Mediating Effect of Self-Efficacy on Self-Leadership and Teachers' Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Conceptual Framework

Ainimazita Mansor

Amer Darus

Mohd Hasani Dali

Graduate School of Business, University Utara Malaysia, Malaysia

Email: ainimazita@yahoo.com

Abstract

If one assumes that organizational citizenship behavior (OCBs) have an effect on organizational performance; it makes sense to identify those variables that increase these behaviors in organizational setting. That is probably why most research in this domain has focused on the potential antecedents of OCBs. One of the main reasons for the interest in OCBs is that they are expected to be positively related to measures of organizational effectiveness. The challenges in meeting the demand for highly qualified teachers are essential. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to determine in what level the teachers at primary schools display contextual performance namely OCB. This paper will also examine the influence of self-leadership and self-efficacy (individual-level variables) and OCB (individual-level performance) according to the perceptions of the teacher itself.

Keywords: Self-efficacy; self-leadership; organizational citizenship behavior; Malaysian teachers.

1. Introduction

Today, as educational systems move into an era of reorganization and are required in a competitive and complex environment (Miller, 2002) success of schools fundamentally depends on teachers who are committed to school goals and values (Oplatka, 2006; Somech and Ron, 2007). Teacher''s willingness to go above and beyond the call of duty to contribute to successful change has engaged in such organizational citizenship behavior (OCBs). It is now firmly believed that the effective functioning of an organization depends largely on employees'' efforts that extend beyond formal role requirements. Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) was first used by Organ to denote organizationally beneficial behavior of workers that was not prescribed but occurs freely to help others achieve the task at hand (Bateman and

Organ, 1983). OCB is defined as "performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place" (Organ, 1997). The practical importance of OCBs is that they can improve organizational efficiency and effectiveness by contributing to resource transformation, innovation and adaptability which will enhance individual and organizational performance (Organ, 1988; Williams and Anderson, 1991; Borman and Motowidlo, 1993; Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994; Barksdale and Werner, 2001).

The literatures concerning organizational citizenship behavior and contextual performance are selectively reviewed in an effort to build a case for citizenship behaviors as one central element in a multi-dimensional individual performance construct. Scholars have studied various factors contributing towards OCB over the

last three decades. However an integrated approach to the determinants of OCB is yet to emerge. Most of the researchers have examined the impact of only one or two factors on OCB, occasionally taking a third factor for probing its mediating role (Smith et al., 1983).

Self-leadership is considered pivotal to employees' enthusiasm for, commitment toward, and performance in empowering organizations (Manz, 1986; 1992). Previous empirical research examined the relation between specific self-leadership behaviors and subsequent performance (Bandura and Schunk, 1981; Gist, 1989) but no research examined how the general combination of self-leadership behaviors translates into performance. It may be that self-leadership behaviors have their initial influence on capability perceptions regarding performance within specific task domains. That is, the utilization of general self-leadership behaviors may influence self-efficacy perceptions which subsequently affect performance. This study examines this relationship and evaluates the extent to which self-efficacy mediates the influence of self-leadership on performance which is teachers" organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools in Malaysia.

Malaysia has made enormous strides in its education system over the past years with an adult literacy rate of around 92%, universal primary enrolment, and one of the fastest growth rates in secondary school enrolment. Enhancing education is not only a matter of basic human rights, it is an economic imperative.

Poor performance in education today will have negative consequences for the country"s future as higher education levels are consistently correlated with more robust economic growth. Unless the Malaysian education system continues to raise the bar to international standards and to close the current achievement gap across schools, Malaysia runs the risk of being left behind in education today and in competitiveness tomorrow. (Tenth Malaysian Plan 2011-2015).

There are currently over 175,000 applicants for entry to the teaching profession in Malaysia every year with up to 20,000 new teachers placed into schools annually. Many applicants do not have the right aptitude and attitude for becoming teachers. For applications to ITEs (Institute of Teaching Educations) in 2010, only 7% of applicants to the undergraduate teaching program had more than 7 as in their SPM, and only 3% of applicants to the postgraduate teaching program had a combined grade point average of more than 3.5 out of 4.0. For students in the top secondary schools, teaching is not widely considered a preferred career option. In countries like Australia or Singapore, teaching is consistently one of the highest ranked professions by school leavers. Similarly, in countries like Republic of Korea and Finland, only graduates in the top 10% and 15% respectively of their cohorts are eligible to apply to teacher training programs. The high entry requirements reinforce the image of teaching as a top profession that only accepts the best (Tenth Malaysian Plan 2011-2015).

Teacher quality is the single most important determinant of student outcomes. Experiences from top performing school systems globally indicate that the only way to improve student outcomes is to improve classroom instruction. Top performing school systems attract and admit only the best candidates into teaching, continuously develop them in school-based settings and develop a strong performance culture. During the Plan period, the Government must take measures to systematically improve both the quality of the new teacher intake as well as to upgrade the quality and professionalism of all existing teachers in the system. Since the performance of schools is usually determined by the state of teachers" psychological well-being and their commitments (Yucel, 2008), one question that arises is with regard to the number of teachers who are actually willing to go over and above their call of duty, especially in schools in Malaysia. It is suggested that by understanding the effects of individual-level variables on teacher"s OCB will improved performance management approaches in schools. Thus, understanding of the mediating effects (direct or indirect) of self-efficacy on the self-leadership and OCB relationship will highlight the causal relationship among the constructs in the model.

1.1 Objectives of Study

This research study aims

(a) To identify the level of organizational citizenship behavior, self-leadership and self-efficacy practice among teachers.

(b) To identify whether there is a significant relationship between self- leadership and organizational citizenship behavior among teachers.

(c) To identify whether there is a significant relationship between self- leadership and self-efficacy among teachers.

(d) To identify whether there is a significant relationship between self- efficacy and organizational citizenship behavior among teachers.

(e) To identify whether there is a significant relationship between self-leadership and organizational citizenship behavior when self-efficacy served as mediators.

(f) To identify whether the relationship between self-leaderships and organization citizenship behavior were directly or indirectly when self-efficacy served as mediators.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) represents 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). OCB consists of informal contributions that participants can choose to make or withhold, without regards to considerations of sanctions or formal incentives. They are often described as behaviors that "go above and beyond the call of duty". The employees who perform citizenship behaviors are considered "good soldiers" (Organ, 1988) for their effort contributed without formal exchange or reward in the employment contract. Organ (1988) provided a multi-dimensional scale of OCB. The scale consists of five dimensions that make up the OCB construct which are altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue. Paille (2009) proposed a four-dimension model of OCB consisting of interpersonal helping, individual initiative, personal industry, and loyal boosterism. Williams and Anderson (1991) found a two-dimensional structure of OCBs, and defined it as: (1) benefits directed at the organization in general, such as performing duties that are not required but which improve organizational image and performance (OCBO), and (2) benefits directed at individuals within the organization, such as altruism and interpersonal helping colleagues who have heavier work loads (OCBI).

Although most scholars agree on the multidimensionality of the OCB construct, a review of the literature reveals a lack of consensus about its dimensionality (Somech and Ron, 2007). Podsakoff et al. (2009) identified almost 30 potentially different forms of OCB and categorized them into seven dimensions based on prior conceptualizations and taxonomies of OCB (Organ, 1988, 1997; Van Dyne et al., 1994). The seven dimensions are helping behavior, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue and self developments.

As for the educational setting, Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2000) proposed three components of teachers"

OCB. The first component consists of OCB towards the school. OCB towards the school refer to behavior beneficial to a larger and more impersonal organization. Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2000) suggest that these behaviors represent innovative and initiative activities, which are not part of the job description. The second component consists of OCB towards team member. These OCB represent behaviors intentionally directed at helping teachers in one"s own team and refer to behavior beneficial to one"s own group of colleagues. The third component consists of OCB towards students. These OCB are behaviors directly and intentionally aimed at improving the quality of teaching and helping students to improve their achievements.

There has been considerable interest in the subject of OCB in business and organizational studies; however, there remains a paucity of research on OCB among school teachers (Oplatka, 2006). According to Hannam and Jimmieson (2002), OCB in teaching and other helping professions has largely been ignored. Most of the OCB literature prefers to focus on employees in more commercial settings such as hotels (Chiu and Tsai, 2006), sales (Ackfeldt and Coote, 2005), banks (Emmerik et al., 2005) and manufacturing industry (Organ & Lingl, 1995) rather than those who work in large bureaucratic systems and whose duties are often intensely interpersonal (such as teaching). Hence, this paper hopes to give an insight of OCB in a non-commercial setting particularly in the education setting in Malaysia.

Previous research that has been conducted on OCB in the education setting conceptualized this behavior in several dimensions. The most common ones are the five dimensions (altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue) proposed by Organ (1988) and also two dimensions of OCB

(OCBO and OCBI) proposed by Williams and Anderson (1991). However, this paper will focus on two dimensions of OCB specifically for the teaching profession following Williams and Anderson (1991), which are OCB targeted at the school as OCBO (towards the organization), and OCB targeted at the teachers as OCBI (towards the individual).

2.2 Self-Leadership

Self-leadership involves the influence people exert over themselves to achieve the self-motivation and self-direction needed to behave in desirable ways (Manz, 1992). Three distinct but complementary categories of self-leadership influence subsequent outcomes: behavior-focused strategies; natural reward strategies; and constructive thought pattern strategies. Behavior-focused strategies refer to specific behaviors that focus on self-assessment, self-reward, and self-discipline. Examples include identifying specific behaviors to enhance or modify, conducting a self-analysis to identify long-term goals, identifying and self-applying motivational rewards, reducing habitual self-punishment patterns, and practicing desired behaviors (Manz, 1992). Natural reward strategies pertain to positive perceptions and experiences associated with tasks to be accomplished. These include a commitment to, belief in, and enjoyment of the work for its own value (Manz, 1992). Thus, natural reward strategies include seeking work activities which are pleasant and enjoyable. Individuals can facilitate natural reward strategies by modifying perceptions or behaviors associated with task performance thereby increasing perceived competence, self-control, or task responsibility. Finally, constructive thought pattern strategies focus on establishing and altering thought patterns in desirable ways. Four particular strategies can be used to change thinking patterns: self-analysis and improvement of belief systems; mental imagery of positive performance; positive self-talk to facilitate performance; and using positive scripts in place of ineffective ones. Manz (1986) asserts that these scripts are individual counterparts to organizational rules, policies, and procedures. In sum, the use of self-leadership strategies facilitates a perception of control and responsibility which positively affects performance outcomes (Manz, 1992). For this reason, self-leadership behaviors and perceptions are examined in this study as an important influence on people's behavior.

2.3 Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is the extent to which an individual believes him or herself capable of successfully performing a specific behavior (Bandura, 1986). These beliefs influence 'what challenges to undertake, how much effort to expend in the endeavor, (and) how long to persevere in the face of difficulties' (Bandura, 1982). The higher a person's self-efficacy, the more confident he or she is about success in a particular task domain. Bandura (1977; 1986) suggests that one of the influential antecedents to the development of self-efficacy is vicarious experience or learning through modeling. Most modeling is based on behavioral observation, but an alternative form of modeling is based on self-instructional learning. This method of modeling, labeled cognitive modeling, utilizes 'self-instructional thoughts (or "statements") to guide performance' (Gist, 1989). These thoughts are similar to the constructive thought patterns set forth in self-leadership theory and resemble learning points in training interventions (Decker, 1984). Research supports the effectiveness of this type of modeling (Gist, 1989; Decker, 1984) and highlights the need to consider how self-leadership affects self-efficacy development. Research results also attest to the positive influence of self-efficacy perceptions on subsequent performance. In sum, self-efficacy is examined in this study in order to (1) determine how self-leadership strategies contribute to the formation of efficacy perceptions and (2) to determine if such perceptions subsequently lead to individual performance improvements.

3. Hypothesis Development

Theoretical and empirical rationales for hypothesis relations between constructs are discussed in the following sections.

3.1 Self-Leadership and OCB

In contrast, self-leadership (Manz, 1986) is a process through which people influence themselves to achieve the self-direction and self-motivation necessary to perform. Self-leadership has deep roots in several related theories of self-influence including self-regulation, self-control, self-management, intrinsic motivation theory, social cognitive theory, and clinical cognitive psychology. Building on these theoretical foundations, self-leadership prescribes specific sets of behavioral and cognitive strategies aimed at positively affecting individual performance outcomes. Self-leadership strategies are generally divided into

three primary categories consisting of behavior-focused strategies, natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies (Prussia et al., 1998).

3.1.1 Behavior-focused strategies are designed to increase self-awareness leading to the successful management of behaviors involving necessary but unpleasant tasks (Manz and Neck, 2004). Based on self-control and self-management theory, self-leadership‟s behavior-focused strategies include self-observation, self-goal setting, self-reward, and self-correcting feedback. Self-observation involves closely examining one‟s behavior to raise awareness of when and why certain behaviors occur. Through self-observation one can identify behaviors to be changed, enhanced or eliminated (Manz and Sims, 1980; Manz and Neck, 2004). This heightening of behavioral awareness represents an important first step toward behavioral change that can allow individuals to more effectively set goals aimed at improving personal performance (Manz, 1986; Manz and Neck, 2004; Manz and Sims, 1980). These self-set goals, coupled with self-reward contingencies, can be very effective in energizing the behaviors necessary for goal achievement (Manz and Sims, 1980; Manz and Neck, 2004). Self-correcting feedback is also useful for shaping desired behaviors. A positively framed introspective examination of failures and undesirable behaviors may be more effective in reshaping these behaviors than the excessive use of self-punishment involving self-criticism and guilt (Manz and Sims, 2001).

3.1.2 Natural reward strategies focus on the inherently enjoyable aspects of task or activity and are designed to create situations in which a person is motivated or rewarded by the task or activity itself (Manz and Neck, 2004; Manz and Sims, 2001). Natural reward strategies involve two primary approaches: building more pleasant and enjoyable features into a task or activity so that value is obtained from the task itself and it becomes naturally rewarding (Manz and Neck, 2004; Manz and Sims, 2001), and shaping one‟s perceptions of an activity by focusing on its inherently rewarding aspects (Manz and Neck, 2004; Manz and Sims, 2001). Both approaches tend to foster feelings of competence and self-determination, the two primary mechanisms of intrinsic motivation (Deci and Ryan, 1989). To the extent that tasks can be chosen, structured or perceived in ways that lead to increased feelings of competence and self-determination, they will be naturally rewarding and task performance will be enhanced.

3.1.3 Constructive thought pattern strategies deal with the management of cognitive processes and include three primary tools for shaping thinking patterns: self-analysis and improvement of belief systems, mental imagery of successful performance outcomes, and positive self-talk (Manz and Neck, 2004; Neck and Manz, 1992). The effective utilization of these specific cognitive strategies tends to facilitate the formation of constructive thought patterns and habitual ways of thinking that can positively impact performance (Manz and Neck, 2004; Neck and Manz, 1992). More specifically, individuals can examine their thinking patterns in order to identify, confront and replace dysfunctional beliefs and assumptions with more rational ones to facilitate more constructive thought patterns (Manz and Neck, 2004; Neck and Manz, 1992). In like manner, negative and destructive self-talk can be identified and replaced more positive and constructive self-dialogues. Self-talk has been defined as what we covertly tell ourselves (Neck and Manz, 1992) and generally involves cognitive evaluations and reactions to oneself and one‟s environment (Neck and Manz, 1992).

Through a careful analysis of self-talk patterns, individuals can learn to suppress or eliminate negative and pessimistic self-talk while fostering and encouraging optimistic self-dialogues. Finally, mental imagery consists of a symbolic and covert cognitive creation of an experience or task without actual overt physical muscular movement. Through mental imagery, it may be possible to symbolically experience behavioral outcomes prior to actual performance (Neck and Manz, 1992), and individuals who envision the successful performance of an activity in advance are much more likely to perform successfully when faced with the actual task (Manz and Neck, 2004). This assertion has been supported by a significant amount of empirical research evidence. Indeed, in a meta-analysis of 35 empirical studies, Driskell et al. (1994) found both a positive and significant effect of mental imagery on individual performance outcomes. Therefore, we propose the following hypotheses.

$H_{1:}$ i. Self-leadership strategies have a direct, positive effect on OCBO. ii.

Self-leadership strategies have a direct, positive effect on OCBI.

H_{1a}: i. Behavior focused strategies have a direct, positive effect on OCBO.

    ii. Behavior focused strategies have a direct, positive effect on OCBI.

H_{1b}: i. Natural reward strategies have a direct, positive effect on OCBO.

    ii. Natural reward strategies have a direct, positive effect on OCBI.

H_{1c}:   i. Constructive thought strategies have a direct, positive effect on OCBO.

    ii. Constructive thought strategies have a direct, positive effect on OCBI.

3.2 Self-Leadership and Self-Efficacy

Several studies have shown that leadership behaviors affect perceptions of self-efficacy. These studies focused on external leadership, self-management, or self-leadership influences on self-efficacy in a variety of task domains. Studies examining external leadership influences on self-efficacy perceptions generally focus on how the provision of feedback (Karl et al., 1993) or the use of effective training techniques (Gist, 1989) influences these perceptions. However, two studies specifically emphasized leader behavior influences on self-efficacy perceptions. Redmond et al. (1993) found that leader behaviors, including task direction and goal-setting, positively influenced self-efficacy expectations. Sherer et al. (1989) also found similar results in that the influence of an entrepreneurial parent (a leadership role) significantly affected subjects' level of self-efficacy and expectancy to pursue an entrepreneurial career. Health science and organizational research indicates that self-management techniques also affect self-efficacy perceptions. Furthermore, Frayne and Latham (1987) found self-management techniques positively influenced self-efficacy for reducing absenteeism. In sum, research generally supports the positive effects of self-management behaviors on self-efficacy. Fewer studies, however, examined how the more general combination of self-leadership behaviors influences self-efficacy. To the extent that individuals are in a position to experience confidence through greater self-control (i.e. self-leadership skill development) efficacy perceptions will be enhanced (Manz and Sims, 1996). On the other hand, several studies examined individual components of self-leadership and provided an indication of their separate influence on self-efficacy. Bandura and Cervone (1986), for example, found that after setting goal standards, individuals high in self-efficacy increased their efforts to meet the standards, whereas those low in self-efficacy did not. In addition, Gist (1989) found that including cognitive modeling in a training session generated higher levels of trainee self-efficacy than for those exposed to lecture training only. In sum, research shows that particular leadership behaviors affect self-efficacy perceptions. However, no research directly examined whether the constellation of self-leadership behaviors influences self-efficacy. We conclude from our research review that the use of self-leadership strategies will influence self-efficacy perceptions for a specific task. Therefore, we propose the following hypotheses.

H_2: Self-leadership strategies have a direct, positive effect on the level of self-efficacy. H_{2a}:

Behavior focused strategies have a direct, positive effect on the level of self-efficacy. H_{2b}:

Natural reward strategies have a direct, positive effect on the level of self-efficacy.

H_{2c}:   Constructive thought strategies have a direct, positive effect on the level of self-efficacy.

3.3 Self-Efficacy and OCB

Empirical research on self-efficacy indicates a strong and consistent link between self-efficacy and subsequent outcomes. For example, researchers have linked self-efficacy to job search success (Kanfer and Hulin, 1985), improved attendance behavior (Frayne and Latham, 1987), increased task performance (Mathieu et al., 1993) and academic achievement (Multon et al., 1991). The positive influences of self-efficacy have been well documented and strong empirical support exists for the effects of self-efficacy on performance.

In this study, teachers" self-efficacy beliefs are determined for three domains of activities or competencies required for successful adoption and implementation of the innovative practices (Dembo and Gibson, 1985). The first domain of self-efficacy beliefs of teachers being employed in the Study-home is working with tasks. The tasks serve for making pupils independently mould their own educational process. Whereas the traditional practices are mainly teacher-centred, i.e., teachers talk and pupils listen passively (Evers et al., 2002) teaching in the study-home is mainly directed at the pupils" independent acquisition of the subject-matter guided by tasks (Evers et al., 2002). Co-operation among pupils and between teacher and

pupils is a striking feature of these Dutch educational innovations. The teachers are supposed to frequently interchange between individual-centred and group-centred practices. Accordingly, the second domain of self-efficacy beliefs in this study is about guiding groups of pupils in a differentiating way. It could be said that teachers increasingly have become „group managers" whose activities are characterized by associating well and efficiently with groups of pupils. However, they must at the same time promote the individual pupil"s academic achievement.

Besides the competencies necessary to function well as a teacher of the Study-home as described above, teachers need specific outlooks to be able to turn to and adopt the new innovative practices. Weak self-efficacy beliefs about being a competent educator may be associated with an increased level of stress caused by changes in the work situation and the pressures of school reform (Duffy and Roehler, 1986). That is why the third domain of self-efficacy beliefs in this study is about coping with stress attending the implementation of innovative educational practices such as the Study-home. This self-efficacy domain is called the use of educational innovative practices. In this study we thus examined teachers" self-efficacy beliefs in relation to (1) involving pupils with tasks in learning processes, (2) differentially guiding groups and (3) coping with the stresses involved in implementing such innovative educational practices. Thus, we propose the following hypothesis.

H_3: i. Self-efficacy has a direct, positive effect on OCBO. ii.

Self-efficacy has a direct, positive effect on OCBI.

H_{3a}: i. Self-efficacy towards guiding groups has a direct, positive effect on OCBO. ii.

Self-efficacy towards guiding groups has a direct, positive effect on OCBI.

H_{3b}: i. Self-efficacy towards using task has a direct, positive effect on OCBO. ii.

Self-efficacy towards using task has a direct, positive effect on OCBI.

H_{3c}: i. Self-efficacy towards using innovations has a direct, positive effect on OCBO.

ii. Self-efficacy towards using innovations has a direct, positive effect on OCBI.

3.4 Self-Leadership, Self-Efficacy and OCB

Self-efficacy results from the acquisition of cognitive, social, linguistic, or physical skills through personal and/or vicarious experience (Bandura, 1982). Individuals synthesize and evaluate this information about their task abilities and make decisions about choice of action, level of effort, and duration of persistence for subsequent task activities (Bandura and Cervone, 1986). In contrast, self-leadership represents a constellation of behaviors, attitudes, and cognitions which represent a less specific orientation. Strategies such as monitoring progress, using self-encouragement, and envisioning positive job factors apply across task domains. Self-leadership is, there-fore, a more global or general level phenomenon than self-efficacy. However, domain specific perceptions such as self-efficacy may mediate the effects of general behavioral strategies on subsequent outcomes (Ellis et al., 2010). Previous empirical research examined the mediating influences of self-efficacy in a variety of task domains. For example, Feltz's (1982) results indicated that self-efficacy mediates the relation between diving anxiety and diving performance. In addition, Bandura (1982) reported coping self-efficacy mediates the impact of individual distress on the performance of threatening tasks. Finally, Prussia et al. (1998) found that self-efficacy mediates the effects of feedback on performance in a computerized simulation of a space shuttle mission. In contrast, limited research examined whether self-efficacy operates as a mediator through which general leadership behaviors are translated into performance outcomes.

Research done by Kirkpatrick and Locke (1996) found self-efficacy did not mediate the effects of visionary and charismatic leader behaviors on performance. They did, however, find support for a 'two-part causal linkage' wherein leader behaviors affected performance to the extent that they initially influenced self-efficacy. On the other hand, a study by Frayne and Latham (1987) showed self-efficacy mediates the influence of self-management behaviors on attendance. But self-management training is distinct from an overall approach to improve global self-leadership skills (Manz, 1986). Self-efficacy may be a task-specific mechanism through which global self-leadership strategies affect performance. This relationship represents the final hypothesis

H$_4$: Self-efficacy mediates the relation between self-leadership strategies and OCBO.

H$_{4a}$: Self-efficacy mediates the relation between self-leadership strategies and OCBI.

4. The Conceptual Model

Based on the preceding discussion, a conceptual framework is proposed based from a model of self-leadership theoretical contexts and performance mechanisms derived from Neck and Houghton (2006). Self-leadership is a normative concept that may operate within several theoretical contexts including self-regulation theory, social cognitive theory, intrinsic motivation theory and self-control theory (Neck and Houghton, 2006). Self-efficacy was based on the social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986) and OCB was based on the classical theory of Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964)

To conceptualize the relationship between self-leadership, self-efficacy and organizational behavior, Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) will be used. Both self-leadership and self-efficacy are assumed to predict OCB, through Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1977). It is reasonable to assume that when teachers exert high level of self-leadership and high level of self efficacy teachers willing to go over and above their call of duty. Hence, based upon the Social Exchange theory, when the teachers feel that their self-leadership and self-efficacy are high, they are expected to demonstrate higher OCB in-return. A conceptual framework is proposed as depicted in Figure 1.

Conclusion

Today successful organizations have employees who are willing to go beyond their formal job responsibilities and freely give their time, effort and energy to succeed the task at hand. OCB is generally defined as discretionary behaviors that benefit the organizations and/or one''s coworkers (Organ, 1988).

Although a teacher may not be required to stay late and assist others, doing so may facilitates the smooth flow of work. Furthermore, when a teacher''s self-leadership and self efficacy are at most, he or she has more assets available to dedicate to other people and tasks. Therefore, it is important for principals, head masters, managers and policy makers to realize the importance of increasing self-leadership and self-efficacy so that teachers would be willing to perform and promote OCB among them.

References

Ackfeldt, A. L., & Coote, L. V. (2005). A study of organizational citizenship behaviors in retail setting. *Journal of Business Research, 58*(2), 151-159.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward an unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191–215.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-Efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist, 37*(2), 122-147.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs. NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. & Schunk, D. H. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41*, 586-598.

Bandura, A. & Cervone, D. (1986). Differential engagement of self-reactive influences in cognitive motivation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 38*, 92-113.

Barksdale, K. & Werner, J. M. (2001). Managerial ratings of in-role behaviors, OCB, and overall performance: testing different models of their relationship. *Journal of Business Research, 51*, 145-155.

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*(4), 587-595.

Blau, G. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.

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

Chiu, S. F., & Tsai, M. C. (2006). Relationships among burnout, job involvement and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Psychology, 140*(6), 517-530.

Deci, E. & Ryan, R. (1989). The support of autonomy and control of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 1024-37.

Decker, P. J. (1984). Effect of different symbolic coding stimuli in behavior modeling training. Manuscript

submitted for publication. In Prussia,G. E., Anderson,J. S., & Manz,C. C. (1998). Self-leadership and performance outcomes: The mediating influence of self-efficacy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19*, 523-538.

Dembo, M. H., & Gibson, S. (1985). Teachers‟ sense of efficacy: An important factor in school improvement. *Elementary School Journal, 86*(2), 173–184.

Driskell, J. E., Copper, C., & Moran, A. (1994). Does mental practice enhance performance? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79,* 481-492.

Duffy, G., & Roehler, L. (1986). Constraints on teacher change. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(1), 1-12.

Emmerik, I. H. V., Jawahar, I. A., & Stone, T. H. (2005). Associations among altruism, burnout dimensions, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Work and Stre*ss, *19*(1), 93-100.

Ellis, S., Ganzach, Y., Castle, E. & Sekely, G. (2010). The effect of filmed versus personal after-event review on task performance: The mediating and moderating role of self-efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(1), 122-131.

Evers, W. J. G., Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2002). Burnout and self-efficacy: A study on teachers‟ beliefs when implementing an innovative educational system in the Netherlands. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 72,* 227-243.

Feltz, D. L. (1982). Path analysis of the casual elements in Bandura‟s theory of self-efficacy and an anxiety-based model of avoidance behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 42*(4), 764-781.

Frayne, C. A. & Latham, G. P. (1987). Application of social learning theory to employee self-management of attendance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*(3), 387-392.

Gist, M. (1989). The influence of training method on self-efficacy and idea generation among managers. *Personnel Psychology, 42*, 787-805.

Hannam, R., & Jimmieson, N. (2002). The relationship between extra-role behaviors and job burnout for primary school teachers: A Preliminary model and development of an OCB scale. Retrieved: 9 September 2011 from http://www.aare.edu.au/02pap/han02173.htm.

Kanfer, R. & Hulin, C. (1985). Individual differences in successful job searched following lay-off. *Personnel Psychology, 38*, 835-847.

Karl, K. A., Kelly A. O., & Martocchio, J. J. (1993). The impact of feedback and self-efficacy on performance in training. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*, 379-394.

Kirkpatrick, S. A. & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(1), 36-51.

Manz, C. C. (1986). Self-leadership: Toward an expanded theory of self-influence processes in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 11*(3), 585-600.

Manz, C. C. (1992). Self-leadership . . . the heart of empowerment. *The Journal for Quality and Participation, 15*, 80-89.

Manz, C. C., & Neck, C. P. (2004). *Mastering self-leadership: Empowering yourself for personal excellence* (Third edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P. (1980). Self-management as a substitute for leadership: A social learning perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 5*, 361-367.

Manz, C. & Sims, H. (1996). *Creating a Company of Heroes*. New York: Wiley.

Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P. (2001). *The new SuperLeadership: Leading others to lead themselves.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Mathieu, J. E., Martineau, J. W. & Tannenbaum, S. I. (1993). Individual and situational influences on the development of self-efficacy: Implications for training effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology, 46*(1), 125-147.

Miller, N. (2002). Insider change leadership in schools. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 5,* 343-360.

Multon, K. D., Brown, S. D., & Lent, R. W. (1991). Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcome:

A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *38*(1), 30-38.

Neck, C. P. & Houghton, J. D. (2006). Two decades pf self-leadership theory and research, Past development, presents trends, and future possibilities. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(4), 270-295.

Neck, C. P., & Manz, C. C. (1992). Thought self-leadership: The impact of self-talk and mental imagery on performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12*, 681-699.

Oplatka,I. (2006). Going beyond role expectations: toward an understanding of the determinants and components of teacher organizational citizenship behavior. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 42*, 385-423.

Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Book.

Organ, D. W., & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology, 135*(3), 339-350.

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: It"s construct clean-up time. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 85-97.

Paille, P. (2009). Assessing organizational citizenship behavior in the French Context: Evidence for the Four-Dimensional Model. *The Journal of Psychology, 143*(2), 133-146.

Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and Organizational-Level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(1), 122-141.

Podsakoff, P. M. & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Organizational Performance: A review and suggestions for Future Research. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 133-151.

Prussia, G. E., Anderson, J. S. & Manz, C. C. (1998). Self-leadership and performance outcomes: the mediating influence of self-efficacy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19*(5), 523-538.

Redmond, M. R., Mumford, M. D. & Teach, R. (1993). Putting creativity to work: Effects of leader behavior on subordinate creativity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 55*, 120-151.

Sherer, R. F., Adams, J. S., Carley, S. S. & Weibe, F.A. (1989). Role model performance effects on development of entrepreneurial career preference. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice, 13*, 53-71.

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

Somech, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2000). Understanding extra-role behavior in school: The relationships between job satisfaction, sense of efficacy, and teachers' extra-role behavior. *Teaching and Teachers Education, 1*(6), 649-659.

Somech, A., & Ron, I. (2007). Promoting organizational citizenship behavior in schools: the impact of individual and organization characteristics. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 5*, 1-29.

Tenth Malaysia Plan 2011-2015. (2011). Retrieved September 10, 2011, from www.epu.gov.my/html/themes/epu/html/RMKE10/rmke10. pdf.

Dyne, V. L., Graham, J. M., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(4), 765-802.

Williams, L. J. & Anderson, S. E.(1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behavior. *Journal of Management, 17*(3), 601-617.

Yucel, C. (2008). Teacher burnout and organizational citizenship behavior in Turkish elementary schools. *Educational Planning, 7*(1), 27-43.

Figure 1: Proposed conceptual framework