analysis of data and might reveal additional trends. For example, a larger study may allow more opportunities for analysis between the citizenship behaviors of teachers and the corresponding action of the principal. In other words, is there a significant relationship between the dimension of citizenship behaviors exhibited by teachers and the specific actions of the leader?

The current study revealed that teachers’ perceptions of the role of a principal who inspires OCB are derived from the leader’s interpersonal skills and, by extension, trust and fairness. The findings’ emphases on interpersonal skills also give rise to the following questions:

1. Does a leader’s level of Emotional Intelligence impact a leader’s ability to influence OCB?

2. What is the role of Emotional Intelligence and a leader’s capacity to inspire OCB?

3. How do distrustful and pessimistic teachers perceive the role of a collegial principal in motivating OCB?

4. Is a principal with strong interpersonal skills able to inspire OCB among distrustful and pessimistic teachers? If so, to what degree?
5. Can a principal who makes a concerted effort to develop his interpersonal skills concurrently inspire higher levels of OCB?

Organizational citizenship behavior in a school setting is a somewhat newly developing area of study, and it is an important one. The nature of teaching requires that teachers not bind themselves to a job description or contract. Organizational citizenship behavior improves the effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity of an organization, and in the context of schools, it makes a positive impact on student achievement. At a more practical level, funding for the educational system is at the mercy of the economy, which is fickle and often unpredictable. Consequently, when the economy takes a downward turn, principals find themselves looking within the organization and hoping that people will be able to do more with less. For all of these reasons, there should be a call for continued understanding about OCB and the explicit role of the principal.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to capture the essence of teachers’ perceptions about principal actions and behaviors that inspire organizational citizenship behavior. Eight critical incidents that contributed to teachers’ motivation to engage in citizenship behaviors emerged from the data. These incidents were mainly characterized by interpersonal behaviors although, given the achievement gains made under Principal Lopez, it is clear that there were other leadership dynamics at play.

Teaching is a profession wrought with challenges, expectations, and public pressure for performance. It is also a profession that has very clear boundaries, which are set by a job description, a union contract, or a combination of both. In order to keep up with the demands of educating children with an ever changing 21st century context, it is
in the best interest of principals to find ways to motivate or inspire teachers to want to work beyond those boundaries. This study presented the story of one school and one administrator with the heart to inspire teachers to go above and beyond. Continued research should be considered essential as it may serve to help other administrators realize their own potential for encouraging a school culture of organizational citizenship behavior.
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APPENDIX A

Teacher Informed Consent

San Diego State University
Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Schools: The Principal’s Influence
Consent to Act as a Research Subject: Teacher

Dear teacher,

You are being invited to participate in a study of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) in schools. Organizational citizenship behavior refers to those actions that go above and beyond the job description. The purpose of this research is to investigate how elementary school principals inspire staff to go above and beyond. Research has shown that organizations with high levels of OCB function more efficiently and effectively. This study will advance awareness and understanding of the specific actions and/or behaviors that serve as the foundation for leaders to motivate school staff to engage in behaviors that are considered above and beyond.

The researcher is Ms. Eileen Moreno, an Educational Leadership doctoral student at San Diego State University. She has been an educator for over 20 years, and currently serves as Director of Language Arts and Social Studies at Santee School District. The faculty supervisor for this study is Cynthia L. Uline, Ph.D. Dr. Uline is a professor of educational leadership at San Diego State University. Dr. Uline co-directs San Diego State’s doctoral program in Educational Leadership and serves as Executive Director of the National Center for the 21st Century Schoolhouse.

The research will be comprised of interviews with several staff members at your school site. You will be asked to contribute to this study by participating in an individual interview, lasting approximately one hour. The interview will take place at a time and location that is convenient to you. Interviews will be audio taped to ensure the accuracy of your responses. Handwritten notes will be taken for subjects who choose not to be audio taped. Examples of questions include:

1. **Think of a time when the principal has done something or behaved in a way that you feel motivated or inspired someone to go above and beyond.**
2. **Describe in detail what the person(s) were inspired or motivated to do that went above and beyond.**
3. **How do you have knowledge of this event?**
4. **Which action or behavior on behalf of the principal inspired the person/people to go above and beyond?**
5. **How do you have knowledge of this event?**
6. **When did this happen?**

A gift card in the amount of $20 will be offered as compensation for interview participants in this study. You can choose not to answer the questions that you are
uncomfortable with answering. You will be able to skip questions that cause discomfort yet continue with participation.

Your participation is voluntary and there is no penalty if you choose not to participate or choose to discontinue participation. Your choice of whether or not to participate will not influence your future relations with San Diego State University. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to stop your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are allowed. At any time you may communicate your decision to discontinue participation via email Eileen.moreno@santeesd.net or phone (619)

The goals of the study are such that there is minimal risk to participants (less than or equal to that encountered in daily life at school). Specifically, the objective of the study is to present data about actions that contribute to OCB, rather than those which negate it. Should the participant fear that they stated a critique about what the principal should have done, or what they did wrong, such data would be excluded as it would automatically fail to meet the criteria of a relevant incident for this study.

The researcher does not foresee any other discomforts or risks associated with this data collection and there are no experimental variables.

All names in work published by the researcher will be pseudonyms and your name will be coded to match the data collected. Interviews will be audio taped and transcribed. If you choose not to be audio taped, you can still participate in the study and handwritten notes will be taken. Quotes from the interviews may be used for publication of findings but no participant will be identified by name. Your participation will remain confidential (this means that we will conceal your identity and only codes will be used on interview forms and notes we take) except as required by law. The researcher does not believe there are any conflicts of interest, and the participant does not waive any legal right by participating in this study.

You may contact the researcher with questions by email (eileen.moreno@santeesd.net) or phone (619) 594-6622; email: irb@mail.sdsu.edu).

The San Diego State University Institutional Review Board has approved this consent form, as signified by the Boards’ stamps. The consent form must be reviewed annually and expires on the date indicated on the stamps.

Your signature below indicates that you have read the information in this document and have had a chance to ask any questions you have about the study. Your signature also
indicates that you agree to be in the study and have been told that you can change your mind and withdraw your consent to participate at any time. Your signature also indicates that you consent to the use of audiotapes and understand how the tapes will be used for this study. You have been given a copy of this consent form. You have been told that by signing this consent form you are not giving up any of your legal rights.

Name of Participant (print)__________________ Gr./Position____________________

_________________________________               _______________
Signature of Participant                                           Date
APPENDIX B

Principal Informed Consent

San Diego State University
Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Schools: The Principal’s Influence
Consent to Act as a Research Subject: Principal

Dear principal,

You are being invited to participate in a study of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) in schools. Organizational citizenship behavior refers to those actions that go above and beyond the job description. The purpose of this research is to investigate how elementary school principals inspire staff to go above and beyond. Research has shown that organizations with high levels of OCB function more efficiently and effectively. This study will advance awareness and understanding of the specific actions and/or behaviors that serve as the foundation for leaders to motivate school staff to engage in behaviors that are considered above and beyond.

The researcher is Ms. Eileen Moreno, an Educational Leadership doctoral student at San Diego State University. She has been an educator for over 20 years, and currently serves as Director of Language Arts and Social Studies at Santee School District. The faculty supervisor for this study is Cynthia L. Uline, Ph.D. Dr. Uline is a professor of educational leadership at San Diego State University. Dr. Uline co-directs San Diego State’s doctoral program in Educational Leadership and serves as Executive Director of the National Center for the 21st Century Schoolhouse.

The research will be comprised of interviews with several staff members at your school site. You will be asked to contribute to this study by participating in an individual interview, lasting approximately one hour. The interview will take place at a time and location that is convenient to you. Interviews will be audio taped to ensure the accuracy of your responses. Handwritten notes will be taken for subjects who choose not to be audio taped. Examples of questions include:

1. Think of a time when you have done something or behaved in a way that you feel motivated or inspired someone to go above and beyond.
2. Describe in detail what that person(s) were inspired or motivated to do that went above and beyond.
3. How do you have knowledge of this event?
4. Which of your actions or behaviors do you believe inspired the person/people to go above and beyond?
5. When did this happen?

A gift card in the amount of $20 will be offered as compensation for interview participants in this study. You can choose not to answer the questions that you are
uncomfortable with answering. You will be able to skip questions that cause discomfort yet continue with participation.

Your participation is voluntary and there is no penalty if you choose not to participate or choose to discontinue participation. Your choice of whether or not to participate will not influence your future relations with San Diego State University. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to stop your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are allowed. You may communicate your decision to discontinue participation via email Eileen.moreno@santeesd.net or phone (619)

The goals of the study are such that there is minimal risk to participants (less than or equal to that encountered in daily life at school). Specifically, the objective of the study is to present data about actions that contribute to OCB, rather than those which negate it. Should you feel that you have stated a critique about your actions or behaviors, such data would be excluded as it would automatically fail to meet the criteria of a relevant incident for this study.

The researcher does not foresee any other discomforts or risks associated with this data collection and there are no experimental variables.

All names in work published by the researcher will be pseudonyms and your name will be coded to match the data collected. Interviews will be audio taped and transcribed. If you choose not to be audio taped, you can still participate in the study and handwritten notes will be taken. Quotes from the interviews may be used for publication of findings but no participant will be identified by name. Your participation will remain confidential (this means that we will conceal your identity and only codes will be used on interview forms and notes we take) except as required by law. The researcher does not believe there are any conflicts of interest, and the participant does not waive any legal right by participating in this study.

You may contact the researcher with questions by email (eileen.moreno@santeesd.net) or phone (619)

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the Division of Research Affairs at San Diego State University (telephone: (619) 594-6622; email: irb@mail.sdsu.edu).

The San Diego State University Institutional Review Board has approved this consent form, as signified by the Boards’ stamps. The consent form must be reviewed annually and expires on the date indicated on the stamps.

Your signature below indicates that you have read the information in this document and have had a chance to ask any questions you have about the study. Your signature also
indicates that you agree to be in the study and have been told that you can change your mind and withdraw your consent to participate at any time. Your signature also indicates that you consent to the use of audiotapes and understand how the tapes will be used for this study. You have been given a copy of this consent form. You have been told that by signing this consent form you are not giving up any of your legal rights.

Name of Participant (please print)__________________________________________

_________________________________________             ____________________
Signature of Participant Date
Interview Guide: Teacher

Thank you for agreeing to meet with me. My name is Eileen Moreno and I am the primary (and only) investigator for this study.

I have provided you with the consent form prior to this meeting. Do you have any questions or concerns regarding consent?

Do you agree to participate in this study? (Have participant sign consent form)
And do you agree to be recorded?
If yes, proceed with interview
If no, advise participant, “Throughout the interview I will be taking notes”

As you know, the purpose of my research is to investigate the actions or behaviors of a principal that inspire organizational citizenship behaviors. In this case, we are talking about your current principal. Before we begin, I’d like to review the Participant Information Letter and answer any questions you might have about organizational citizenship behavior.

(Define OCB and the categories of OCB using the handout. Review the examples)
When you think of examples, don’t worry if you are not sure whether or not it is Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Just go ahead and share whatever it is that you feel falls into the category. You don’t have to do the work of categorizing your examples for me. I am just providing you with examples for your reference.

(Research questions begin here)
- Think of a time when the principal has done something or behaved in a way that you feel motivated or inspired someone to engage in citizenship behaviors.
- Describe in detail what the person(s) were inspired or motivated to do.
- How do you have knowledge of this event?
- Which action or behavior on behalf of the principal inspired the person/people to engage in citizenship behaviors?
- How do you have knowledge of this event?
- When did this happen?

Thank you very much for participating in this study. Should you have any other questions, comments, concerns, or clarifications please feel free to contact me (provide my business card) anytime.
Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Helping

Behaviors aimed at helping specific persons

- Tutoring a child before/after school
- Assisting a family in need
- Assisting colleagues when they ask for help.

Sportsmanship

Rolling with the punches even when things get challenging
Willingness to tolerate less than ideal circumstances without complaining to the point that it negatively impacts the organization.

- Class size is larger than it should be but teacher makes the best of it
- There is a shortage of supplies but the teacher resolves it
- Being asked to take on additional responsibilities
- Being asked to take “challenging” students
- Complying with last minute requests

Courtesy

Actions that help to prevent work-related problems

- Teacher A seeks out Teacher B to let them know how to handle a challenging student.
- Teacher A notices that Teacher B is having difficulty with a child or parent and offers to assist.
- Teacher A notices that Teacher B is running late so they offer to watch the class.
- Giving advance notice of changes in schedules/avoiding last minute changes
Civic Virtue

Actively participating in the functioning and decision-making of the organization
- Volunteering to serve on committees (SSC, PTA, etc)
- Voluntarily attending Special Events beyond the contract time
- Organizing Clubs

Conscientious

Doing things that are right and proper, more for the sake of the system than for a specific person.
- Excellent attendance
- Punctuality: Arriving to work and meetings on time
- Consistently turning things in on time
- Refrain from wasting time, being EXTRA productive
APPENDIX D

Interview Guide: Principal

Thank you for agreeing to meet with me. My name is Eileen Moreno and I am the primary (and only) investigator for this study.

I have provided you with the consent form prior to this meeting. Do you have any questions or concerns regarding consent?

Do you agree to participate in this study? (Have participant sign consent form)
And do you agree to be recorded?
If yes, proceed with interview
If no, advise participant, “Throughout the interview I will be taking notes”

As you know, the purpose of my research is to investigate the actions or behaviors of a principal that inspire organizational citizenship behaviors. Before we begin, I’d like to review the Participant Information Letter and answer any questions you might have about organizational citizenship behavior.

(Research questions begin here)
- Think of a time when you have done something or behaved in a way that you feel motivated or inspired someone to engage in citizenship behaviors.
- Describe in detail what the person(s) were inspired or motivated to do.
- How do you have knowledge of what this person(s) did?
- Which of your actions or behaviors do you think inspired the person/people to engage in citizenship behaviors?
- When did this happen?

Thank you very much for participating in this study. Should you have any other questions, comments, concerns, or clarifications please feel free to contact me (provide my business card) anytime.
APPENDIX E

Superintendent Recruitment Letter

Dear Dr. Escobedo,

Two schools within your district, Lauderbach and Otay, have been selected to participate in a study being conducted by Ms. Eileen Moreno, an Educational Leadership doctoral student at San Diego State University. As high performing and award winning urban schools, they present a great opportunity to investigate an aspect of staff behaviors that have been shown to contribute to organizational effectiveness. Specifically, this is a study on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) which refers to those actions that go above and beyond the job description.

Research has shown that leadership impacts OCB, however the majority of this research has been quantitative. The purpose of this research is to investigate how elementary school principals inspire Organizational Citizenship Behavior by gathering specific (qualitative) incidents of OCB and their relationship to the principal’s actions and/or behaviors. Such a study will advance awareness and understanding of the specific actions and/or behaviors that serve as the foundations for leaders to motivate school staff to engage in behaviors that are considered above and beyond.

In order to establish eligibility, the staff at each school will be asked to answer a questionnaire that will be used to calculate the overall level of organizational citizenship behavior. If the scores qualify each school for the study, selected staff members at both sites will be asked to engage in individual interviews that will take between 45-60 minutes. The interviews can occur at places and times that are most convenient for each participant. Participants will include at two teachers per grade level (or 14 total teachers), two credentialed support staff, the vice principal, and principal. All participation will be confidential, meaning that names will not appear on interviews, notes, or the final product.

Please contact me via email at, eileen.moreno@santeesd.net if you have any questions regarding this study.

Your signature below indicates that you have read the information in this document and have had a chance to ask any questions you have about the study. Your signature also indicates your approval for Lauderbach and Otay elementary schools to participate in this study.

Name (please print) Dr. Francisco Escobedo, Superintendent

Signature of Participant ____________________ Date ________________

Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerely,

Eileen Moreno
Dear Principal,

Your school has been selected to participate in a study being conducted by Ms. Eileen Moreno, an Educational Leadership doctoral student at San Diego State University. As a high performing urban school, yours presents the great opportunity to investigate an aspect of staff behaviors that have been shown to contribute to organizational effectiveness. Specifically, this is a study on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) which refers to those actions that go above and beyond the job description.

Research has shown that leadership impacts OCB, however the majority of this research has been quantitative. The purpose of this research is to investigate how elementary school principals inspire Organizational Citizenship Behavior by gathering specific (qualitative) incidents of OCB and their relationship to the principal’s actions and behaviors. Such a study will advance awareness and understanding of the specific actions and behaviors that serve as the foundations for leaders to motivate school staff to engage in behaviors that are considered above and beyond.

You and several staff members will be asked to engage in individual interviews that will take between 30-45 minutes. The interviews can occur at places and times that are most convenient for each participant. If possible, participants would include one teacher per grade level (or 7 total teachers), one credentialed support staff, the vice principal, and yourself. All participation will be confidential, meaning that names will not appear on interviews, notes, or the final product.

A gift card in the amount of $20 will be offered as compensation for interview participants in this study. Furthermore, this may present a valuable opportunity to reflect on an aspect of your leadership and its positive effects that you may not have previously considered.

If you agree to your school’s participation, I would like to request approximately 15 minutes with your staff (perhaps at a staff meeting) in order to explain the study and answer any questions they might have. During this time I would also be handing out and collecting a 12 question multiple choice questionnaire which should take no longer than
five minutes to complete. This survey will serve to determine the level of organizational
citizenship behavior at the school site and the school’s eligibility to continue in the study.
Please contact me via email at, eileen.moreno@santeesd.net or phone (619) if
you have any questions regarding this study and to communicate your decision about
participation. You are not required to participate in this study. Your choice to participate
will not affect your standing at the district or university.

A request to Dr. Escobedo for permission to ask for your participation has been made and
approved. If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant in research you
may also contact the Insititutional Review board at San Diego State University
619-594-6622 irb@mail.sdsu.edu.

Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerely,

Eileen Moreno
APPENDIX G

Recruitment Script

My name is Eileen Moreno and I am a doctoral candidate at SDSU.

I would like to invite your school’s participation in a study I am conducting. I selected your school because it is an academically award winning site and since there is a connection with my topic of study and student achievement, this school presents a great opportunity for this study.

The name of my study is Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Principals Influence. Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is defined as individual work behavior that is discretionary—that is considered above and beyond and is not directly or explicitly recognized by a formal reward system.

My interest in this subject began soon after I became a principal when the importance of relationships became apparent in a way it never had. I wanted build a work environment where my staff would look forward to coming to school every day because I believed that if they did, they would want to give 110% to their students. It turned out that this had a name: organizational citizenship behavior.

OCB has been researched extensively in the business realm and also within education. Researchers have found that organizations with high levels of OCB tend to be more effective and efficient. In education, student achievement has been positively linked to citizenship behaviors. Naturally this made people want to know, what are the conditions that promote citizenship behaviors?

As a result of many studies around this idea of OCB, researchers have been able to identify several workplace factors that set the foundation for motivating or inspiring people to go above and beyond. What we know, in education, is that factors such as collegial leadership, professional norms, and a strong press for academic achievement are positively related to OCB. Other factors related to OCB include trust, shared decision making, collaboration, fairness and justice. Research has also looked at leadership characteristics that influence OCB. To name a few of the findings, we know that a principal who is an effective communicator, an instructional resource, a visible presence, and a resource provider are likely to inspire staff to go above and beyond.

This is the background on OCB which leads me to the details about my study. These elements I’ve just mentioned which contribute to OCB are influenced to varying degrees by school leadership, however, the vast majority of studies have been quantitative; that is, using surveys to gather data. Qualitative studies, which give the opportunity to dig into specifics, are in very short supply. As such, we have very many general descriptors or categories of factors that lead to OCB, but hardly any specifics about the way a principal carries out the characteristics I’ve described. My study aims to get to the nitty gritty
because it is a qualitative study; that is, the data I gather will come from interviews rather than surveys. So, for example, knowing that trust influences OCB is one thing—knowing the specifics of how a principal has built that trust that led to OCB is another. For this reason, I believe that a qualitative study may be beneficial to school leaders in a different way than previous research, because of its specificity.

The process for my study includes starting out with a 12 question, multiple choice survey instrument for the credentialed teaching staff. This will allow me to determine the level of citizenship behavior at the school. In order to ensure that my study is trustworthy, I will ideally have at least 14 varied teacher participants, meaning two teachers from each grade level and two credentialed support staff. I would select the staff members at random and only I need to know who you are. I would not share that information at any point of the study. Next, I would contact each of the potential participants to ask if you would in fact like to participate and send along a consent form so that you can read it and ask any questions if necessary. You absolutely do not have to participate and this would not have any adverse effect since only I will know whom I am approaching with my request. Once I receive a verbal consent, we would set up a day, time and location of your choosing to conduct the interview. Please know that before, during, and after the interview/study you can ask me any questions or share concerns regarding the study.

When we meet, I anticipate the interview to last between 30-60 minutes. With your permission I would audiotape the interview so that I can effectively transcribe the conversation. The audio taping and transcription minimizes the possibility of error upon my analysis. The notes, transcriptions and audio would all be coded and your identity would not be attached to anything.

In terms of any other perceived risks, the nice thing about my study is that it is very strictly focused on those actions and behaviors that influence citizenship behavior, not on any that may negate or work against it. What this means is that if you are worried that you may make a criticism that would later come out in print, this would be impossible because any critique does not meet the criteria of my study and would automatically be excluded.

Finally, once your interview is transcribed, you would have the opportunity to look it over and give me feedback should you feel that something needed to be clarified.

A gift card in the amount of $20 will be offered as compensation for interview participants in this study.

Questions?

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

If you have any questions at a later date, please feel free to contact me at Eileen.moreno@santeesd.net or 619-258-2357.
Organizational Citizenship Behavior Survey

Organizational Citizenship Behavior—Scale

The survey you are about to complete is part of a study on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) at high performing schools. This survey serves to measure the level of OCB at a school site.

This research is being conducted through the College of Education at San Diego State University. All teachers’ responses are anonymous and data gathered about the school will be completely confidential. Data will be compiled at the school level and will be used determine the level of OCB at the school site. This information will help to determine the school’s eligibility for the second part of the study which seeks to understand how a principal inspires or motivates OCB. It is not used for any other purpose.

Your participation is voluntary. You may decline to complete the survey or you may skip any item that you feel uncomfortable answering. Please know that there are no correct or incorrect answers to this survey. The researcher is interested only in your frank opinion.

Your time, insights, and perceptions are valuable resources. Thank you for sharing them!

(DiPaola & Hoy, 2004)

(Appendix H)

Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements about your school from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Your answers are confidential.

1. Teachers help students on their own time.
2. Teachers waste a lot of class time.
3. Teachers voluntarily help new teachers.
4. Teachers volunteer to serve on new committees.
5. Teachers volunteer to sponsor extracurricular activities.
6. Teachers arrive to work and meetings on time.
7. Teachers take the initiative to introduce themselves to substitutes and assist them.
8. Teachers begin class promptly and use class time effectively.
9. Teachers give colleagues advanced notice of changes in schedule or routine.
10. Teachers give an excessive amount of busy work.
11. Teacher committees in this school work productively.
12. Teachers make innovative suggestions to improve the overall quality of our school.