

Spring 2022

Educational Transformational Leadership and Teacher Organizational Citizenship Behavior Motives

Jeremy T. Davis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Davis, Jeremy T., "Educational Transformational Leadership and Teacher Organizational Citizenship Behavior Motives" (2022). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2359.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/2359>

This dissertation (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies, Jack N. Averitt College of at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

EDUCATIONAL TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND TEACHER ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR MOTIVES

by

JEREMY T. DAVIS

(Under the Direction of Juliann Sergi McBrayer)

ABSTRACT

A principal's leadership is a key part to the success of a school as their leadership guides both instructional and organizational leadership. Teachers often work beyond their formal duties to see that all of their students have their needs met including academic, social, and physical. The performance of such behaviors is referred to as Organizational Citizenship Behavior, which is when followers display behaviors that benefit the organization or its members beyond their current job requirements. This study investigated the relationship between principal's transformational leadership and teachers' Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and related motivating factors. Participants from a single suburban school district completed a questionnaire based on their perceptions of their principal's leadership characteristics and reflections upon their own practices. The analysis through multiple statistical tests showed the strongest transformational leadership practice is individualized support. This practice demonstrated a positive relationship with Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Organizational Concern, and Prosocial Values. The outcomes of this study are intended to assist school leaders in promoting citizenship behaviors through leadership practices.

INDEX WORDS: Transformational leadership, Organizational citizenship, Principals, Educational leadership, Teacher motivation

EDUCATIONAL TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND TEACHER
ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR MOTIVES

by

JEREMY T. DAVIS

B.S., North Georgia College & State University, 2009

M.S., Georgia Southern University, 2012

Ed.S., Augusta University, 2015

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Georgia Southern University in Partial
Fulfillment for the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

© 2021

JEREMY T. DAVIS

All Rights Reserved

EDUCATIONAL TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND TEACHER
ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR MOTIVES

by

JEREMY T. DAVIS

Major Professor:	Juliann Sergi McBrayer
Committee:	Brian W. Griffin
	Suzanne Miller

Electronic Version Approved:
May 2022

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my late grandfather A.B. Taake. You taught me the passion of working with people and always pushed your family to be their best.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful for and send appreciation to:

My lovely wife, Liza Davis, for the countless hours of support and encouragement.

My beautiful daughter, Wyndell Kate Davis, for giving me those times of interruption as a reminder to smile and laugh.

My parents, Michael and Carolyn Davis, for teaching me to never give up.

My family-in-law, for your willingness to assist at any time.

Dr. Juliann Sergi McBrayer, for your encouragement and guidance through the times I had no clue in what I was doing.

Dr. Bryan W. Griffin, for your statistical drive to make me a better research practitioner.

Dr. Suzanne Miller, for your discussions and expertise.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	3
LIST OF TABLES	7
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	8
Background	10
Theoretical Framework: Transformational Leadership.....	11
School Climate	12
Teacher Motivation	13
Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)	14
Organizational Citizenship Behavior Citizenship Motives	15
Statement of Problem	17
Purpose Statement	18
Significance of Study	18
Research Questions	19
Procedures	20
Definition of Key Terms	24
Chapter Summary	24
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	26
School Administration.....	28
The Role of Principal Compared to the Assistant Principal.....	28
Preparation Programs and Professional Development	30
Theoretical Framework: Transformational Leadership.....	35
School Climate	41
Teacher Motivation	42
Effects of Leadership on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment	43
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	50

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Citizenship Motives	54
Chapter Summary	60
III. METHODOLOGY	62
Research Questions	63
Research Design	63
Population, Sample, and Sampling.....	64
Instrumentation.....	65
Variables.....	68
Data Collection.....	69
Data Analysis	70
Chapter Summary.....	73
IV. REPORT OF THE DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS.....	74
Research Questions	74
Research Design	75
Findings	76
Chapter Summary.....	88
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS	90
Methodology	90
Findings	92
Research Sub-Question 1	93
Research Sub-Question 2	94
Research Sub-Question 3	94
Discussion	94
Implications for Practice	97
Recommendations for Future Research	98
Limitations, Delimitations, and Assumptions	100
Conclusion.....	100
REFERENCES	102
APPENDICES	

A. EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP	
BEHAVIOR MOTIVE QUESTIONNAIRE	120
Transformational Leadership Inventory (TLI) / (Podsakoff et al., 1990)	120
Organizational Citizenship Behavior School Scale (OCBSS) / (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005).....	122
Citizenship Motive Scale (CMS) / (Rioux & Penner, 2001).....	123
Demographics.....	124
B. QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS ASSIGNED TO DIMENSION.....	125
C. EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP	
MOTIVE QUESTIONNAIRE IN QUALTRICS	126
D. ORIGINAL INSTRUMENTS BEFORE ALTERATIONS	131
E. RECRUITMENT AND PREPARATORY INFORMATION EMAIL	136
F. INVITATION TO SURVEY EMAIL	137
G. REMINDER AND FOLLOW-UP EMAIL	138
H. LAST REMINDER AND FOLLOW-UP EMAIL	139
I. INFORMED CONSENT	140
J. ADDITIONAL TABLES.....	142

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Variables	69
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for All Variables	78
Table 3: Regression of OCBSS on TLI Variables	80
Table 4: Regression of Organizational Concern of TLI Variables	81
Table 5: Regression of Prosocial Variables on TLI Variables	82
Table 6: Regression of Impression Management of TLI Variables.....	83
Table 7: ANOVA Results and Descriptive Statistics for Individualized Support by School Level	84
Table 8: ANOVA Results and Descriptive Statistics for Intellectual Stimulation by School Level	85
Table 9: Multiple Comparisons and Mean Difference in Individualized Support by School Level	85
Table 10: Multiple Comparisons and Mean Difference in Intellectual Stimulation by School Level	85
Table 11: Results of t-tests and Descriptive Statistics in TLI, OCBSS, and CMS by Hiring Status	87

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

A principal's leadership style has a large impact on the culture of the school (Martin, 2009). In any organization, the relationship between the leader and its members are key to success (Fullan, 2008). There is a need for preparation programs to teach leadership skills, specifically, a need to teach transformational leadership. Transformational leadership is the leadership style that uses motivating factors to convert followers' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors in order to raise achievement and performance levels beyond current levels (Anderson, 2017; Burns, 1978). There are six dimensions of transformational leadership that can be measured including vision, model, goals, expectations, support, and stimulation (Podsakoff et al., 1990).

When followers display behaviors that benefit the organization or its members beyond their current job requirements, it is referred to as Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB; Lemmon & Wayne, 2015). In addition, there are motivating factors that lead to OCB amongst organizational members and include concern, value, and impression (Rioux & Penner, 2001). Research showed that schools with higher OCB scores have higher achieving students (Burns & DiPaola, 2013). As a result, preparation programs may see the need to train their educational leaders in transformational leadership to improve teacher OCB and in turn, enhance the achievement of their students.

Additionally, the importance of school leadership, and the need for more research regarding leadership preparation programs specifically related to the assistant principal is vital (Oleszewski et al., 2012). In developing an Assistant Principal Academy, Gurley et al. (2015)

found that assistant principals who completed professional training felt a “strengthening of their knowledge base and skills in instructional leadership” (p. 227). Additionally, participants also grasped a better understanding that increased their perspective of the overall school district’s mission and vision. Furthermore, by participating in the cohort model, participants felt better connected through the collaborative practice. A school administrator often enters the administrative career through their role as an Assistant Principal. During preparatory programs, desiring school leaders learn about the art of running a school or district.

Paths to an administrative role are not the same, but they typically share similar characteristics such as volunteering for teacher-leader duties, mentoring new teachers, and assisting with special administrative functions (Marshall & Davidson, 2016). The call to administration generally begins during the time of teaching, as a teacher receives statements of encouragement and support before they consider administration; likewise, at this time the teacher begins to separate themselves from other teachers by rising to opportunities to display their leadership skills (Marshall, 1992). These teacher leaders may require the needed coursework and the proper licensing to be considered for an administrative position. However, like in most jobs, the best way to learn the details of the position is to be in the position learning the job details (Oleszewski et al., 2012). The same is true with becoming an administrator, but teachers rarely have the opportunity to serve in an administrative capacity until they are in an actual leadership position.

The most effective pre-administration training may be lacking until the administration position is accepted as the Assistant Principal fills their new position, as they generally attach themselves to a role model who is successful (Marshall, 1992). Together, they focus their

attention on the greatest area of need (Marshall, 1992; Oleszewski et al., 2012). Districts need to establish preparation programs for aspiring administrators to master their educational leadership skills. Additionally, there is a need for school leaders to be taught and familiarized with the characteristics of transformational leadership because teachers may feel more positive about the overall climate on campus when they identify with a school leader who exhibits a high level of idealized transformational leadership attributes (Allen et al., 2015).

School systems have begun to operate like businesses, so school districts are examining the management skills and leadership qualities of potential school administrators (principals and assistant principals) by ensuring schools run effectively (Anderson, 2017), finding a balance between instructional and managerial responsibilities (McBrayer et al., 2018), and promoting teacher engagement (McCarley et al., 2016). Many leadership styles exist, but transformational leadership has demonstrated a positive impact on performance in schools (Anderson, 2017). The performance of a principal is based on his or her ability to improve teaching and learning within the school building (McCarley et al., 2016). As a school leader, whether a principal or an assistant principal, it is important to understand how the transformational leadership style can increase the motivation of teachers leading to OCB. In turn, training school administrators in transformational leadership may heighten awareness of OCB and drive schools toward higher achievement (Burns & DiPaola, 2013) and a more positive school climate (McCarley et al., 2016).

Background

A review of the literature provided information about transformational leadership as the theoretical framework, school climate, teacher motivation, OCB, and OCB Citizenship Motives.

Theoretical Framework: Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership was utilized as the theoretical framework of this study and is defined by a contemporary paraphrase of Burns (1978) definition as a, “Style of leadership that transforms follower attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors to a higher realm of motivation where the leader inspires followers to be motivated to rise above and beyond current levels of achievement and performance to even higher levels of achievement and performance” (Anderson, 2017, p. 3). Upon observations of multiple political leader behaviors, Burns (1978) proposed two distinct leadership styles. The researcher defined the first style, transactional leadership, as the interaction process between leaders and followers where leaders reward employees based on achieving levels of effort and performance. Secondly, the goal for transformational leadership is to encourage followers to build stronger leader-member relationships where followers surpass their own self-interests for the good of the organization. In transformational leadership, followers “gain increased awareness for valued outcomes as well as their own higher-level needs” to go beyond traditional expectations (Connell, 2005, p. 13).

Bass (1985) examined transformational leadership and expanded beyond Burns (1978) basic transactional leader-member exchange by focusing on the positive change associated with elevating goals; however, Burns (1978) did not distinguish between positive or negative change. Lastly, the two researchers have different views between the relationship of transformational and transactional leadership. Where Burns (1978) viewed the two leadership styles as opposites, Bass (1985) viewed the relationship as complimentary. Thus, for this study, transformational leadership was referred to as a complimentary relationship between transformational leadership and transactional leadership.

School Climate

Transformational leadership holds a significant positive relationship with school climate as leadership seeks to “establish new norms, change employee attitudes, create a new vision of reality, and make fundamental changes to the culture of the organization” by using teamwork to accomplish a common goal (Anderson, 2017, p. 5). Additionally, the researchers noted that providing individualized support is when the school leader displays respect for individual team members and displays concern for their personal feelings and needs. Transformational school leaders engage teachers individually and collectively to increase morale, improve work-related attitudes, and encourage motivation (Berkovich & Eyal, 2017; Stewart, 2006).

A positive environment is sought by employees as well as employing organizations. Specific leadership styles and organizational practices make a positive impact on businesses and organizations (Burton et al., 2017; Jaiswal & Dhar, 2015; Weller et al., 2019). These positive cultures create a buy-in from employees, which allow them to increase production and performance (Ogbonnaya & Nielson, 2016). However, leadership characteristics, through leader-member exchange, have the greatest impact on individual and performance outcomes (Russell et al., 2018). Furthermore, this same leadership is necessary in creating a positive climate for employees (teachers) and clients (students).

Principals have a goal to improve the school’s climate and culture by providing effective leadership skills and practices that lead to increasing student performance (Fullan, 2014; Leithwood & Sun, 2012; Ross & Cozzens, 2016). An effective school leader uses practices, similar to those in business to connect teacher instruction to the individual needs by including strengths and weakness of students. By creating these practices, school leaders are able to

address a positive school climate and teacher effectiveness (Ross & Cozzens, 2016). In order to build a positive school climate, the transformational leader must provide individual support while adhering to the school vision (Anderson, 2017; Leithwood & Sun, 2012; Ross & Cozzens, 2016).

Teacher Motivation

It is important for school leaders to understand not only what effective practices motivate student learning but to also understand how to motivate the teachers in the classroom as employees (Amtu et al., 2020). A teacher's first five years in the teaching profession are crucial and the most sensitive because they endure higher job stress, which may lead to teacher burnout and desire to leave the profession (Ponnack et al., 2018; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2018). Since leadership styles vary, school leaders can use transformational leadership practices to improve teacher motivation and attain a positive school environment (Carnahan, 2014). The transformational school leader's ability to meet individualized teacher needs is highly impactful to teacher motivation, attitude, and morale (Avolio et al., 2004; Berkovich & Eyal, 2017; Stewart, 2006). In turn, the increase in these practices to improve teacher motivation may lead to an overall increase in OCB (Bogler & Somech, 2004).

Teachers enter the profession for both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational reasons. While extrinsic motivating factors such as job stability, pay, and extended breaks are benefits, long-tenured teachers shared that most of their extrinsic motivation comes through the management of the school leader (Choing et al., 2017). Longer-serving teachers show a greater gain from intrinsic, altruistic motivation (Choing et al., 2017). While there seems to be a clear distinction between the two types of motivation, it is possible for them to coexist with one being dominant

based on the situation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). It is important for the management style of the school leader to build positive intrinsic motivating factors to impact the teacher's perception of the teaching profession (Finkelstein, 2011; Wasserman et al., 2016).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

Organ (1988) described OCB behavior as discretionary and not directly or explicitly rewarded or recognized, specifically beyond the role of the job description or specified terms of a person's contract with an organization. OCB is an important attribute to the P-12 education system and is defined by the time teachers spend outside the classroom preparing, tutoring, and providing detailed feedback for the improvement of their students. The complexity of teaching requires judgements that are not adequately written through specific job descriptions, as teachers often do whatever it takes to assist student learning (DiPaola et al., 2005). OCB carries multiple organizational outcomes, to include productivity, efficiency, and turnover reduction (Podsakoff et al., 2009). These outcomes paired with connections to high student achievement (Burns & DiPaola, 2013) and positive school climate (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001) present a reasonable cause to study the need for school administrators to lead with a focus on OCB. While positive school climate can lead to positive OCB, the reverse is not necessarily true (Wingate et al., 2019).

A strong relationship exists between transformational leadership and teacher OCB, so it is suggested that "a school leader who implements transformational leadership practices can positively influence the educational environment" (White, 2018, p. 62). When a principal sets high but achievable goals for students and teachers, both teachers and students create a new behavior to meet these goals. This goal setting technique is called achievement press (Smith,

2015) and is positively correlated with OCB. In addition, teachers and students fostering an achievable group goal is a factor of transformational leadership, so teachers increase their production by displaying more OCBs to meet the goal set by the principal. Since it is the principal's primary responsibility to improve teaching and learning (McCarley et al., 2016), the school leader should pay close attention to transformational leadership because it holds a predictive relationship with OCB (Willis, 2015; Yeager, 2016). School leaders who are motivating, encouraging, and promoting leadership skills among their teachers have teachers that are motivated and hold positive work-related attitudes (Anderson, 2017; Berkovich & Eyal, 2017; Yeager, 2016).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Citizenship Motives

It is important to not only understand the usefulness of OCB but also the motivating causes of OCB (Rioux & Penner, 2001). Additionally, it is important for leaders to comprehend the patterns of citizenship behavior within their organization (Klotz et al., 2018), for even positive OCB motives can prevent workplace fatigue (Qiu et al., 2020). One would assume the OCB is driven by intrinsic motivation, but Finkelstein's (2011) study shared that participants displayed more individual differences in motivations and the data favored intrinsic motives over extrinsic motives. The root of Citizenship Motives, or OCB Motives, is housed in the work of Penner et al. (1997). Additionally, Grube and Piliavin's (2000) work stated that organizational social structure is what produces sustained volunteerism, which begins with organizational commitment, so they sought to create a positive organizational experience such that it increased the volunteer's organizational commitment. However, Penner et al. (1997) disagreed and argued the connection to an organization and drive is solely based on the role you play within the

organization. Rioux and Penner (2001) noted there are differences and similarities between volunteerism and OCB. Similarities are that both are prosocial behaviors and occur within an organization, and the differences are how they arrive at the prosocial behaviors.

Employees that display a higher Leader-Member Exchange also display more positive OCB motivating behaviors (Bowler et al., 2019). Leader-Member Exchange describes the overall taxonomy of leadership approaches (Graen & Uhl-Bein, 1995). Where most leadership theories focus on the characteristics of either the leader or the follower, Leader-Member Exchange concentrates on the dyadic relationship at the level of the analysis (Gerstener & Day, 1997). This supports the research of Hauserman and Stick (2013) and Yeager (2016) that noted an increase in motivation by teachers when they received individualized support. Leithwood and Sun (2012) encouraged teacher commitment, satisfaction, and teacher efficacy. These teacher characteristics have indirectly impacted student achievement (Leithwood & Sun, 2012). Boberg and Bourgeois' (2016) indicated that principals who display transformational leadership characteristics foster teacher optimism in regards to the teacher's role in a student's life. This form of teaching is a selfless act, which supervisors prefer, to distinguish between selfless OCB and self-serving OCBs (Donia et al., 2016).

In summary, there is a need for principals to be trained as transformational leaders. School leaders with transformational leadership can have a positive impact on the school climate, teacher OCB, and teacher motivation. A principal's transformational leadership should be focused on the organization as well as be tailored for individual support. When principals display that individualized consideration through a cooperative and trusting relationship, teachers are more positive about the school environment. A simple characteristic, such as a leadership style,

can have an effective impact on an entire school community. Thus, further research is warranted to examine teacher perception of principal transformational leadership and teacher OCB and OCB motives.

Statement of Problem

As school districts and post-secondary institutions seek to advance their educational leadership programs for P-12 education, they will need to examine research to find the most effective practices to train educational leaders. Educational leadership preparatory programs teach a large spectrum of topics pertaining to the position, but an educational leadership position may appear differently depending on the educational organization. In an educational leadership preparatory program, participants learn general practices that apply to multiple levels of school leadership, but as aspiring leaders consider the position, it is important for them to understand effective leadership practices to maximize teacher performance, and in turn, improve student achievement. However, aspiring and newly hired principals and assistant principals may not receive leadership training needed to successfully perform the required job duties.

The evolving changes in education require the adjustment of practices in order to meet the growing needs of administration, teachers, and students. While most current schools have more than one administrator, the principal is the one who casts the vision of the school, so he or she has the greatest impact on the organization. Some teachers see the need for change, but other teachers are more resistant to change from their consistent practices. To improve educational practice, transformational leadership uses motivating factors to change teacher attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. Building these strong leadership traits in school leaders may increase their impact on teachers and students. Teachers who display OCB may have a more profound impact on

students. It may be the goal of a school transformational leader to increase the OCB within his or her faculty, so it would be necessary to understand the motivating factors of a teacher's OCB. An educational organization could use the knowledge of Citizenship Motives to guide the transformational practices of its school leaders to increase the success of teachers and students.

As educational leader preparation programs begin training future educational leaders, it is important that they understand a school leader's transformational impact. Similar research has been conducted in private business but not in public education. However, educational studies have respectively covered the impact of transformational leadership and OCB. This study seeks to bridge the gap between business organizational management concepts and education organizational management practices. Through this study, key leadership characteristics were identified to guide future training for educational leaders as they begin molding their practices to have the greatest impact as a school principal. Since many principals enter their position after spending time as an assistant principal, both roles need to be considered when implementing training for school leaders.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between teacher perception of principal's transformational leadership, teacher Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), and OCB Citizenship Motives. By examining the teacher perceptions of principal leadership, this research sought to add to leadership development for future educational leaders.

Significance of Study

Research has been conducted relating transformational leadership to the OCB and Citizenship Motives in the business sector, but few studies have conducted similar research in

the educational field. As challenges arise in educational reform, it is the role of the school leader to establish themselves as the agent of change. The impact of transformational leadership on the school leader's practices may increase the citizenship motivation among teachers. This study sought to examine the teacher's perception of the principal's transformational leadership in comparison to the teacher's OCB and Citizenship Motives. The results of this study are intended to lead to the improvement of preparation programs' consideration of leadership training. By improving the training of the school leaders, which in turn may have a greater impact on teacher OCB and Citizenship Motives.

Research Questions

This study surveyed currently employed teachers of a suburban Georgia school district. Participants were asked to measure three separate items to include their perceptions of their principal's transformational leadership skills, their OCBs, and their Citizenship Motives. The researcher sought to answer the following overarching question: Which of the seven dimensions of transformational leadership (i.e., vision, model, goals, expectations, support, stimulation, and reward) relate to teacher OCB and Citizenship Motives (i.e., concern, values, impression)? The following sub-questions were utilized:

1. To what degree do teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motives differ across school levels?
2. To what degree do teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motives differ between teacher's principal hiring status?
3. To what degree do teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motive scores correlate with teacher's years of experience?

Procedures

The study was conducted in a suburban Georgia school district with 1701 teachers across 18 elementary schools, eight middle schools, and five high schools. After approval from both Georgia Southern University Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the school district office, a questionnaire was distributed to teachers via email. Due to the availability of the teachers in the specific school district, a convenience sample was utilized to collect data (Creswell, 2014), as a convenience sample looks to gather information by creating groups for further data analysis and in the case of this study, all three school levels. The researcher sent the questionnaire to each school principal, and each principal forwarded the questionnaire to teachers who had the opportunity to complete the questionnaire. To calculate the response rate, the number of participants was divided by the total population of 1701 teachers (Fowler, 2009). The researcher sought a 30% response rate. A recent study found the average response rate for online empirical studies was 34.2% (Poynton et al., 2019) when educational researchers provided strategies to increase response rates. Teachers had the opportunity to participate for four weeks, and an email reminder was sent after the second week to increase response rate as well as prior to the close of the questionnaire in the final week.

The instrument for this study was a combination of three already existing instruments: Transformational Leadership Inventory (TLI; Podsakoff et al., 1990), Organizational Citizenship Behavior for Schools (OCBSS; DiPaola & Hoy, 2005), and Citizenship Motive Scale (CMS; Rioux & Penner, 2001). The TLI and CMS required appropriate adjustment to relate to the educational setting and were shortened according to each instrument's factor analysis. All items from the questionnaire were based on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly

Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree). A copy of this instrument is located in Appendix A.

To assist participants, the TLI was changed in the beginning narrative to specify the principal as the leader, so the teachers answered each item in reference to their perception of the leadership characteristic of their principal. The TLI consisted of seven total dimensions. The first six transformational leadership dimensions were articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model, fostering the acceptance of group goals, maintaining high performance expectations, providing individualized support, and engaging in intellectual stimulation. The seventh dimension, continuous reward, is a factor measuring transactional leadership. This dimension was included because we were considering transformational leadership as a complimentary relationship between the two forms of leadership. Each dimension had three to five items for a total of 28 items; however, each dimension of the TLI only used three items per dimension. A more detailed explanation of this process can be found in chapter three. The dimensions that had more than three items were calculated using the three strongest items per factor. The TLI showed a consistent reliability (.90; Podsakoff et al., 1996) and consistent validity across several studies (Connell, 2005; Podsakoff et al. 1990; Podsakoff et al. 1996; Podsakoff et al. 2001). Occasionally, studies will combine three dimensions (articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model, and fostering the acceptance of group goals) due to their high correlation and referenced as the *core* transformational leadership construct (Connell, 2005; Podsakoff et al., 1990), but for this study, the full seven, independent dimensions were used and scored using the three assigned items.

The original OCBSS was created by DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) and later shortened by DiPaola and Hoy (2005) to 12 items, which provided a strong reliability (.87) and

validity to the OCBSS. The original OCBSS used the teacher's perceptions of the school behaviors in reference to OCB in the school setting. The original scale used the sum of all items per participant for a single score, and all individual scores were averaged to obtain a school score (DiPaola, 2020). For this study, the individual teacher reflected upon their own practices as they completed the OCBSS. With this change, one item in the OCBSS was not applicable, so it was omitted from the instrument. One single OCBSS score was created by averaging all of the items.

Rioux and Penner (2001) created the CMS to determine what needs are met by people choosing to engage in OCB. The original 30 item scale measured three dimensions to include prosocial values, organizational commitment, and impression management. Each of the dimensions had 10 items, but for this study, the five weakest items per dimension according to Rioux and Penner's (2001) factor analysis were omitted to shorten the overall instrument. To score the CMS, each dimension of the CMS utilized the sum of their perspective five items. The CMS had a strong test-retest reliability for each of the dimensions ($\alpha \geq .90$; Bowler et al., 2009; Rioux & Penner, 2001).

Qualtrics ©, an online system was used to collect all data and keep participant responses confidential. A participant had the opportunity to complete the questionnaire via a computer or mobile device. The questionnaire was separated into four blocks: TLI, OCBSS, CMS, and demographic data. Blocks for the TLI, OCBSS, and CMS contained brief instructions for that block and a matrix of items with the Likert scale. The final block for demographic data contained multiple choice and slider questions. Sliders ensured that numerical values were inputted for questions requiring numerical values (e.g., years with principal, years of experience).

To answer the overarching research question, four multiple regressions were used to find

a correlation and prediction model. The OCBSS and three CMS variables were the dependent variables using the seven variables from the TLI to serve as the independent variables for each equation. There are three sub-questions using demographic data. First, to answer the question about the degree to which teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motives differ across school levels, a one-way ANOVA examined the three distinct school levels to identify differences in group means across the variables of the OCBSS and the CMS. Secondly, in order to answer the question pertaining to what degree teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motives differ between teacher's principal hiring status, a two-way sample t-test identified the group means of the variables from the OCBSS and the CMS. Finally, the third sub-questions examining the degree to which teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motive scores correlated with years of experience, a multiple regression compared years of experience and the group mean variables of the OCBSS and the CMS. Results from the correlational analyses were presented through tables and charts. The importance of the overarching and these three sub-questions provides further insight to the differences between teacher perceptions of principal's transformational leadership.

Survey data were inputted into Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for data analysis. A multiple regression analysis determined the correlation between all 11 factors. This identified any statistical relationships between a teacher's perception of transformational leadership characteristics, a teacher's OCB, and a teacher's OCB Motives. If a strong correlation existed, one may be able to determine the specific transformational leadership characteristics that lead to more OCBs or have an effect on OCB Motives. In addition, an ANOVA, t-tests, and Pearson Correlations determined additional relationships based on the demographic data.

Definition of Key Terms

School Level – The distinction between elementary, middle, and high schools. In the district of the study, elementary schools are prekindergarten through fifth grade, middle schools are sixth through eighth grade, and high schools host ninth through twelfth grade (Columbia County School District, 2019).

Preparation Programs – The series of classes taught, often by higher educational institutions, to certify and prepare individuals to enter educational administration. The purpose of this program is to meet the transitional needs and struggles found in the initial appointment of an administrator (Armstrong, 2015).

Transformational Leadership – “Style of leadership that transforms follower attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors to a higher realm of motivation where the leader inspires followers to be motivated to rise above and beyond current levels of achievement and performance to even higher levels of achievement and performance” (Anderson, 2017, p. 3)

Organizational Citizenship Behavior – Organ describes these behaviors as completed beyond the job requirements that benefit the organization or its members (Lemmon & Wayne, 2015).

Citizenship Motives – The reasoning factors that motivate a person towards positive organizational citizenship behavior. These factors display an understanding on why the person is acting for the betterment of the organization (Rioux & Penner, 2001).

Chapter Summary

It is important that the principal possess transformational leadership characteristics in order to meet the ever-changing demands of education. However, not all principals are trained in transformational leadership. With the changes that occur in education, teachers are required to

change their practices for improvement and to meet state and district guidelines. This often refers to going beyond the contractual roles and responsibilities. The display of this Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) puts the betterment of the students and the school at the center of their actions.

There is a need for school districts and educational leadership preparation programs to examine effective practices for the improvement of educational leaders. In addition, it is important to have leadership preparatory programs in place to build these effective leadership characteristics and practices in aspiring educational leaders, including both principals and assistant principals. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between teacher perceptions of principal's transformational leadership, teacher OCB, and OCB Citizenship Motives. If principals utilize these practices, they may make more informed decisions to improve the school climate. This study sought to bridge the gap and contributed to the research pertaining to the motivation of educational professionals. When changes occur in education, it is important for the principal to understand the motivation and OCB of his or her faculty. With the results of this study, school districts and educational leadership preparation programs may be able to provide more specific training to aspiring and current principals to implement effective practices to maximize teacher performance.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

When working, one can identify employees that put their entire heart, soul, and mind into not only their work but their organization. Since the 1990s, leadership has been fascinated by the idea of transformational leadership and its people-center approach as a motivation tool. Businesses and researchers have conducted studies in many countries and industries to see how leadership can motivate employees who desire to see individuals and their organization succeed. School principals parallel other business leaders, for a school often functions as a business. It is important to examine the literature for practices that examine transformational leadership, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and OCB Citizenship Motives in both the educational and business arena. The significance of this study is to better understand the transformational leadership practices of school administration in reference to OCB and OCB Citizenship Motives.

In the process of researching previous studies, online databases and search engines were used to search through material for any research pertaining to this study. Most of the studies used were through databases online at Zach S. Henderson Library at Georgia Southern University. Key words such as burnout, job satisfaction, school climate, teacher motivation, organizational leadership, transformational leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, citizenship motives, and the effects of leadership were utilized. Once a reliable study was found, the references were examined to find related articles.

Transformational leadership served as the theoretical framework for this study based on the work of Burns (1978). However, it was not until the work of Bass and Avolio (1990) that a measurement was created to determine differences between transactional and transformational

leadership. Based upon that instrument, Podsakoff et al.'s (1990) empirical study created a new transformational leadership instrument the Transformational Leadership Behavior Inventory (TLI). This work connected transformational leadership to OCB. It is also important to further examine other factors that connect educational leadership and teacher behavior by discussing school climate, teacher motivation, and the effects of leadership on job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

The OCB theory originates with Organ's (1988) five factors of OCB. Podsakoff et al. (1990) incorporated the five factors and reorganized them into a two-factor system: the betterment of an individual and the betterment of the organization. As the instrument was not relevant to the education setting, DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001), later revised by DiPaola et al. (2005), created the OCB version for the school setting. The researchers found that in the education setting, the betterment of the individual is simultaneously the betterment of the organization, so their scale is only one factor for an overall OCB rating.

In the Penner et al. (1997) research, the researchers created a model for the motives leading to OCB. Additionally, in Rioux and Penner's (2001) study, the researchers created the Citizenship Motive Scale. The 30-item scale factors into three dimensions: Prosocial Values, Organizational Concern, and Impression Management. Other works in these two sections provide more information regarding OCB and OCB motives. Through research presented in this section, studies display a variety of research methods to show this connection. While job satisfaction is a direct predictor of OCB, differing studies argue whether or not organizational commitment is a predictor of OCB.

School Administration

While each school's leadership is different, it is important to compare the roles of principal and assistant principal. In conjunction with examining their roles, it is pertinent to additionally explore the training received from both university preparation programs and school districts.

The Role of Principal Compared to the Assistant Principal

As the leader of the school, the role of the principal has been researched for many years. In 1972, Greenfield (1985a) began a case study of fourteen aspiring principals. He interviewed each participant on a two-year interval to capture their journey through the promotion to becoming principal. Through this research, Greenfield (1985a) found that candidates who had the most training for the position had the best transition into a leadership role; however, participants still documented that the experience required a different way of thinking that one cannot understand until they are in that specified role. All fourteen of the participants had different experiences. For example, one participant even documented her experience as "traumatic" (Greenfield, 1985a, p.41). In a later study, Greenfield (1985b) discussed that a principal's success in one school does not guarantee success in another school.

The role of the assistant principal has been vastly understudied (Militello et al., 2015). In an ideal administration, the principal and assistant principal(s) work as a unit. Thus, they should share the same vision and ideals. This ideal world is not always the case, so this section focuses on the different leadership roles, which might be a struggle for the assistant principal, and the need to prepare for the principalship. According to Militello et al. (2015), the assistant principal position contains a diverse selection of responsibilities and often is required to play the

“whatever necessary” role of the administration (p. 197). These roles often consist of evaluations, attendance, and pupil management while showing leadership abilities to the faculty. To survey the participants, the researchers used the Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) developed by Marzano et al. (2005). This instrument identified 21 responsibilities of successful and effective school leaders. Militello et al. (2015) used a Q-methodology, which they defined as “a useful social science research tool, as it provides data on subjects’ perceptions. While social science studies of phenomena can be reported in highly subjective manners, Q-methodology allows researchers to quantify subjectivity” (p. 201). Fifty-six assistant principals received a set of 21 statements where each statement depicted an element of the McREL leadership responsibilities. The first time the assistant principals sorted them, they were required to sort them according to their desired or idealized duties. The second time the participants sorted the statements they sorted them based on their actual duties performed. In the results, the participants believed their role should be centered on Goal-Oriented Leadership, Instructional-Focused Management, and Culture-Generating Leadership. Instead their duties required them to focus on Rational Education Management, Learning Outcomes-Focused Leadership, and Relationship-Centered Leadership. While all 21 factors of the McREL are vital to any organization, the assistant principals desired to be more a part of a transformational leadership style. This study is valuable in that while the vision begins with the principal, much consideration needs to be taken that the assistant principal desires to be a transformational leader alongside the principal. Thus, there is a need for transformational leadership among both positions.

In their research, Schulz et al. (2016) asserted that there is a growing need for qualified

principals as the number of public schools continue to increase. Their study sought to determine if the assistant principal position adequately prepares the candidate for the principalship. Over 800 principals and assistant principals in South Texas completed Kriekard's (1985) competencies questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale, which examines the six core competencies of principals: management of the school, leadership in staff personnel, community relations, instructional leadership, student activities, and pupil personnel. While the principals scored higher on all six competencies, the differentials are important to note. The researchers reported a three-point differential in the mean on instructional leadership, student activities, and community relations. The smaller margin of difference came in the leadership of staff personnel, management of schools, and pupil personnel. The smaller differentials are easy to understand because most of assistant principal's managerial duties are categorized in these last three competencies. From this study, it is understandable that the assistant principal's competencies are not as high as the principal, so the results show where school administration, in combination with other professional learning opportunities, can build these competencies in assistant principals. One way of building the instructional leadership, student activities, and community relations competencies is through standard leadership training and outlets for both principals and assistant principals to utilize and grow those leadership abilities.

Preparation Programs and Professional Development

It is apparent that assistant principals can use more leadership training according to Schulz et al. (2016). The principal could also use further professional development, but these skills could also come from reviewing the curriculum of educational leadership preparatory programs. Much research has been completed on the effects of preparatory programs as well as

professional development. Some research calls for more conjunctive educational experiences that prepare school administrators and follow them through their career.

Allen and Weaver (2014) utilized a quantitative study to investigate professional development needs of assistant principals across the Northern Kentucky regions. Sixty-six assistant principals completed the survey, where they ranked 31 leadership statements using the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards using a 5-point Likert scale. Initially in the survey, participants ranked the 31 statements based on the importance of the task. Like the Militello et al. (2015) research, assistant principals were to rank the statements based as actually performed as the participants followed their initial ranking with a new ranking based on the actual performance or proficiency. A Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test, with an alpha level of significance of 0.05, resulted in a significant difference on all 31 items. On all 31 items the importance of the item was found to be higher than the proficiency of the item. Thus, the average assistant principal in northern Kentucky believed he or she is underperforming. The researchers were looking for the professional needs of the area, for their desire was to form a network of assistant principals as a professional development community to train each other. While most of the statements in the survey related to the managerial roles of assistant principals, a number of the statements pertained to the leadership skills of a principal. In the closing remarks, the researchers stated how useful the survey is in developing the skills of mostly managerial items. This research also highlighted the need for more leadership training. As all school administrators utilized proper leadership skills, they became more proficient at managing people but, more importantly, at leading people.

The work of Peters et al. (2016) looked deeper into the needs of assistant principals as

well. They took the idea where the assistant principal is typically a school administrator's first appointment as they enter formal educational leadership. The researchers collected a convenience sample of assistant principals in Alabama to create a focus group. During their interview, participants shared their roles as assistant principals and their perception on how well they were trained to take on the role of the principal. After analysis of the responses, four themes emerged to include gaps in knowledge, emotional challenges, real life application, and the need for mentoring. When investigating deeper into the gaps of knowledge, the researchers found that the knowledge missing pertained to the managerial roles of an assistant principal such as technology implementation, program management, and school finance fidelity, which are generally built through exposure and experience. Considering the roles of assistant principals, their positions are often associated with pupil and personnel management. While this may include positive interactions, the emotional drain of the negative interactions was noted by multiple participants. The participants highlighted a lack of application from the classroom into the workforce. However, the participants understood that it is impossible to train specifically for the position of assistant principals due to the different make-ups of schools and school districts. Lastly, the participants noted the need for more support once they entered the position, especially managing relationships and this is important because it directly ties into the leadership component of assistant principals. As assistant principals become leaders in their building, it is important for them to obtain proper leadership training to be effective within the school environment.

Research has been conducted on professional programs to assist principals as well. Taylor-Backor and Gordon (2015) conducted a qualitative study where they interviewed five

education professors, five principals, and five teacher leaders. These participants were nominated by an expert panel of professionals and practitioners. During the interviews, participants answered questions regarding their belief in programs truly preparing the principal as an instructional leader. In all three groups of interviewees, the researchers found eight commonalities across three stations of the preparation process. To begin the process, the groups believed that programs needed a stout screening protocol. Through the screening process, interviews, written exercises, leadership experience, and leadership exercise allows the program to exclude those who do not meet the requirements of the program. Once in the program, a three-tiered system of preparation should occur. At the core, leaders should first fully understand the function of the role of principal versus assistant principal, which most programs excel. In the next tier, leader candidates use their understanding of the role to build their own dispositions, knowledge, and skills. These understandings allow for the third tier of teaching and learning strategies combined with field experiences. During these three tiers, leaders build the tools necessary for becoming an educational leader; unfortunately, this is where most programs fail. The last station is the most important, but difficult for universities. The induction process of the educational leader provides an opportunity for universities and districts to work together in continual support of the new educational leader. In their closing thoughts, the researchers stated that “although leadership for the improvement of instruction should include teachers, it begins with the school principal as the leader of leaders” (p. 123). School administrators do need that call for leadership, but even through Taylor-Backor and Gordon’s (2015) research, the participants never discussed leadership training. During the screening process, the participants stated they needed to look at applicant’s leadership potential before selecting principal

candidates, but there should be continuing development of educational leaders' leadership skills.

In Johnson's (2016) quantitative study, he examined the role of principals and assistant principals, and their knowledge gained from a university educational leadership preparation program. This study provided feedback for those in higher education looking to improve their program. Johnson surveyed 64 principals and assistant principals. He designed and used a 25-item survey, which was vetted for validity by educational experts. On the survey, three sections allowed participants to give demographic data, give their perceptions regarding their university preparation program using a 5-point Likert scale, and provide open-ended questions as insights to skills used and unused as well as their perceptions of overall preparation, five school administrative roles (school finance, human resources, data analysis, school law, school leadership), and the participant's learning experiences. The findings of this study displayed that "university preparation programs effectively readied them for administrative roles" (p. 13). A number of participants did state that university programs did not prepare them well in school finance, budgeting, data analysis, and human resources. According to 92% of participants, job-embedded learning experiences were the most meaningful portions of the preparation programs. In addition, the participants received their certifications from 24 different universities across 10 states. Of the participants, 92% agreed on job-embedded experiences were key, one may easily see how the on the job training is vital in meeting the needs of school administrators as they tackle their evolving roles.

Not all research examining educational leadership preparation programs focus on the managerial skills of school administrators. Quin et al. (2016) research regarding transformational leadership and its relationship to high and low performing schools, noted a struggle in increasing

student achievement, which begins with leadership. Ten school districts from Southwest Mississippi chose to participate in the study. To gain school performance scores, student scores on state assessments were combined using a Quality Distribution Index (QDI). The Mississippi Department of Education used the QDI to categorize the schools into seven accountability labels to include Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At Risk of Failing, and Failing. If a school is labeled as Low Performing, At Risk of Failing, or Failing, then the school is considered as an underperforming school. Ninety-two teachers, chosen randomly, across elementary, middle, and high participated by completing the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) by Kouzes and Posner (2003) based on their perceptions of their principal's leadership style, which measure five items to include modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging the process, enabling others to act, and encouraging the heart. Findings indicated "principals in high performing schools utilize all five transformational leadership practices more regularly and effectively than leaders in low performing institutions" (p. 79). Low performing school leaders displayed a need for all five transformational leadership practices; however, the greatest need was improving practice in inspiring a shared vision and challenging the process. Additionally, the purpose of this study was to provide university preparation programs with research showing the need to implement more leadership training into their curriculum, as they believed that the establishment of a strong transformational leader could lead to a high performing school.

Theoretical Framework: Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership was chosen as the theoretical framework for this study. The purpose of this study was to improve the practices of school leaders, so transformational

leadership is the framework for such improvements. A school leader's leadership impacts, whether directly or indirectly, the entire school building. For the purpose of this study, Transformational Leadership is defined as, "Style of leadership that transforms follower attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors to a higher realm of motivation where the leader inspires followers to be motivated to rise above and beyond current levels of achievement and performance to even higher levels of achievement and performance" (Anderson, 2017, p. 3). Through transformational leadership, a school leader has the opportunity to inspire and motivate teachers to improve achievement and performance.

Studies demonstrated connections between transformational leadership and OCB. Podsakoff and colleagues (1990) created the Transformational Leadership Inventory (TLI) as an alternative to the MLQ. The survey brought forth six factors of measurement: High Performance Expectations, Individualized Support, Intellectual Stimulation, Articulating a Vision, Providing an Appropriate Model, and Fostering the Acceptance of Group Goals. These factors significantly support a relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and Organ's (1988) five OCB dimensions. However, it is important to note the transformational behaviors only indirectly impacted OCBs. The research explained that "transformational leader behaviors influenced both employee trust and satisfaction" (p. 135), as it was the employees' trust that influenced the OCBs. Transactional leadership, which is the interaction process between leaders and followers where leaders reward employees based on achieving levels of effort and performance, did directly influence OCB, and Podsakoff and colleagues conveyed that the direct relation of transactional behaviors is due to the "nature of the behaviors themselves" (p. 135). Transactional leadership used rewards as the motivating factor, and transformational leadership sought to

change intrinsic motivating factors, such as attitudes and beliefs. Thus, the researchers placed an emphasis on the importance of distinguishing between transformational and transactional leader behaviors. Hamstra et al. (2014) separated the transformational and transactional leadership as they examined employee achievement goals. The transformational leader uses his or her influence on their organization by communicating an idealistic vision for the future, recognizing individual needs and abilities, and stimulating their intellectual ability. Furthermore, the transactional leader specifies that individual rewards are contingent on the individual's performance and achievements (Hamstra et al., 2014). Ranging from age 17 to 62, 449 participants represented 120 organizations spread throughout different industries (e.g., finance, informational technology, food service, health care, education) with up to 39 years of experience in their field. Volunteering participants completed a modified Dutch version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1995) and the revised Achievement Goal Questionnaire (AGQ-R). In addition, the researchers adapted the AGQ-R to fit the job context they were researching by focusing on the approach goals for their applicability to organizational practices. The AGQ-R factored into two items: performance goals and mastery goals. As they hypothesized, transformational leadership positively related to endorsement of mastery goals, and transactional leadership positively related to endorsement of performance goals. While this research was conducted outside the field of United States education, it reveals great information as it pertains to the development of strong educational leaders in American schools.

Rodrigues and Ferreira (2015) examined the differences in transformational and transactional leadership behaviors as they related to the OCB of food industry workers in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The convenience sample of 213 participants completed the Portuguese version of

the MLQ and the OCB Scale developed by Porto and Tamayo (2003). Porto and Tamayo's (2003) scale was divided into five factors: creative suggestions to the system, protection to the system, creation of a climate favorable to the organization in the external environment, self-training, and cooperation. A multiple regression analysis identified that transactional leadership style positively predicted the creation of a climate favorable to the organization in the external environment. This is explained by a subordinate's motivation of either the leader's promises or negative rejections as well as disciplinary actions. Transformational Leadership indicators positively and strongly predicted all four of the other Porto and Tamayo's (2003) OCB indicators. Rodrigues and Ferreira's final thoughts are to better train the food service supervisors based on the frameworks of transformational leadership. They see the importance of improving leadership in order to improve subordinates' OCB. This is also true for P-12 education in that, as you improve the leadership skills of the principal, the teachers OCB may also better the organization.

One key to a transformational leader is the ability to relate and understand others. Berkovich and Eyal (2017) studied principals' ability to recognize emotions of others. A random sample of 69 Israeli primary state schools participated. Principals and teachers participated on a voluntary basis, and all 69 principals had at least two years of administrative experience but averaged just over 11 years. The 639 teachers who participated averaged 9.5 years of experience, which is about seven years under the Israeli national average. The principals completed an emotion recognition video task, which was a seven-minute video of a principal and teacher in conversation, but only the teacher was in the frame of the camera. Broken into nine clips, the principal was asked to identify in writing the emotions displayed by the teacher in the clip. Two

independent judges reviewed each reporting and scored them based on similarity to the actual emotion represented. The researchers divided the teachers into two groups. The first group participated by completing a survey based on their perception of their principal's transformational leadership behaviors, and the second group completed a self-reporting survey, the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ), regarding the "emotional reframing" by their principal (Berkovich & Eyal, 2017, p. 322). This research found that the more principals display transformational leadership behavior, the more the principal is able to recognize the teachers' emotional reframing. In addition, the findings suggested a relation to the principal's ability to "identify emotions is linked to their tendency to adopt a supportive approach toward teachers" and a "leader's emotion recognition ability is positively related to transformational leadership behaviors" (p. 327). A principal who can reframe teacher emotions is vital in building a connection as a transformational leader.

Stein et al. (2016) examined 11 qualitative case studies that followed teachers under principals in an urban elementary setting. Each of the three principals held their own leadership style as either transactional, transformational, and laissez faire. Specifically, transactional and transformational leadership had "substantial influence on teacher leader efficacy" (p. 1022). In addition, each of these schools had high levels of stability that strengthened teacher leadership over time. The only commonality between transformational and laissez faire is a shared interest in teacher autonomy. In a model they constructed, the principal's leadership style directly influenced school culture, teacher leader's work, and teacher leader's understanding of their administrative role. In addition, school culture directly impacted teacher leader's work, but together with the inclusion of the teacher leader's personal characteristics lead to teacher leader

efficacy. This research is very useful in providing documentation for the positive influence of transformational leadership to school climate and teacher's willingness to improve their school culture.

An important factor in leadership is being able to “perceive emotion in oneself and others” or understand emotional intelligence (Jiang & Lu, 2020, p. 2). Jiang and Lu (2020) broke down emotional intelligence in their literature review to focus on empathy from the current research in psychology. Two common themes of communication and interpersonal relationships emerged as important factors in leadership theories as they related to empathy. Additionally, it is important for leaders to promote follower's awareness and importance of organizational values and goals, which bring the followers the ability to share in the vision of the organization (Jiang & Lu, 2020). While Jiang and Lu (2020) made a case for school administrators to consider empathy when making decisions in their school buildings, as the ability to read other's emotions during the communication can have “significant impacts on students, teachers, staff and stakeholders” (p. 12). Research such as Jiang and Lu (2020) provided insight to the decision-makings processes for transformational leaders and addresses the need to consider teacher emotions and the impact emotions have on teacher motivation.

Through the preliminary work of Burns (1978) and Bass (1985), transformational and transactional leadership has allowed researchers to examine more leader and follower interactions. Current research demonstrates that transformational leadership behaviors have a great impact on OCB and OCB related behaviors (Berkovich & Eyal, 2017; Jiang & Lu, 2020; Stein et al., 2016). When change is necessary, transformational leadership motivates individuals to raise their expectations and complete tasks for the advancement of the organization. In P-12

education, the betterment of the organization leads to the achievement of students.

School Climate

School climate is an impactful piece of school culture. Another important piece to school culture is school effectiveness, which is defined as “the degree to which the educational, organizational, and administrative goals of the school are achieved” (Ozgenel, 2020, p. 38), which is measured by The School Effectiveness Index. According to Ozgenel’s (2020) research, school climate is a predictor for school effectiveness. This research is impactful due to the behavioral aspect as transformational leadership and OCB are both behaviors that may impact school climate.

It is important for the educational leader to understand the impact of their leadership on school climate. Singh and Townsley (2020) recognized the shift in Georgia school leadership evaluation as previously, a large part of the evaluation was placed in standardized assessment scores, but now the evaluation has shifted to emphasize school climate. In their research, a strong correlation was found between leadership effectiveness and teacher perceptions of school climate and between teacher perceptions in school climate and employment engagement at all school levels. However, a positive correlation between leader effectiveness and employee engagement existed in elementary schools. Singh and Townsley (2020) charged leadership preparation programs to focus on building strong instructional leaders to increase leadership effectiveness. Furthermore, this research is important to understand the importance of school leadership as it relates to teacher perceptions of their principal’s leadership. A strong component of school climate is communication (Singh & Townsley, 2020), which can impact how much the teacher shares with their school leadership team.

Alqarni (2020) used the term organizational silence as the “withholding of potentially useful information or critical concerns that employees fail to share with their supervisors or those in positions of authority (p. 13). Through his quantitative study, a negative correlation was determined between supportive principal behavior and teacher organizational silence. Additionally, teachers under a principal who displays a more restrictive or directive behavior will maintain a higher organizational silence. Furthermore, as transformational leadership centers around being supportive of the followers, the supportive principal behavior will provide a functional opportunity for communication between teachers and principals, which is important (Alqarni, 2020).

Teacher Motivation

The school year can be long and taxing for teachers, but there are pieces that motivate teachers to come back year after year. School leaders are continuing to have issues keeping teachers in the profession, so Choing et al. (2017) examined why long-tenured teachers stay in the profession. According to the findings of their quantitative study, extrinsic benefits such as pay and holiday schedule were not important, but instead, altruistic and intrinsic motivators were highly important to longer-tenured teachers (Choing et al., 2017). Additionally, Choing et al. (2017) suggested that a longitudinal study would be useful in the future, so it is important to know that as educational leaders introduce new teachers to the career field, they will also need to build altruistic and intrinsic behaviors to increase the teacher’s motivation.

It is important for teachers to feel safe and supported in the school environment. Reaves and Cozzens (2018) examined the teachers’ perceptions of the school climate and work environment as it compared to the teachers’ motivation and self-efficacy. The quantitative study surveyed 204

sixth through twelfth grade teachers from West Tennessee school districts. The researchers used the Safe and Supportive School Questionnaire and the Attitude Toward Teaching Survey and found that there is a significant impact of school climate on teacher motivation and self-efficacy. Additionally, the researchers stated educational leaders must continue to focus on teacher motivation through the evolving changes by continuing to research, monitor, and improve programs that promote a positive school climate. It is important to note here that a link has been made from educational leadership and its effects on school climate, and this is impactful because of its connection from school climate to teacher motivation, which is a piece of OCB.

Without using school climate, Wasserman et al. (2016) studied the direct link between principal's leadership and teacher motivation. This quantitative study, surveyed 137 elementary and secondary teachers throughout the country of Israel. Furthermore, through their statistical analysis, the researchers found a positive correlation between a teacher's time spent actively devoted to work the more time the teacher was willing to devote that time to improving their classroom through special initiatives that related to teaching. The highest school principal characteristics, as scored by the teacher's perception, was the principal's ability to be a role model for others. Lastly, the researchers were able to conclude that the principal's leadership has a positive impact on teacher's perceptions of the teaching profession, which is important because the school leader can establish themselves as a role model and have an effect on teacher behavior leading to more participation in school-wide initiatives.

Effects of Leadership on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

The goal of leadership is to motivate employees beyond the norm and complete tasks that are not typically related to their role. Two antecedents that many believe lead to those OCBs are

job satisfaction and organizational commitment and research supports job satisfaction as a predictor for organizational commitment (Matheiu et al., 2016) . Unlike job satisfaction, research does not support organizational commitment as a direct influence on OCB (Moorman et al., 1991) even though organizational commitment is important due to its correlation to transformational leadership.

Dutta and Sahney (2015) explored principals' instructional and transformational leadership and its effect on school climate and job satisfaction. This quantitative study took place in the two Indian metropolitan cities of New Delhi and Kolkata. A total of 306 principals and 1,539 teachers participated across 306 schools. Four areas were measured as a result of this survey: principal leadership, job satisfaction, school climate, and student achievement. The researchers pulled 12 items from the Instructional Leadership Inventory (Alig-Mielcarek & Hoy, 2005). Transformational dimensions were tested by utilizing 12 items from Leithwood et al.'s (1999) leadership scale as well as nine items from Ostroff's (1992) scale were chosen to measure teacher job satisfaction. An additional 12 items were chosen from the Organizational Climate Index (Hoy et al., 2002). Dutta and Sahney's (2015) findings exhibited a lack of direct relationship between principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction. However, transformational leadership provided an indirect effect on teacher job satisfaction through the mediator of school climate. Physical environments, in reference to school climate, appeared to have dominated the role in connecting instructional leadership to the effects of teacher job satisfaction. While these are good things to consider, the findings are taken with question considering the differences between the Indian school settings and American settings. This information is useful in comparing other domestic literature with that of the international research community.

Matheiu et al. (2016) examined the Structural Turnover Intention Model, which includes supervisory behavior, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. A total of 763 employees, in an array of Canadian businesses, completed the surveys, which consisted of four separate measurement excerpts: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intentions, and supervisory behavior. As seen throughout multiple studies in this section, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire by Weiss et al. (1967) is used to measure job satisfaction. A modified version of Meyer et al. (1993) affective and normative commitment scales measured the employee's organizational commitment. Cammann et al. (1983) used the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire and established the employee's turnover intentions. Lastly, supervisory behavior used a leadership measure developed by Geringer et al. (2002). According to the researcher's results, job satisfaction did not predict the employee's turnover intentions. Instead, job satisfaction had a greater predictor value when leading to organizational commitment. This prediction held a negative prediction on turnover intentions, where commitment serves as a mediator between job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Further examination in supervisory roles relays an employee-oriented leadership style has a more positive relation to employee satisfaction over task-oriented leadership. Thus, this may support the use of transformational leadership as a possible predictor for OCB and its motives.

In 2014, Shaw and Newton completed a study to find an answer to Richard W. Riley's dilemma. Secretary Riley, Secretary of Education in 1994, announced that the need for two million teachers over the next decade. Education exceeded that goal by hiring 2.25 million teachers, but over the next decade American schools lost 2.7 million teachers. This does not include the teachers who started their careers in 2007 and 2008, for 10% to 12% of those

teachers left the profession. Shaw and Newton (2014) reported it takes three to seven years for a novice teacher to develop into a high-quality teacher (O'Rourke et al., 2008). A collection of 234 teachers completed the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2004) on their perception of the principal's leadership and the Organizational Leadership Assessment, which measured job satisfaction (Laub, 1999). Teachers also responded with their intentions on staying or leaving the school. Results of the study showed a strong correlation between the principal's level of servant leadership and the teacher's job satisfaction. The research is useful because it showed how school systems can train principals in improving school climate. Likewise, the study confirmed that due to the servant leadership of the principal, teachers will stay at their current school. As baby boomers continue to retire, more and more teaching positions open as there is not only a need for teachers, but there is also a need for principals with servant leadership to retain good teachers in the profession, and a connection exists between servant leadership and transformational leadership. Thus, this provides another connection between transformational leadership and teacher job satisfaction

Thibodeaux et al. (2015) examined the connection between principal leadership behaviors and teachers' intent to remain in the profession. However, they also considered the effects high-stakes testing has on the situation. Their mixed-method study focused on K-12 teachers in a southern state, which could make a difference because there is more than likely not a teacher's union to assist in job satisfaction or retention. Furthermore, a convenience sample of teachers were selected to participate and represented all three levels of K-12 schooling and both state-measured subject areas and non-state-measured subject areas were included in the sample. The 212 teachers participated by completing the Teacher Retention Survey Instrument.

Additionally, the qualitative portion of the study included sections on principal leadership behaviors, teacher intention, teacher job satisfaction, teacher mentoring, and intrinsic motivators. At the end of the survey, five open-ended questions regarding their reasons for entering, remaining in, and/or leaving the teaching profession were posed. In the findings of Thibodeaux et al. (2015), teachers who taught state-measured courses received the most pressure to increase student scores on the high-stakes test from the administration. According to the findings while considering teacher job satisfaction, teachers are leaving the profession the quickest due to the pressures of high-stakes testing. When comparing the factors of teacher retention, the leadership from the principal tended to convince teachers to remain in the profession. On the contrary, teacher mentoring and job satisfaction had the least impact of teacher retention. As a leader in this situation, it is important to use leadership skills to transform teacher outlooks on high-stakes testing, especially since many states are requiring less mandated standardized testing.

Okan and Akyüz (2015) researched the impact of ethical leadership behavior on employee's intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction of academic and administrative staff at a Turkish university. They also examined the possibility of utilizing loyalty to the supervisor as a mediator in this relationship. While this does not fit the current interest of P-12 research, there is a connection to leadership and job satisfaction. Three separate instruments were used in compiling the measurements of this survey. Initially, questions were pulled from Brown et al.'s (2005) measurement of ethical leadership. To measure the loyalty to supervisor, the researchers used the scale from Chen et al. (2002), which examined the dedication to supervisor, extra effort for supervisor, attachment to supervisor, identification with supervisor, and internalization of supervisor's values. Additionally, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ; Weiss et al.,

1967) measured intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and overall job satisfaction. During data analysis, both an Exploratory Factor Analysis and Confirmatory Factor Analysis were used to verify the validity of the scales. Their findings, through mediation analysis, suggested that ethical leadership directly effects loyalty to supervisor, which increases job satisfaction. Thus, a part of the relationship from ethical leadership to job satisfaction is based on the employee's loyalty to the supervisor.

Yang (2016) assessed six alternative models relating mediators of leadership trust and change commitment in Taiwan. The Direct Effects Model (Podsakoff et al., 1990) represents a baseline for comparison and includes three direct influences on job satisfaction without the involvement of the two mediators. Secondly, the Simple Mediator Model (Braun et al., 2013) displays leadership trust as a facilitator between the leader's integrity and the acceptance of the leader's influence within the workplace. The Single-Step Multiple Mediator Model showed that there is a lack of relationship between the mediators of trust and commitment, and leadership only influences job satisfaction through one of the two mediators. Next, the Proximal-Distal Mediator Model (Neves & Caetano, 2009) is based on the influence of leadership trust having a positive influence on satisfaction and commitment. Yang's (2016) Model 6, which derived from Neves and Caetano (2009), denoted leadership impacts job satisfaction through change commitment, the Proximal Mediator Model, then through leadership trust, the Distal Mediator Model. Model 5 based on Zhu et al. (2013) predicted that "trust may mediate the relationship between leadership and commitment" (Yang, 2016, p. 158). To test the models, 341 surveys were completed by employees from four major Taiwanese insurance companies. The instruments used were Podsakoff et al.'s (1990) TLI and six-item leadership trust scale, Herscovich and

Meyer's (2002) Change Commitment Scale, and Weiss et al.'s (1967) Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. A chi square test examined the models, and an additional multiple mediation procedure examined Model 2. All six models demonstrated a sufficient structural fit. Overall, the meta-analytic studies demonstrated the use of effective leadership directly effects job satisfaction. Yang (2016) implied that different models are suitable for different organizational structures. However, Model 5, the idea of trust mediating leadership and commitment, is appropriate for service industries and in education it is applicable as school administrators and teachers provide services to students, parents, and the community. Thus, it is important for teachers to trust the principal, which predicts teacher job satisfaction.

Transformational leadership can provide the employee-oriented leadership (Mathieu et al., 2015) needed for employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This is the purpose of Malik et al. (2017) study as the researchers examined transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as portrayed in the banking sector. Staff at five Islamic banks completed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 2000). Job satisfaction was measured through a scale developed by Brayfield (1951), and a scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1997) to measure commitment. Their findings resulted in perceived transformational leadership having a significant impact on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Their reasoning is due to the favorable interpersonal supervisor-subordinate relationship. However, the researchers claimed that banking leaders do not demonstrate strong transformational leadership skills as a whole. Thus, they are planning to use this research to boost the leadership training of banking supervisors. This research is useful in making another connection between transformational leadership and job satisfaction, which is a predictor of

OCB.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Podsakoff et al. (1996) studied the effects of transformational leadership behaviors and substitutes for leadership. Using material gathered from other research, they noticed that a set of substitutes for leadership variables were used in reference to many leadership styles except transformational leadership. The researchers sought to examine these substitutes towards the set of transformational leadership behaviors. Surveys were issued to 1,539 employees and matching performance data from 1,200 managers were examined. The majority of the participants held white collar, managerial, and professional positions. The survey's predictor variables consisted of Podsakoff et al's (1990) TLI transformation behaviors and Kerr and Jermier's (1978) 13 substitutes were measured by Podsakoff et al's (1993) 41-item scale. The researchers used the 20-item Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ; Weiss et al., 1967) to assess the criterion variables for general satisfaction, Porter et al's (1974) 15-item scale to assess the criterion variables for organizational strength, and Podsakoff's (1990) six-item scale to assess the criterion variables for trust in loyalty to the leader. As a result of this study, it is important for transformational leadership behaviors to be considered as antecedents of satisfaction, organizational commitment, and loyalty. While all behaviors demonstrated a correlation to the criterion variables, the behavior individualized support displayed an important determinant of employee's attitudes, role perceptions, and behaviors. This research is important with providing confirmation that the use of transformational leadership is vital to OCB.

Sahin's (2013) study examined teacher candidates in Turkey and their level of OCB as it relates to professional achievement and performance. The population targeted was undergraduate

students in southeastern Turkey. Podsakoff's OCB scale used seven dimensions to assess OCB. The seven dimensions are helping behavior, sportsmanship behavior, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and self-development. All seven virtues scored satisfactory, with civic virtue being the lowest mean score. Sahin defined civic virtue as one's "level of interest in the organization as a whole" (p. 76). After running an ANOVA, results suggested that students with high academic success showed more OCBs. The researchers discovered the connection between high performing students and high OCBs is the understanding of what it takes to complete a task with high detail. In addition, they noted that these teacher candidates are "promising in terms of improving schools' success by boosting teachers' OCB" (p. 83).

Also in Turkey, Yaylaci (2015) interviewed 95 participants to examine the rights and responsibilities of teachers and parents in terms of organizational citizenship. Of the 95 participants, 20 school administrators, 20 teachers, 15 parents, and 20 pre-service teachers participated in this study. The pre-service teachers were students who had already completed and passed their pedagogical examination. Using Organ's (1988) framework of good soldiers to active citizens, he noted that all stakeholders would only perform for the good and appropriateness of the organization's benefits. Once all interviews were completed, Yaylaci (2015) completed a content analysis and based on results, the researcher drew the conclusion that participant perceptions of organizational citizenship are heavily influenced by the societal citizenship style, especially the parent role. This research makes an important conclusion as schools seek more parental support, and they must realize the parents are only following the societal norm.

As DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) stated “within effective organizations employees often go beyond formal job responsibilities, performing nonmandatory tasks with no expectation of recognition or compensation” (p. 424), leading to examining the same idea in the K-12 setting. To do so, they constructed and confirmed a new measure using the OCB two-factor structure. To test the validity of the instrument, the researchers conducted two separate studies. The first study examined 664 teachers in 42 public schools in Ohio and Virginia based on a convenience sampling. Of the 42 schools, all three school levels (i.e., elementary, middle, and high) were represented, and all socio-economic categories were represented in the study. The second study used 1,210 teachers in 97 public high schools throughout Ohio. The researchers carefully selected schools to represent the diverse geographic areas, and again all socio-economic categories were represented. While Organ’s (1990) OCB scale measured five items and found citizenship behaviors directed towards helping an individual and citizenship behaviors performed in service of the organization were most often noted.

DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) adapted their instrument from Smith et al’s (1983) 16-item measure of OCB within the private sector. To create the new instrument, the researchers worked with three panels of 15 public educators to establish a 16-item survey using 16 corresponding statements. Then three panels of 12 public educators vetted each item on the instrument. After the field test in 18 public schools, five items were removed and four items were added to make a 15-item instrument, which created the Organization Citizenship Behavior in Schools Survey (OCBSS). This instrument asked teachers to rate the extent of OCBs as they observed the entire faculty from rarely occurs to very frequently occurs. Scores were summed and averaged by the total teachers in the individual school, which provided an individual school

score. After completion of both studies, the OCBSS revealed only one factor. This is because the “distinction between individuals and furthering the organization mission is blurred” (p. 442). Additionally, when a teacher is assisting an individual in the school setting, the teacher is also assisting the organization. To measure school climate, the researchers used the School Climate Index (SCI) developed by Hoy et al. (1998). Hoy et al.’s (1998) scale contained four dimensions: collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, academic press, and community pressure (DiPaola & Tshannen-Moran, 2001). The results suggested a significant connection between OCB and school climate. Furthermore, OCB was identified in the school setting along with their work in the development of the OCBSS. This study is helpful because it provides clarity under the former two factor OCB material and brings the understanding of a one factor system as it fits in public education. The OCBSS was utilized in measuring the OCBs among the teachers in comparison to the school administration’s transformational leadership in this current study.

In the fall of 2013, Burns and DiPaola examined the relationships between organizational justice, OCB, and their effects on student achievement. The concept of organizational justice is derived from Greenberg (1990) where employees are able to deem supervisors as fair, respectful, and/or equitable. Many teachers complain about not being treated fairly, so this measure could definitely relate to OCB and job satisfaction. To measure organizational justice, Burns and DiPaola (2013) used the Organizational Justice Scale (OJS) developed by Hoy and Tarter (2004), and the OCBSS is utilized to measure the OCB. However, rather than the 15-item OCBSS, Burns and DiPaola used the updated 12-item OCBSS (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005). The measurement of student achievement did not come from the teacher survey, but instead, the Virginia Standards of Learning yearly assessment provided the measurement for student mastery of content and skills.

Understanding the effects of socio-economic status on student achievement, the researchers used socio-economic status as a proxy for this study. Thirty-four high schools participated in the study by having their teachers complete the survey during a regularly called faculty meeting. As a result of this study, the research found a significant relationship between organizational justice and OCB, and OCB contained a positive and significant correlation to mean student achievement scores in Biology and English. However, no significant correlation between organizational justice and student achievement existed in the findings. The results of this study provide evidence of the growing idea that organizational justice is significantly related to OCB and OCBs positive effect on student achievement. Using this study provides support for the reasoning to prepare school administrators as transformational leaders.

A case has been built for the need to promote positive OCB from teachers within the schools as Burns and Dipaola (2013) provided the evidence of teacher OCB and the direct effect on student achievement. When school administrators become transformational leaders that encourage OCB, it may directly affect student achievement. Aspiring principals should be trained not only to lead teachers in OCB, but there is much consideration to what motivates teachers in participating in OCBs thus, warranting further research.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Citizenship Motives

The root of OCB Citizenship Motives, is housed in the work of Penner et al, (1997). Their study came from a stem of Grube and Piliavin's (2000) work stating that organizational social structure is what produces sustained volunteerism. The idea of sustained volunteerism begins with organizational commitment. The focus of this research was to create a positive organizational experience such that it increased volunteer's organizational commitment.

Additionally, the researchers disagreed with this model due to the reliance on role-identity theory, which is the connection to an organization and drive is solely based on the role you play in the organization. In some of Penner's earlier work (Penner & Finkelstein, 1996) their findings strongly suggested that role-identity mediated the impact of organizational commitment, but they did not directly measure role identity. From this, a conceptual model was established for the causes of OCB in a two-phase process. The initial phase established the factors that engage a worker in an intermediate OCB. These factors are Organizational Variables, Job Attitudes, Mood on the Job, Prosocial Orientation, and Motives for OCB; intermediate OCB is "a stable level of OCB that has been occurring for a relatively short period of time" (p. 127). Furthermore, these variables have not yet been correlated at the time of their study. As the second phase of role identity begins, the intermediate OCB phases out because the worker has established an identity within the organization.

These theories of the researchers created only a model, but the measures had yet to confirm the model until Rioux and Penner's (2001) work. Rioux and Penner (2001) sought to find an instrument, which measured the personal motives behind OCB. In referencing Penner et al.'s (1997) previous work, the researchers admitted there are differences and similarities between volunteerism and OCB. Similarities are that both are prosocial behaviors and occur within an organization. In addition, both prosocial behaviors are generally performed over an extended period of time. The creation of the Citizenship Motive Scale (CMS) originated with a set of 110 items regarding motives noted to support OCB. The researchers conducted a two-phase test on the scale using two separate groups. The first group of 616 undergraduates completed the CMS answering all 110 items on a six-point Likert scale. Since this first group

was the field test, the factor loading resulted in three factors based on 79 items, and then the items were reduced to 30. The first factor loaded was labeled Organizational Concern due to its desire for the organization to do well and for individuals to display pride and commitment to the organization. Secondly, participants displayed the need to be helpful and a desire to build positive relationships with others, which is why this factor was labeled Prosocial Values. The final OCB motive factor is Impression Management because participants were motivated to avoid a negative appearance to coworkers and supervisors. Additionally, Impression Management is where participants displayed their need to obtain rewards. The second sample of 176 undergraduate students were similar to the first group of students. All results of the second study confirmed that of the first study, so the researchers sought to test their measurement by an actual workforce. This study aimed to answer the theoretical questions regarding the significance between motives and OCB. Another study used 145 participants employed by a city government in Florida, with 13% completing only high school, 53% having some college experience, and the remaining 34% completing at least a bachelor's degree. Five different measures were used during this study: organizational justice, positive mood, prosocial personality battery, motives for OCBs, and OCB. Using previous literature, Rioux and Penner (2001) chose to assess Organizational Justice using Moorman's seven-item scale to measure procedural justice. Testing the positive mood of the employee, participants completed the Job Affect Scale. To understand the prosocial dispositions, the researchers used the Prosocial Personality Battery (PSB; Penner et al., 2001). In addition to their own CMS to test for motives of OCB, Rioux and Penner (2001) used Podsakoff and colleague's OCB questionnaire. However, they used the OCB questionnaire differently and not only did they target employees to take the OCB, but two of their peers and

supervisor also took the OCB in reference to the target employee. This allowed for each employee to obtain their own independent OCB rating. As a result, the CMS three-factor structure was stable and replicable. This study is important to the research because it only provides the instrumentation for research, but it presents three factors for consideration of OCB motives.

Lemmon and Wayne (2015) also examined the motivation behind OCB, but they chose to focus on two specific motives: egoism and altruism. They defined egoism in reference to satisfaction, or self-serving motives, one completes through an obligation in a helping behavior and altruism as “valuing the welfare of another person” (Lemmon & Wayne, 2015, p. 132). The participants in this study were employees of a large real estate company that owned, developed, and managed malls and other properties throughout the United States. The 399 employees and 200 supervisors who completed the survey all worked at the company headquarters. Nine different scales were used in the survey: Perceived Organizational Support (Eisenberger & Miller, 1987), P-O Fit (Chao et al., 1994), Leader-Member Exchange (Liden & Maslyn, 1998), Supervisor-Subordinate Similarity (Turban & Jones, 1988), Felt Obligation (Eisenberger et al., 2001), Altruistic Concern for the Organization (Rioux & Penner, 2001), Altruistic Concern for the Supervisor (Davis, 1994), OCB (Podsakoff et al., 1990), and Impression Management (Bolino, 1999). The OCB survey used two dimensions: the OCB in reference to the supervisor and the OCB in reference to the organization. Due to its explained variance in OCB, the Impression Management was used as a control variable. The researchers of this study examined the data using confirmatory factor analysis, common method variance, and a within and between analysis. Based on the relationship with the supervisor, the results suggested that a highly

regarded supervisor-subordinate relationship significantly influenced the employee's extra-role behavior. The OCB pertaining to the organization is heavily driven by identification and empathy for the organization, found in the Perceived Organizational Support and the Person-Organizational Fit. These feelings stem from the altruism for the organization. This research is useful in identifying the reason for OCB motives. Transformational leadership may provide that supervisor-subordinate interaction which applies the employee's extra-role behavior. In addition, the use of transformational leader behaviors may create the organizational bond for teachers to display an altruistic motive in the OCB.

In the field of parks and recreation, Huang et al. (2015) examined the growing workforce among those of age 55 and older. Using a purposive sampling approach, they surveyed full-time employees for municipal park and recreation agencies in the state of Illinois. A total of 627 participants from across multiple agencies completed the survey. Three separate scales were compiled to create the survey: the 20-item OCB of Niehoff and Moorman, which is derived from Podsakoff et al.'s (1990) OCB, the impression management motives from Rioux and Penner's (2001) CMS, and the Subjective Age measure (Kastenbaum et al., 1972). The five-item measurement used a Likert scale to measure the participant's perspective on feeling, look, perceptions of others, interest and activity. Researchers used a chi squared test to analyze the data and the research did not support any direct effects on the employees' age to prosocial motives. However, a partial mediation linked age to conscientiousness and sportsmanship, while a full mediation linked age to altruism, courtesy, and civic virtue. Both prosocial and impression management motives fully mediated the relationship between subjective age identity and OCBs. As a result of the study, the younger employee's focus was more on the impression management

due to their greater focus on the future, but the difference does not exist in the prosocial values. The use of this study does require one to consider the changes in education and the current issues it faces. As the baby boomers begin to retire, there are not enough teachers to refill those positions. Therefore, age is an interesting factor to consider when examining the motives of OCB and the teacher's reaction to transformational leadership.

Takeuchi et al. (2015) used Organ's (1997) definition of OCB to examine motives. They investigated all three of Rioux and Penner's (2001) OCB motives in reference to supervisor-subordinate relationships in Taiwanese financial institution. The researchers surveyed both supervisors and subordinates using their own respective surveys. Takeuchi et al.(2015) used an OCB measurement by Williams and Anderson (1991), which uses a seven-item scale for each OCB Individual (OCBI) and OCB Organizational (OCBO). In addition, they used the CMS from Rioux and Penner (2001). Their data analysis consisted of a confirmatory factor analysis with maximum-likelihood estimation and a chi squared test and the results displayed a clear understanding of how citizenship motives and OCBs are impacted differently depending on the cultural context. The researchers found that Prosocial Values motives predicted the OCBI, which was strengthened by Organizational Concern motives. Similarly, Organizational Concern easily predicted the OCBO strengthened by the Prosocial Values motives. When considering the Impression Management motives, these motives weakened the relationship between Prosocial Values and OCBI. However, these motives did not significantly affect the relationship between Organizational Concern and OCBO. Lastly, they found a three-way interaction between the CMS dimensions. The connection of between Prosocial Values and OCBI was stronger when Organizational Concern motives were high and Impression Management motives were low. A

strong relationship existed between Organizational Concern and OCBO when Prosocial Values and Impression Management motives were high, but a stronger relationship existed when Impression Management was low. Thus, as an employee displays less concern for their appearance, then the employee will show greater citizenship motives towards other individuals and the organization. This research is important when considering teachers as school administrators can consider this a part of their transformational leadership, for the less they care about their appearance, the more support and care is put into the faculty and staff as well as the school.

While it is important to make the connection between transformational leadership and OCB, the use of OCB motives provides the understanding of where teacher OCBs originate. Using the CMS in conjunction with the OCBSS, a measurement of OCBs compared the three dimensions of the CMS: Prosocial Values, Organizational Concern, and Impression Management (Rioux & Penner, 2001). Prosocial values contribute to the OCBs in reference to why the teacher desires the connection with colleagues, administration, and students. Teachers who use Organizational Concern are self-motivated teachers who see and understand the picture of the school. Lastly, a teacher with Impression Management is one that is more concerned with their positive appearance as it brings a hindrance to the organization.

Chapter Summary

The literature reviewed in this chapter provided an overview of school administration, transformational leadership, school climate, teacher motivation, effects of leadership on job satisfaction and organizational commitment, OCB, and OCB citizenship motives. The role of the principal and assistant principal as school leadership are important to school climate.

Specifically, a transformational school leader who supports and communicates with his or her faculty will increase teacher motivation and build a positive school climate. As teachers demonstrate altruistic and intrinsic behaviors, teachers were motivated and demonstrated more positive OCB. Additionally, school leadership practices also impacted teacher job satisfaction and organizational commitment. While both are important factors to school climate, they are not predictors of OCB. Through the literature, transformational leadership stands apart from transactional and laissez faire leadership. Connections have been made between transformational leadership and OCB. This connection has not been fully researched within the P-12 educational setting. In addition to making that connection, this study sought to fill the gap in relation to the motives of teachers to participate in OCB. Through research, an indirect connection has been made from transformational leadership to OCB motives. Transformational leadership has a positive effect on job satisfaction, and job satisfaction is a predictor of OCB. The motives are connected to OCB because the results of positive motives lead to OCB. However, the bulk of this research has been conducted in the business setting. Therefore, the hopes of this study were to see in the P-12 setting provides a direct connection between transformational leadership, OCB, and OCB motives.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Accountability for schools continues to increase resulting in school districts and post-secondary institutions seeking to improve their educational leadership programs for training P-12 school leaders, and they must find connections between leadership and teacher behavior. Evolving changes in P-12 education require school leaders to focus their transformational practices into keeping a positive school climate, attaining high student achievement, and focusing on high teacher Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and motivating factors. Based on the previous chapter's literature review, it is evident that there is a gap in the literature regarding transformational leadership and its effects on OCB and OCB Citizenship Motives. Existing research linking the three topics focuses on the business organizations, in turn, this study strived to connect the three topics in the P-12 education setting. While this study only focused on one Georgia suburban school district, it sought to discover practices that may be linked to transformational school leadership, which is the theoretical framework of this study in other P-12 settings.

Based on findings from literature, studies were found using similar instruments, and three surveys were merged to measure the school leadership and teacher OCB behavior and motives. First, the Transformational Leadership Inventory (TLI; Podsakoff et al., 1990) measured the teacher's perception of their school leader's transformational leadership as teachers must reflect upon their own practices and motives. Second, DiPaola and Hoy (2005) tailored an OCB scale to meet the needs of the educational setting through the Organizational Citizenship Behavior School Scale (OCBSS), which was used to measure the teacher's OCB. Third, to measure the

teacher's motives for behavior, teachers completed the Citizenship Motive Scale (CMS; Rioux & Penner, 2001) as a way to categorize their motives for displaying citizenship behavior. In this chapter, the research design methods, population, sample and sampling, instrumentation, data collection, data analysis, and data reporting will be reviewed.

Research Questions

This study surveyed currently employed faculty of one suburban Georgia school district. Participants were asked to complete four separate sections to include their perceptions of their principal's transformational leadership skills, their OCBs, their Citizenship Motives, and demographic questions. The researcher sought to answer the following overarching question: Which of the seven dimensions of transformational leadership (i.e., vision, model, goals, expectations, support, stimulation, and reward) relate to teacher OCB and Citizenship Motives (i.e., concern, values, impression)? The following sub-questions were used to further analyze the data in regards to specific groups of teachers:

1. To what degree do teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motives differ across school levels?
2. To what degree do teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motives differ between teacher's principal hiring status?
3. To what degree do teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motive scores correlate with teacher's years of experience?

Research Design

A quantitative, non-experimental design was chosen for this research in order to generalize the information to provide better administrative practices for all district administrators

(Creswell, 2014). Participants completed a questionnaire during this quantitative study to determine “numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions” of their own practices and perceptions (Creswell, 2014, p. 155).

Population, Sample, and Sampling

The setting for this study was one Georgia suburban school district that contained 18 elementary schools, eight middle schools, and five high schools with approximately 1700 teachers within this school district. The sample size consisted of 216 teachers who completed the questionnaire, which is approximately a 12.2% response rate. According to school district policies, approval from the school principal and the district was required before the questionnaire was sent to any participants. Participants voluntarily completed the questionnaire, so the sample of participants was collected by a convenience sample.

Of the 216 teachers who completed the questionnaire, 89 (41%) teachers identified as elementary school (grades P – 5) teachers, 63 (29%) teachers identified as middle school (grades 6-8) teachers, 56 (26%) teachers identified as high school (grades 9-12) teachers, and 8 (4%) teachers chose not to identify. In addition, 157 participants (73%) identified as female, 24 (11%) participants identified as male, and 35 (16%) participants chose not to identify their gender. The average age of the identifying participants was 41.9 years-old ($n = 209$) with an average teaching career of 15.3 years. Of these, 45% (99 participants) stated that their principal hired them, and the average length of tenure with the participant’s principal is 3.6 years.

To gain access to participants in this school district, each school principal gave their approval for the study to be completed in their building. Once principals agreed to allow the research, a research request was approved by the district office. After district approval and the

Georgia Southern Institutional Review Board (IRB), the survey and a letter to the participant was forwarded by the school principal to each participant. After two weeks, a reminder email was sent to encourage further participation.

Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study titled Educational Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Motive Questionnaire is comprised of three independent instruments: Transformational Leadership Inventory (TLI; Podsakoff et al., 1990), Organizational Citizenship Behavior School Scale (OCBSS; DiPaola, Tarter, & Hoy, 2005), and Citizenship Motive Scale (CMS; Rioux & Penner, 2001). Participants also answered five demographic items to include gender, school level, if the principal hired them, years with the current principal, and total years of experience. When combined, this survey contained 53 items for the participants to complete. Each item, except the demographic questions were measured on a Likert scale. A copy of the instrument may be found in Appendix A.

First, the 21 item TLI ($\alpha = .96$) was used for this study to measure teacher perceptions of principal transformational leadership behaviors. This scale measured six dimensions of transformational leadership: articulating vision ($\alpha = .87$), providing an appropriate model ($\alpha = .94$), fostering the acceptance of group goals ($\alpha = .91$), high performance expectations ($\alpha = .84$), providing individualized support ($\alpha = .83$), and intellectual stimulation ($\alpha = .92$). In addition, the TLI measured one dimension of transactional leadership behavior factor of contingent reward ($\alpha = .93$). Each item was measured using a 7-point Likert scale asking participants to indicate to the extent they agree or disagree with the statement as a descriptive of their principal (Connell, 2005). While three dimensions highly correlated, Cronbach's alpha reliabilities for the individual

dimensions range from .82 to .87 (Connell, 2005), and the TLI shows an overall consistent reliability of .90 (Podsakoff et al., 1996). Multiple studies have provided validity evidence for TLI (Podsakoff et al., 1990, Podsakoff et al., 1996, Podsakoff et al., 2001). Not all dimensions of the TLI had the same number of items correlated, so in order to shorten the overall instrument, each dimension, which had more than three items, was analyzed to determine items to be omitted. If items were similar in their wording, the item with the weaker factor loading was omitted (Podsakoff et al., 1990). If the dimension did not have any similar items, the items of the three stronger correlation factors were included and the others were omitted. Once all items were omitted, the TLI has seven dimensions measured with three items each for a total of 21 items.

Second, Organ (1990) developed a scale that measured the organizational member's OCB based on Bateman and Organ's (1983) seminal study of OCB that displayed a relationship between job satisfaction and citizenship. DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) created the OCBSS measure based on Organ's (1990) scale. However, DiPaola et al. (2005) refined the instrument by removing four items. The current 12-item scale held a strong reliability coefficient, with a Cronbach's alpha of .87 and demonstrated validity through previous research of DiPaola and Hoy (2005), DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001), and Burns and DiPaola (2013). The original instrument was designed to have teachers complete based on the behaviors of the teachers in the building on a 4-point Likert scale. For this study, teachers utilized a 7-point Likert scale to reflect on the extent they agree with the statement based on their own OCB behaviors. With this change, the phrasing of the items was changed to create a self-reflecting statement in first-person. For example, an original statement may say, "Teachers help students on their own time." The word "teachers" is replaced with "I" to read, "I help students on my own

time.” After the rephrasing of the items, one item no longer applied, so this item was omitted. A copy of all the original instruments can be found in Appendix D. The 11 items of the revised OCBSS ($\alpha = .67$) created a single dimension in this study.

Next, the OCB motives, measured by Rioux and Penner’s (2001) CMS, utilized 30 items to measure three dimensions: prosocial values, organizational concern, and impression management. Each item allowed participants to explain the importance of each item’s statement on a 7-point Likert scale. The original CMS used a six-point Likert scale, but the research used a seven-point scale to bring uniformity to the questionnaire. Participants were asked to rate the importance of the motive “in their decision to engage in this behavior” (Rioux & Penner, 2001, p. 1309). CMS’s reliability had been found to be above .80 (Rioux & Penner, 2001). To shorten the overall instrument, the same process as completed for the TLI was used to omit five items per dimension (Rioux & Penner, 2001). Thus, the shortened CMS of this study contained 15 items ($\alpha = .74$), five per dimension: prosocial values ($\alpha = .85$), organizational concern ($\alpha = .76$), and impression management ($\alpha = .82$).

The demographic questions were presented last in the questionnaire. The first two demographic items, gender and age were used to further explore the research questions more specifically. Demographic questions three and four pertained to the participants’ current and previous teaching experience. As noted in previous chapters, intrinsic motivation is more prevalent in teachers who have a longer tenure in the classroom, so teacher experience provided a factor that may correlate with TLI, OCBSS, or CMS scores. In P-12 there are natural divides based on the school level, so each participant identified themselves as an elementary, middle, or high school teacher. Each school level requires different teacher skill sets, so this demographic

assisted in identifying any differences in the leader-member relationship between school levels. Lastly, the final two demographic questions aided in examining the leader-member relationship. By asking if the current principal hired the teacher, the findings may demonstrate if there is a difference between the group of teachers hired by their principal and the group of teachers not hired by their principal. Since relationships take time, it is also important to compare the amount of time this teacher has been with the principal. Through the examination of the demographic dimensions, it allowed the dimensions of the TLI, OCBSS, and CMS to be deeply examined across multiple groups to provide a further understanding of the school leader and teacher relationship.

Variables

This study contained 16 variables. The 12 independent variables are associated with the demographic and TLI items on the questionnaire. The four dependent variables are created using items from the OCBSS and the CMS. Table 1 provides a breakdown of each variable and the questionnaire item associated with each variable. A copy of the instrument can be found in Appendix A.

Table 1*Variables*

Variable	Questionnaire (Item Number)	Type	Scale
Gender	Demographic (1)	Independent (Dichotomous)	Nominal
School Level	Demographic (2)	Independent (Dichotomous)	Nominal
Teaching Experience	Demographic (3)	Independent (Discrete)	Ordinal
Principal Hire	Demographic (4)	Independent (Dichotomous)	Nominal
Work with Principal	Demographic (5)	Independent (Discrete)	Nominal
Articulating Vision	TLI (9, 12, 16)	Independent (Discrete)	Ordinal
Appropriate Model	TLI (4, 6, 19)	Independent (Discrete)	Ordinal
Acceptance of Group Goals	TLI (14, 17, 21)	Independent (Discrete)	Ordinal
High Performance Expectations	TLI (1, 8, 11)	Independent (Discrete)	Ordinal
Individualized Support	TLI (3, 5, 7)	Independent (Discrete)	Ordinal
Intellectual Stimulation	TLI (13, 15, 20)	Independent (Discrete)	Ordinal
Contingent Reward	TLI (2, 10, 18)	Independent (Discrete)	Ordinal
OCB	OCBSS (All)	Dependent (Discrete)	Ordinal
Organizational Concern	CMS (3, 7, 9, 11, 12)	Dependent (Discrete)	Ordinal
Prosocial Values	CMS (1, 5, 10, 13, 14)	Dependent (Discrete)	Ordinal
Impression Management	CMS (2, 4, 6, 8, 15)	Dependent (Discrete)	Ordinal

Data Collection

Before the school district approved the research, the researcher obtained approval from

the Georgia Southern University Institutional Review Board (IRB). Once approved by the university IRB, an application for research was submitted to the district superintendent's office. The researcher did not have direct contact with the participants, so all communication with participants was distributed by the school principal. Creswell and Creswell's (2018) suggested a four-part invitation procedure as a recommendation in seeking a higher response rate. First, each school principal received an email to distribute informing participants of the upcoming questionnaire (Appendix E). In this email, a copy of the letter of cooperation from the superintendent's office was included. Secondly, a week after the initial email, an email requesting participation in the questionnaire was sent to school principals for distribution to their teaching faculty (Appendix F). This invitation included the purpose and significance of the research, anonymity assurance, approval from the IRB, implied consent, a link to the questionnaire in Qualtrics, and notification that the link was active for four weeks. Additionally, this invitation addressed the concern that all participation is voluntary and not required by the school principal or district, and in turn all responses remained anonymous. With all responses remaining anonymous, there was no additional risks from the participant completing the survey beyond that of everyday life, for the participant was not required to identify their school or supervising principal. Next, a third email was sent one week after the initial email as a follow-up to the invitation and reminder of the questionnaire (Appendix G). Lastly, a fourth and final email was sent, at the conclusion of week three, as one last reminder of the link being open to the questionnaire (Appendix H) to maximize the response rate.

Data Analysis

All data collected was downloaded from Qualtrics[®] into Microsoft Excel. As referenced

in Table 1, each item was mapped to a variable. Variable scores were calculated using the mean of item responses, to include the decoded reverse coding items. Incomplete data entries were removed from the data sets, and the completed data sets were uploaded into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS®). The functions of SPSS were used to run the statistical tests for each research question.

To answer the overarching research question, which of the seven dimensions of transformational leadership (i.e., vision, model, goals, expectations, support, stimulation, and reward) relate to teacher OCB and Citizenship Motives (i.e., concern, values, impression), four multiple regressions will be performed. Both a correlation and regression were employed to find correlation and create a prediction model for each of the four dependent variables (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Each regression was run with a different variable from the OCBSS and CMS serving as the dependent variable, and the seven TLI variables as the independent variables or the predictors. Correlations among OCBSS, CMS, and TLI dimensions were calculated and reported. Additionally, regression was used to determine the direction and strength of each TLI dimension in predicting OCBSS and CMS scores. Regression results are reported in tabular format and include the following statistics: R^2 , degrees of freedom, sample size, coefficients, standard error, confidence intervals, and F-ratio. The R^2 value is the correlation coefficient (R) squared to signify the percentage of variation in the dependent variable (a variable of OCBSS and CMS) using the variations of the independent variables (variables of TLI; Richardson, 2011). The confidence intervals, which is an estimate of the margin of error, are calculated using the sample size (number of data entries), degrees of freedom, and the number of coefficients (Cohen et al., 2003). Degrees of freedom is the number one less than the number of coefficients

for the independent variables, and the F-ratio is a measure used to understand the variance among groups (Bakeman & Robinson, 2005).

In order to answer research question one, to what degree do teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motives differ across school levels and identify differences in group means of the variables of the OCBSS and CMS, a one-way ANOVA was used as the statistical test for the three distinct school level groups. A one-way ANOVA was utilized to compare the variable outcomes of more than two groups (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The one-way ANOVA presented, through a summary table, the groups, means on the dependent variable, standard deviations, sample sizes for each group, and the F-ratio. The F-ratio compared the critical value of the F-distribution to determine if a significant mean occurred (Bakeman & Robinson, 2005). If a significant mean difference occurred, the Bonferroni Multiple Comparison assisted in determining where the differences occurred between the school levels (Cohen et al., 2003).

To answer to what degree do teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motives differ between teacher's principal hiring status, a t-test was used to identify the differences in group means of the variables of the OCBSS and CMS on the principal hiring the participant. A t-test is utilized to compare the variable outcomes of two groups (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The results of the t-test were reported in tabular format to include the following statistics: the mean, standard deviation, sample size, confidence interval, t-ratio, and degrees of freedom for each group. The standard deviation determines the distribution of the scores based on the mean, which is the average of all scores, and the t-value is the ratio representing the difference of the two groups' (hired and not-hired by principal) means and the variance of the two groups' means (Bakeman & Robinson, 2005).

Lastly, in order to answer the final research question, to what degree do teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motive scores correlate with teacher's years of experience, a Pearson Correlation was used to identify any correlation between teacher's years of experience (independent variable) and the group mean variables of the OCBSS and the CMS (dependent variable). A Pearson Correlation is utilized to determine the direction and strength of relationship (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The correlations were reported using a correlation table, which included Pearson's R. Pearson's R provides the direction by using positive and negatives and the strength of the relationship using numbers between 0 (weak) and 1 (strong; Bakeman & Robinson, 2005).

Chapter Summary

Engaging in research of practices is crucial to educational leadership. To create impactful leadership practices, a leader must continue to assess their impact on those they are leading. In this quantitative, non-experimental study, the use of three questionnaires merged into a new questionnaire sought to find the connection between transformational leadership practices and teacher behaviors and motivations. A questionnaire given to teachers in one suburban Georgia school district used demographic items as well as the TLI, OCBSS, and CMS to collect teacher perceptions. Teachers used a seven-point Likert scale to answer each item in the questionnaire. These items were analyzed by using statistical tests run through SPSS. Through analysis, the data determined if these three theories have a connection in education. All results will be reported in the following chapters.

CHAPTER FOUR

REPORT OF THE DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

This research study was designed to identify and examine relationships between teacher perception of principal's transformational leadership, teacher Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), and OCB Citizenship Motives. The researcher viewed transformational leadership characteristics through the transformational leadership definition of Anderson (2017), which is defined as, "style of leadership that transforms follower attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors to a higher realm of motivation where the leader inspires followers to be motivated to rise above and beyond current levels of achievement and performance to even higher levels of achievement and performance" (p. 3). For this study, participants used Anderson's (2017) definition of transformational leadership as the framework to rate items pertaining to their principal's transformational leadership characteristics. In addition, participants reflected upon their own OCBs and motivating factors. The goal of this study was to gain a better understanding of what transformational leadership practices had the greatest impact on teacher behavior and motives. In addition, the researcher noted an intended result of specific transformational leadership related to teacher OCBs and Citizenship Motives. In this chapter, the researcher used the data collected to address research questions regarding teacher perceptions of transformational leadership and teacher OCBs and OCB Citizenship motives.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between teacher perception of principal's transformational leadership, teacher OCB, and OCB Citizenship Motives. This study aimed to answer the following overarching question: Which of the seven dimensions of

transformational leadership (i.e., vision, model, goals, expectations, support, stimulation, and reward) relate to teacher OCB and Citizenship Motives (i.e., concern, values, impression)? The following sub-questions will be utilized:

1. To what degree do teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motives differ across school levels?
2. To what degree do teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motives differ between teacher's principal hiring status?
3. To what degree do teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motive scores correlate with teacher's years of experience?

Research Design

As discussed in Chapter Three, this study was a quantitative, non-experimental design in order to generalize the information to provide better administrative practices for all district administrators. The population of the study is the approximately 1700 teachers in a Georgia suburban school district that contained 18 elementary schools, eight middle schools, and five high schools. All teachers received an invitation to voluntarily participate in the questionnaire through their school email. The questionnaire comprised of three independent instruments titled Educational Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Motive Questionnaire is comprised of three independent instruments: Transformational Leadership Inventory (TLI; Podsakoff et al., 1990), Organizational Citizenship Behavior School Scale (OCBSS; DiPaola, Tarter, & Hoy, 2005), and Citizenship Motive Scale (CMS; Rioux & Penner, 2001). Each scale was tailored to fit the education setting. The questionnaire produced 11 variables and six additional items, which contained demographic data. An initial email was sent to the principals

with an invitation for them to pass on to teachers. At the end of the second week, all teachers received an email directly from the researcher reminding them of their invitation. At the end of the fourth week, the questionnaire was closed and prepared for analysis.

Findings

Before analyzing any data, all data were downloaded from Qualtrics into Microsoft Excel. All variables were calculated using the corresponding questionnaire items, including the reverse coding items. Any incomplete results were removed from the data sets. Once composite variables were calculated, using the mean of relevant items, all variables and demographic data were moved into SPSS. To address the overall research question, both correlations and regression were used. Correlations among variables are presented in Table 2.

OCBSS correlates significantly with small positive correlations (Lovakov & Agadullina, 2021) to all TLI variables except Contingent Reward, which demonstrates a connection between OCB in teachers and transformational leadership and not transactional leadership. The strongest correlations of the CMS came from the Organizational Concern, which was a large positive correlation with all TLI variables. Two significant, small negative correlations (Lovakov & Agadullina, 2021) existed between the number of years a teacher works with a principal and the teacher's OCBSS ($-0.136, p = .050$) and organizational concern ($-0.153, p = .027$). In addition, another significant, small negative correlation existed between the teacher's age and CMS Impression Management ($-0.195, p = .005$). These three negative correlations support the argument that the longer the teacher works with a principal, their OCB declines to include Organizational Concern. In addition, their desire to impress their colleagues and supervisors declines.

To answer the overarching research question, a multiple regression was used, where variables from the OCBSS and the CMS were the dependent variables. The seven variables of the TLI were used as the predictors.

Two significant negative correlations existed between the number of years a teacher works with a principal and the teacher's OCBSS ($-.136, p = .050$) and organizational concern ($-.153, p = .027$). These two negative correlations supported the argument that the longer the teacher worked with a principal, their OCB declined to include Organizational Concern. In addition, another significant negative correlation existed between the teacher's age and CMS Impression Management ($-.195, p = .005$), so teachers that were older had less of a desire to impress their colleagues and supervisors.

Table 2*Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for All Variables*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. TLI-Vision	---												
2. TLI-Model	.809*	---											
3. TLI-Goals	.861*	.849*	---										
4. TLI-Performance	.693*	.616*	.627*	---									
5. TLI-Support	.691*	.805*	.790*	.383*	---								
6. TLI-Stimulate	.824*	.790*	.804*	.578*	.667*	---							
7. TLI-Reward	.779*	.826*	.831*	.595*	.748*	.770*	---						
8. OCBSS	.202*	.166*	.207*	.259*	.139*	.142*	.135	---					
9. CMS-Concern	.521*	.553*	.545*	.439*	.538*	.501*	.525*	.376*	---				
10. CMS-Values	.286*	.261*	.302*	.361*	.270	.245*	.276*	.428*	.541*	---			
11. CMS-Manage	-.008	-.079	-.022	.047	-.102	.052	-.048	-.131	.072	-.122	---		
12. Teaching Exp	.023	.033	.001	-.047	.030	-.009	-.030	.070	.053	.054	-.128	---	
13. Years w/Princip.	-.092	-.105	-.079	-.106	-.073	-.063	-.042	-.136*	-.153*	-.069	.039	.145*	---
Mean	5.56	5.53	5.62	5.84	5.19	5.07	5.42	5.43	5.75	6.19	3.06	15.33	3.63
SD	1.34	1.49	1.48	1.14	1.55	1.52	1.61	.51	1.02	.72	1.31	7.62	2.4
Scale Min/Max Values	1 to 7	1 to 7	1 to 7	1 to 7	1 to 7	1 to 7	1 to 7	1 to 7	1 to 7	1 to 7	1 to 7	0 to 50	0 to 50

Note. N = 208.

*p < .05.

The regression model for OCBSS was significant at the .05 level, which means the TLI variables predict more variance in OCBSS than would be expected by chance. Regression results are shown in Table 3. For the dependent variable of OCBSS, the only significant independent variable was the TLI variable pertaining to High-Performance Expectations ($p = .024$), but OCBSS showed correlations with each of the six TLI transformational leadership variables. In addition, all six of these TLI variables showed some correlation to each other. Thus, it is likely that collinearity exists. Collinearity statistics are included in Table 3, Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6. The variables Articulating Vision, Appropriate Model, and Acceptance of Group Goals all demonstrate a strong correlation with other independent variables. However, the other four independent variables were only moderately correlated. Since further variability is possible, a full Collinearity Diagnostic may be found in Appendix J in Table 31. In the regression model, it appears that a relationship existed between the principal's high-performance expectations and teacher OCB, which would mean the higher the teacher's perceptions of the principal's high-performance expectations the more citizenship behaviors the teacher would likely demonstrate. However, the lack of significance for the other predictors, given many had similar sized correlations with OCB, could be due to collinearity issues in the regression equation.

Table 3*Regression of OCBSS on TLI Variables*

Variable	b	se b	95% CI	t	Collinearity Statistics	
					Tolerance	VIF
Articulating Vision	.012	.061	-.108, .131	.194	.179	5.575
Appropriate Model	-.020	.055	-.128, .088	.365	.177	5.664
Acceptance of Group Goals	.070	.060	-.048, .187	1.170	.153	6.524
High Performance Expectations	.114	.045	.025, .204	2.522*	.441	2.267
Individualized Support	.026	.043	-.060, .111	.593	.263	3.807
Intellectual Stimulation	-.026	.044	-.113, .062	.580	.259	3.864
Contingent Reward	-.050	.044	-.137, .036	-1.154	.238	4.197

Note: $R^2 = .069$, adj. $R^2 = .038$, $F = 2.241^*$, $df = 7, 200$; $n = 208$

* $p < .05$.

As mentioned in the first regression, collinearity exists due to the correlations among the TLI variables, so the results of the last three regressions are also suspected due to the high correlations among the predictors. In the second regression, the CMS variable of Organizational Concern was used as the dependent variable, and the regression results showed that both High-Performance Expectations ($p = .026$) and Individualized Support ($p = .007$) were significant predictors. Additionally, in the third regression, the regression results showed that both High-Performance Expectations ($p < .001$) and Individualized Support ($p = .025$) variables were also found to be significant when the CMS variable of Prosocial Values was identified as the dependent variable. These two regression results suggested that the teacher who perceived that the principal had high-performance expectations and was willing to provide the teacher with

individualized support likely had a greater concern for the betterment of the school rather than themselves, the need to be helpful, and the desire to build positive relationships. Like in the first regression, these significances could exist due to the high correlations among the TLI independent variables. The teacher who perceived that the principal had high-performance expectations and was willing to provide the teacher with individualized support likely had a greater concern for the betterment of the school rather than themselves, need to be helpful, and desire to build positive relationships.

Table 4*Regression of Organizational Concern on TLI Variables*

Variable	B	se b	95% CI	t	Collinearity Statistics	
					Tolerance	VIF
Articulating Vision	.001	.102	-.200, .201	.009	.179	5.575
Appropriate Model	.051	.092	-.130, .233	.558	.177	5.664
Acceptance of Group Goals	.018	.100	-.179, .215	.183	.153	6.524
High Performance Expectations	.171	.076	.021, .321	2.243*	.441	2.267
Individualized Support	.198	.073	.055, .342	2.726*	.263	3.807
Intellectual Stimulation	.050	.075	-.097, .198	.676	.259	3.864
Contingent Reward	.028	.073	-.117, .173	.383	.238	4.197

Note: $R^2 = .363$, adj. $R^2 = .340$, $F = 16.251^*$, $df = 7, 200$; $n = 208$

* $p < .05$.

Table 5*Regression of Prosocial Values on TLI Variables*

Variable	B	se b	95% CI	t	Collinearity Statistics	
					Tolerance	VIF
Articulating Vision	-.040	.082	-.202, .122	-.489	.179	5.575
Appropriate Model	-.102	.074	-.248, .045	-1.370	.177	5.664
Acceptance of Group Goals	.040	.081	-.119, .199	.494	.153	6.524
High Performance Expectations	.242	.062	.121, .364	3.936*	.441	2.267
Individualized Support	.133	.059	.017, .249	2.266*	.263	3.807
Intellectual Stimulation	-.006	.060	-.125, .112	-.106	.259	3.864
Contingent Reward	.003	.059	-.114, .120	.048	.238	4.197

Note: $R^2 = .162$, adj. $R^2 = .133$, $F = 5.541^*$, $df = 7, 200$; $n = 208$

* $p < .05$.

In the last regression model, the TLI variables once again served as the independent variables and the dependent variable was the CMS variable of Impression Management. The regression results showed there does seem to be a significant relationship between a principal's intellectual stimulation ($p = .020$) and a teacher's impression management, so a teacher who perceived more intellectual stimulation from the principal felt a greater desire to avoid looking bad to coworkers and supervisors. Once again, the lack of significance for the other predictors, given many had similar sized correlations with OCB, could be due to collinearity issues in the regression equation.

Table 6*Regression of Impression Management on TLI Variables*

Variable	b	se b	95% CI	t	Collinearity Statistics	
					Tolerance	VIF
Articulating Vision	-.082	.159	-.396, .232	-.516	.179	5.575
Appropriate Model	-.233	.144	-.516, .051	-1.618	.177	5.664
Acceptance of Group Goals	.085	.156	-.223, .394	.546	.153	6.524
High Performance Expectations	.124	.119	-.111, .360	1.044	.441	2.267
Individualized Support	-.089	.114	-.313, .136	-.778	.263	3.807
Intellectual Stimulation	.274	.117	.044, .505	2.352*	.259	3.864
Contingent Reward	-.061	.115	-.287, .166	-.529	.238	4.197

Note: $R^2 = .055$, adj. $R^2 = .022$, $F = 1.677$, $df = 7, 200$; $n = 208$

* $p < .05$.

The first sub question aimed to locate differences in teacher's OCB and Citizenship Motives across the school levels. An ANOVA respectively compared the means of each dependent variable (OCB and CMS) across the three school levels to determine whether mean differences exist. First, the OCBSS composite variable was used as the dependent variable and compared across all three school levels, and no differences were identified. Since no differences were identified, this suggested that OCB was similar across all school levels. The next ANOVA used the CMS variable of Organizational Concern. Results did not identify any differences across the school levels, so this suggested that Organizational Concern was the same across school levels. Another ANOVA was performed using the CMS variable Prosocial Values, and results did not identify any differences, which suggested that all school levels demonstrated

similar Prosocial Values. Lastly, the CMS variable of Impression Management was used as the dependent variable of the ANOVA. Once again, no differences were identified, so this suggested that Impression Management was similar across all school levels.

However, additional ANOVAs over TLI's seven scales reported that a significant difference existed in the Intellectual Stimulation ($p = .028$) and Individualized Support ($p = .025$), which are shown in Table 7 and Table 8. This suggests that the only differences in school levels are related to the variables Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Support. To identify these differences, a Bonferroni Comparison was used, and these results are found in Table 9 and Table 10. All data tables for non-significant variables can be found in Appendix J.

Table 7

<i>ANOVA Results and Descriptive Statistics for Individualized Support by School Level</i>				
School Level	Mean	SD	N	
Elementary	5.36	1.49	89	
Middle	5.40	1.41	63	
High	4.72	1.71	56	
Source	SS	df	MS	F
School Levels	17.623	2	8.812	3.776*
Error	462.495	205	2.543	

Note: $R^2 = .036$, adj. $R^2 = .026$

* $p < .05$

Table 8*ANOVA Results and Descriptive Statistics for Intellectual Stimulation by School Level*

School Level	Mean	SD	N
Elementary	5.10	1.49	89
Middle	5.40	1.33	63
High	4.65	1.68	56

Source	SS	df	MS	F
School Levels	16.471	2	8.236	3.650*
Error	462.495	205	2.543	

Note: $R^2 = .034$, adj. $R^2 = .025$

* $p < .05$

According to the Bonferroni Comparison, the difference in means of the Individualized Support results showed that high school teachers tended to have lower mean scores when compared to middle and elementary school teachers. There is not a significant difference between middle school and elementary schools. The difference of means for Intellectual Stimulation only occurred between the middle school and high school teachers ($p = .023$).

Table 9*Multiple Comparisons and Mean Differences in Individualized Support by School Level*

Comparison	Mean Difference	s.e.	Bonferroni Adjusted 95% CI
Elem. vs. Middle	-.046	.252	-.653, .561
Elem. vs. High	.636*	.261	.007, 1.265
Middle vs. High	.682*	.281	.005, 1.359

* $p < .05$, where p-values are adjusted using the Bonferroni method.

Table 10*Multiple Comparisons and Mean Differences in Intellectual Stimulation by School Level*

Comparison	Mean Difference	s.e.	Bonferroni Adjusted 95% CI
Elem. vs. Middle	-.296	.247	-.893, .301
Elem. vs. High	.446	.256	-.172, 1.065
Middle vs. High	.742*	.276	.076, 1.408

* $p < .05$, where p-values are adjusted using the Bonferroni method.

An independent samples t-test was used to determine whether differences occurred in the

four dependent variables (OCB, CMS-Concern, CMS-Value, and CMS-Manage) and the seven dimensions of TLI between those teachers hired by their current principal and those hired by a former principal (i.e., hiring status). In total, 11 t-tests were performed, which are found in Table 11, and the only significant differences in the group means with an $\alpha = .05$ was the CMS variable of Impression Management ($p = .005$). Thus, there is a suggested significant difference between the means of teachers who were hired by their principal and teachers who were not hired by their current principal, and the teachers who were hired by their principal had a greater desire to avoid looking bad to other teachers and the principal. However, noted that each t-test had a Type 1 error rate of .05 (i.e., 5% chance of falsely claiming there is a difference when none exists). Over the 11 tests, the Type 1 familywise error rate is .43, or there is a 43% chance of falsely claiming a difference occurred when in fact there is no difference. Given that only one t-test was significant out of 11 tests, it is important to understand this difference could be a statistical artifact rather than a real difference within the population studied.

Table 11

Results of t-tests and Descriptive Statistics in TLI, OCBSS, and CMS by Hiring Status

Outcome	Group						95% CI for		
	Hired			Not Hired			Mean		
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	Difference	t	df
Articulating Vision	5.57	1.39	99	5.54	1.30	109	-.338, .397	.159	206
Appropriate Model	5.40	1.68	99	5.64	1.30	109	-.652, .176	-1.136	184.6
Acceptance of Group Goals	5.57	1.60	99	5.66	1.36	109	-.488, .321	-.406	206
High Performance Expectations	5.73	1.33	99	5.95	.93	109	-.538, .097	-1.374	172.8
Individualized Support	5.23	1.60	99	5.17	1.51	109	-.373, .476	.238	206
Intellectual Stimulation	5.01	1.64	99	5.13	1.41	109	-.539, .295	-.575	206
Contingent Reward	5.49	1.67	99	5.35	1.56	109	-.311, .572	.581	206
OCBSS	5.40	.50	99	5.46	.513	109	-.193, .085	-.768	206
Organizational Concern	5.78	1.09	99	5.71	.96	109	-.210, .351	.496	206
Prosocial Values	6.21	.77	99	6.18	.67	109	-.170, .226	.279	206
Impression Management	3.34	1.40	99	2.81	1.18	109	.171, .878	2.928*	206

The last research question examined if a correlation existed between a teacher's years of experience and the CMS and OCBSS variables. Results are presented in Table 2 above. None of the Pearson correlations for years of teacher experience were significant at the .05 level. These

results suggested that OCB does not significantly relate to experience. Likewise, the motivation to participate in OCB, represented by CMS variables, was not significantly related to the teachers' years of experience. Thus, a teacher with few years of experience had the same chance to participate in and motivated to perform OCBs as a teacher who had been teaching for 20 plus years.

Chapter Summary

The focus of this study was to determine the principal's transformational leadership characteristics correlated with teacher OCBs and Citizenship Motives. Data were collected from teachers in a suburban school district by participants completing the Educational Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Motive Questionnaire, and data were analyzed through multiple statistical tests. Before more detailed statistical tests were performed, a Pearson correlation was performed to show relationships between all variables. Additional statistical tests consisted of four regressions using seven predictors each, an ANOVA for each of the 11 composite variables compared across three school levels, and a t-test for each of the 11 composite variables. Over these 67 statistical tests, only ten tests were found to be significant. Of the leadership characteristics, High Expectations and Individualized Support were the most significant predictors of teacher OCB and Citizenship Motives, which answered the overarching research question. In reference to the first sub-question, differences in OCBSS and CMS were examined across school levels and no differences were found. However, further analysis of the TLI variables displayed a significant difference between school levels in Individualized Support and Intellectual Stimulation. The second research question analysis displayed a significant difference between teachers who had been hired by their principal and those who had not in

reference to their Impression Management. Lastly, the third research questions sought to find any correlations between a teacher's years of experience and their CMS and OCBSS variables. While no significant correlation was found in reference to teacher experience, a negative correlation was found between how long a teacher works with a principal and the teachers OCBs and organizational concern.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

In a school building, a relationship between a principal and the teachers are a key to success and have a large impact on school culture (Fullan, 2008; Martin, 2009). One key leadership style for preparation programs to teach is transformational leadership, for transformational leadership allows principals to use motivating factors to covert teacher's followers' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors in order to raise achievement and performance levels beyond current levels (Anderson, 2017; Burns, 1978). If teachers display behaviors that benefit the school, students, and colleagues, it is referred to Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB; Lemmon & Wayne, 2015). Furthermore, it is important for principals to understand the motivating factors behind OCB. According to Rioux and Penner (2001), there are three key motivating factors: concern, value, and impression. Prior research supports that schools with higher OCB scores have higher achieving students (Burns & DiPaola, 2013), so educational leadership preparation programs may see the need to teach transformational leadership practices to increase motivating factors that lead to increased OCB.

Methodology

Since the purpose of this study is to identify any relationship between teacher perceptions of principal's transformational leadership to teacher OCB and Citizenship Motives, the overarching research question for this study was: Which of the seven dimensions of transformational leadership (i.e., vision, model, goals, expectations, support, stimulation, and reward) relate to teacher OCB and Citizenship Motives (i.e., concern, values, impression)? However, to better understand the relationships three sub-questions: To what degree do teachers'

OCB and Citizenship Motives differ across school levels?; To what degree do teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motives differ between teacher's principal hiring status?; and To what degree do teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motive scores correlate with teacher's years of experience? These questions allowed for the analysis of differences to better understand the relationships between the variables.

In order to best determine the relationships among transformational leadership, OCB, and Citizenship Motives, a quantitative, non-experimental design was used to provide generalized information of administrative practices for all district administrators. This survey method allowed for a quick response of data collection (a convenience sample was utilized) and data analysis by the researcher (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Potential participants were identified by all teachers within a suburban school district in Georgia. This district had 18 elementary schools, eight middle schools, and four high schools with approximately 1700 teachers.

All participants used an online platform to complete a modified questionnaire, with four sections, titled Educational Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Motive Questionnaire. The first section of the questionnaire took the Transformational Leadership Inventory (TLI; Podsakoff et al. 1990) and reworded the questions to have the teachers rate their perception of the principal's transformational leadership characteristics. The second section changed the statements from the teachers rating the school as a whole to the teachers rating of their own practices in DiPaola & Hoy's (2005) OCBSS. A third section assessed the citizenship motives by using Rioux and Penner's (2001) Citizenship Motive Scale. Lastly, the fourth section consisted of demographic questions collecting individualized information from the participant to

manipulate the data as appropriate to answer the research questions.

Findings

The data was downloaded from the online platform. Each item of the questionnaire mapped to a variable, which was calculated by the mean of all corresponding items, including decoded reverse coding items. In addition, incomplete submissions were removed from the data to prepare for accurate statistical tests. A total of 216 teachers completed the survey, and 89 (41%) teachers identified as elementary school (grades P – 5) teachers, 63 (29%) teachers identified as middle school (grades 6-8) teachers, 56 (26%) teachers identified as high school (grades 9-12) teachers, and 8 (4%) teachers chose not to identify. In addition, 157 participants (73%) identified as female, 24 (11%) participants identified as male, and 35 (16%) participants chose not to identify their gender. The average age of the identifying participants was 41.9 years-old ($n = 209$) with an average teaching career of 15.3 years. 46% (99 participants) stated that their principal hired them, and the average length of tenure with the participant's principal is 3.6 years. These data sets were then uploaded into the statistical computer software.

Before research questions were addressed, a Pearson Correlation was performed to best understand the relation between each variable. A large positive correlation (Lovakov & Agadullina, 2021) was found between OCBSS and each of the TLI variables except Contingent Reward, so this supports the claim that teacher OCB connects with transformational leadership and not transactional leadership. A connection between the length of time a teacher works with a principal holds a small negative correlation (Lovakov & Agadullina, 2021) with both teacher's OCB (-0.136 , $p = .050$) and organizational concern (-0.153 , $p = .027$). In addition, another significant, small negative correlation existed between the teacher's age and CMS Impression

Management ($-.195, p = .005$). These three negative correlations support the argument that the longer the teacher works with a principal, their OCB declines to include Organizational Concern. However, their declining desire to impress their colleagues and supervisors could lead to a more independent motivation for positive behavior.

To answer the overarching research question, a regression was used to create four models where each variable of OCBSS and CMS were the dependent variable and the seven TLI variables served as the independent variables. Results indicated that significant predictors existed; however, the interpretation of these variables may be different due to possible collinearity. For the dependent variable of OCBSS, the High-Performance Expectations ($p = .024$) of the TLI variables was found to be significant. In both the models for dependent CMS variables Organizational Concern and Prosocial Values, the High-Performing Expectations ($p_{oc} = .026$ & $p_{pv} < .001$) and Individualized Support ($p_{oc} = .007$ & $p_{pv} = .025$). The final regression model returned a significant relationship between CMS variable Impression Management and a principal's Intellectual Stimulation ($p = .020$). While all of these significant relationships were noted, there exists a chance of performing a Type I error due to collinearity among the independent variables. These significant relationships are highly probable due to the significant correlations among the TLI variables.

Research Sub-Question 1

Secondly, to determine if a significant difference existed between school levels of teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motives an ANOVA was conducted. Each school level was the independent variable, and OCBSS and CMS composite variables were the dependent variables. No significant differences occurred among the OCBSS and CMS composite variables. However,

upon further statistical testing two TLI variables, Individualized Support ($p = .028$) and Intellectual Stimulation ($p = .025$) displayed significant differences, so a Bonferroni Comparison was performed to specify the groups where the differences occurred. The Bonferroni Comparison shared that high school teachers had lower mean scores for Individualized Support when compared to middle and elementary school teachers. The difference of means for Intellectual Stimulation only occurred between the middle school and high school teachers ($p = .023$).

Research Sub-Question 2

To determine if the principal hiring a teacher has an effect on teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motives a t-test was used to test for a significant difference in group means. The grouping variable is the Boolean variable of principal hiring the teacher, and the test variables were the OCBSS and CMS composite variables. With an $\alpha = .05$, the CMS variable of Impression Management ($p = .005$) was the only significant variable.

Research Sub-Question 3

Lastly, the Pearson Correlation performed earlier was used to analyze the relationship between a teachers' years of experience and teachers' OCB and Citizenship Motives. While no correlation was found, other significant negative correlations were discovered. Two significant negative correlations existed between the number of years a teacher worked with a principal and the teacher's OCBSS ($r = -.136, p = .050$) and organizational concern ($r = -.153, p = .027$).

Discussion

Through leadership, a principal has the opportunity to inspire and motivate teachers to improve achievement and performance. The goal of this study is to improve upon principal

leadership practices, which are often learned during preparation programs as aspiring principals and assistant principals move into leadership positions. With the growing number of schools, there is a need for improved leadership training. Leadership has been researched and taught through many organizations, and there is a need to teach transformational leadership to leaders in all organizations (Rodrigues and Ferreira, 2015). In P-12 education the need for transformational leadership exists because it directly influences school culture (Stein et al, 2016). For example, principals that display more transformational leadership behavior are better at recognizing teacher emotions (Berkovich & Eyal, 2017). Interpersonal relationships are important factors in leadership theories (Jiang & Lu, 2020). A positive correlation exists between leader effectiveness and employee engagement (Singh & Townsley, 2020), so there is a need for leadership training among school building leaders. One characteristic that stands out is individualized support, which is when the school leader displays respect for individual team members and displays concern for their personal feelings and needs (Anderson, 2017). This individualized support increases the communication between teachers and principals (Alqarni, 2020) and teacher motivation (Yeager, 2016). Individualized support is an important determinant in employee's attitudes, role perceptions, and behaviors (Podsakoff et al., 1990).

Through this increased communication, a school leader can assist teachers to find their altruistic and intrinsic motivation because these specific motivators are highly important in keeping teachers in the profession longer (Choing et al, 2017). This is confirmed through multiple statistical tests in this study, as seen in the correlation table, the positive correlation shows that the more individualized support a teacher receives from the principal, the greater the teacher's motivation to demonstrate OCB through their concern for the school itself

(Organizational Concern). Individualized Support appeared as a possible predictor in both of the regression models for Organizational Concern and Prosocial Values, which by definition is the motivation to participate in OCB in order to build positive relationships. This implies that there is a possibility for school leaders to increase OCB behaviors within the building by increasing their individualized support for teachers.

The findings of this study are intended to add to the existing research. In addition, this study seeks to fill gaps within the transformational leadership, OCB, and Citizenship Motives related research. Results of this study confirm previous studies and add to the discussion of transformational leadership, OCB, and Citizenship Motives with additional findings.

Individualized support displays a significant role in the relationship between principals and teachers. It increases teacher motivation (Yeager, 2016) and communication (Alqarni, 2020). This study examined the teachers' perceptions of principal transformational leadership characteristics, which according to the findings of this study are higher among elementary and middle school teachers. The goal for this study was to use teacher perceptions as predictors for teacher OCB and Citizenship Motives. The findings of this study displayed individualized support as a possible predictor for organizational commitment and prosocial values.

Organizational Commitment ($r = .538$) is a moderate, positive correlation with Individualized Support, which is the strongest correlation outside of the TLI variables.

Through the characteristics of transformational leadership, the supervisor-subordinate relationship is important, and the higher the supervisor-subordinate relationship is regarded, the greater the impact on that employee's extra-role behavior (Lemmon & Wayne, 2015). As the baby boomers begin to retire, there is a need to attract a younger generation to fill positions, so it

is important to understand the difference in motivating factors. It was not an original intention for this research to relate to Huang et al.'s (2015) findings, but the negative correlations between years with a principal and teacher OCB and organizational concern share reasonings with Huang et al.' (2015). Their claim suggested that younger professionals sought the need to impress more of their supervisors and colleagues. This study's findings further describe the supervisor-employee relationship, for the data suggests that when a teacher moves to work with a new principal the teacher's OCB and Organizational Concern are greatest that first year.

Therefore, this research study was designed to identify relationships between transformational leadership practices, teacher OCB, and teacher motives leading to OCB and to gain a better understanding of principal's transformational leadership practices as perceived by teachers and its relation to the motivation to perform and complete additional duties teacher beyond teacher formal responsibilities. Based on the data with support from the literature, the teacher's perception of principal's individualized support and desire for professional relationships has a positive impact on teacher OCB and Organizational Concern. In addition, non-planned data analysis brought to light the motivation for younger teachers to show OCB to impress others, which is useful in building principal-teacher and inter-teacher relationships. It is the intention of this study to improve training for school leaders, such that school leaders have a greater impact on teacher OCB and Citizenship Motives.

Implications for Practice

Through this study, valuable information may be added to transformational leadership practices. Educational leadership preparation program coordinators, school district leaders, and school building leaders may view this information useful as professional learning in leadership

practices for all school leaders, especially building level principals and assistant principals. Results of the study confirmed the need for leaders to provide teachers individualized support, made a connection to the need to maintain high expectations, increase teacher Impression Management if hired by their current principal, and note connections between the longer a teacher works with a principal and the teacher's decline in OCB and organizational concern. These results add to the discussion of school building principal's practices in working with teachers throughout a school year.

A potential predictor Intellectual Stimulation also exists for Impression Management. While this may not be an actual predictor, the data shows a difference in engaging in OCBs depending on whether the principal hired the teacher or not. Teachers who were hired by the teacher displayed an 18% increase in citizenship behavior for the sole purpose to impress supervisors and colleagues. Understanding this concept, may not directly impact the leadership practices of the principal, but this information assists the principal in understanding the teachers they have hired and those that are veterans to the building.

Two unintentional findings occurred from the correlation matrix of all variables. A relationship exists between the number of years a teacher works with a principal and the teacher's OCB and Organizational Concern, which is the desire to demonstrate citizenship behaviors due to pride and commitment to the school. While the negative correlations are weak, they are significant. The implications of these findings lead the principal to seek leadership practices that keep more tenured teachers engaged in OCB.

Recommendations for Future Research

Results from this research have contributed to the literature of transformational

leadership practices, OCB, and citizenship motives. However, some data sparks interest and recommends that future research of transformational leadership practices be warranted. Since this study used a single suburban school district, it would be useful to expand the study across multiple districts to include rural and urban districts to see if there are similar results. However, this study had a low response rate, so additional recruiting could have assisted in a higher response rate. In a larger and more diverse sample, the results provide more participants per demographic subgroup.

Of the literature reviewed regarding transformational leadership, the characteristic of High Expectations was not mentioned regarding principals nor teacher behavior. However, High Expectations appears as a predictor in the regression models for OCB, Organizational Concern, and Prosocial Values. While collinearity is likely due to the correlations among the TLI variables in this model, it would be suggested for further research to be completed before deciding on the relationship between a principal's high-expectations and teacher behavior.

High school teachers were the lowest demographic (26%) of school level to complete the questionnaire. In the examination of the first sub question, an ANOVA shared that a significant difference in school levels existed in the TLI variables of Individualized Support and Intellectual Stimulation. After the Bonferroni Comparison, it was determined that the perception of principal's Individualized Support for high school teachers was significantly lower than middle and elementary teacher perceptions. With so much data support for the importance of Individualized Support, further research is suggested to examine the difference in Individualized Support among high school teachers. Lastly, there was a significant difference in the means of teacher perceptions of principal's Intellectual Stimulation between high school and middle

school teachers. While high school teacher perceptions of Intellectual Stimulation are lower than elementary and middle school teachers, it is only significantly different from middle school. While the lack of Intellectual Stimulation could be due to the departmentalization and content experts of high schools, a researcher may find value in examining the differences as pertaining to transformational leadership characteristics.

Limitations, Delimitations, and Assumptions

While different populations exist in the surrounding districts, this district was chosen based on the convenience of the study. Since there is no contact with participants, the response may be limited due to lack of motivation to complete the questionnaire. The delimitations of the study exist as the research was focused on one suburban school district in Georgia. The lack of accountability to complete the questionnaire allowed for potential participants to simply delete the email. The greatest assumption in the study was that teachers understood transformational leadership enough to give truthful perceptions regarding their principal's leadership. To assist with the participant understanding in the future, transformational leadership will be defined in the questionnaire based on the work of Anderson et al. (2017).

Conclusion

Current media displays that local boards of education around the nation are struggling to fill open teaching positions and retain current teachers. Research referenced in this study discussed the impact of transformational leadership and teacher job performance. While combined TLI characteristics are still unclear as predictors and strength of relationships towards citizenship behaviors, each transformational leadership TLI characteristic held a significant, large, and positive correlation with teacher OCB. It is the goal in a leader-member exchange to

continually build the other, but according to the research, teachers demonstrate less OCB and organizational concern motivation the longer the teacher works with a principal. This research adds to the body of literature that relate to transformational leadership practices in education and teacher behavior and identifies needs for additional research.

Therefore, as educational organizations battle the everchanging educational requirements, it is important for educational preparatory programs and organizations to teach the transformational leadership theory and practices. Principals that use transformational practices lead to an improved teacher OCB. Other research has linked teacher OCB to student achievement. It is the hope of this researcher that these findings will assist incoming and current educational leaders in creating organizational change. While educational leaders do not often have direct impact on student achievement, their decisions and behavior still impact student achievement through teacher behavior.

REFERENCES

- Alig-Mielcarek, J. & Hoy, W. K. (2005). Instructional leadership: Its nature, meaning, and influence. In Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. (Eds.), *Educational Leadership and Reform* (pp. 29-54). Information Age.
- Allen, J. G., & Weaver, R. L. (2014). Learning to lead: The professional development needs of assistant principals. *NCPEA Education Leadership Review*, 15(2), 14-32.
- Allen, N., Grigsby, B., & Peters, M. L. (2015). Does leadership matter? Examining the relationship among transformational leadership, school climate, and student achievement. *NCPEA International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 10(2), 1-22.
- Alqarni, S. A. Y. (2020). How school climate predicts teachers' organizational silence. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 12(1), 12-27.
- Amtu, O., Makulua, K., Matital, J., & Pattiruhu, C. M. (2020). Improving student learning outcomes through school culture, work motivation, and teacher performance. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(4), 885-902.
- Anderson, M. (2017). Transformational leadership in education: A review of existing literature. *International Social Science Review*, 93(1), 3-13.
- Armstrong, D. E. (2015). Listening to voices at the educational frontline: New administrator's experiences of the transition from teacher to vice-principal. *Brock Educational Journal*, 24, 110-122.
- Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and

- moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(8), 951-968.
- Bakeman, R., & Robinson, B. F. (2005). *Understanding statistics in the behavioral sciences*. Psychology Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio B. J. (1990). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Consulting Psychologist Press.
- 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.
- Berkovich, I., & Eyal, O. (2017). The mediating role of principals’ transformational leadership behaviors in promoting teachers’ emotional wellness at work: A study in Israeli primary schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 45(2), 316-335. doi: 10.1177/1741143215617947.
- Boberg, J. E. & Bourgeois, S. J. (2016). The effects of integrated transformational leadership on achievement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 54(3), 357-374.
- Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers’ organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(3), 277–289. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2004.02.003
- Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 82-98.

- Bowler, W. M., Halbesleben, J. R. B., Stodnick, M., Seevers, M. T., Little, L. M. (2009) The moderating effect of communication network centrality on motive to perform interpersonal citizenship. *Journal of Management Issue*, 21(1), 80-96.
- Bowler, W. M., Paul, J. B., & Halbesleben, J. R. (2019). LMX and attributions of organizational citizenship behavior motives: When is citizenship perceived as brownnosing? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 34(2), 139-152.
- Braun, S., Peus, C., Weiseiler, S. & Frey, D. (2013). Transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and team performance: A multilevel mediation model of trust. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 270-283.
- Brayfield, A. H. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35(5), 307-311.
- Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decisions Processes*, 97, 117-134.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
- Burns, W. R. T., & DiPaola, M. F. (2013). A study of organizational justice, organizational citizenship behavior, and student achievement in high schools. *American Secondary Education*, 42(1), 4-23.
- Burton, L. J., Peachey, J. W., Wells, J. E. (2017). The role of servant leadership in developing an ethical climate in sports organizations. *Journal of Sports Management*, 31(1), 229-240.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D. G., & Klesh, J. R. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. E. Seashore, E. E. Lawler, P. H. Mirvis, &

- C. Cammann (Eds.), *Assessing organizational change* (pp. 71-138). New York: Wiley.
- Carnahan, J. R. (2014) *The impact of transformational leadership on teachers' motivation & commitment*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada.
- Chao, G. T., O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Wolf, S., Klein, H. J., & Gardner, P. D. (1994). Organizational socialization: Its content and consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 730-743. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.79.5.730
- Chen, Z. X., Tsui, A. S., & Jiing-Lih, F. (2002). Loyalty to supervisor vs. organizational commitment: Relationships to employee performance in China. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 339-356.
- Chiong, C., Menzies, L., & Parameshwaran, M. (2017). Why do long-serving teachers stay in the teaching profession? Analysing the motivations of teachers with 10 or more years' experience in England. *British Educational Research Journal*, 43(6), 1083–1110. doi: 10.1002/berj.3302
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Columbia County School District. (2019). *Annual report: Year two, Report of Progress for the 2018-2023 Strategic Plan*. <https://indd.adobe.com/view/f579380e-c083-41df-b703-5b573a68c190>
- Connell, P. W. (2005). *Transformational leadership, leader-member exchange (LMX), and OCB: The role of motives* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of South Florida, Tampa, FL.

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Davis, M. H. (1994). *Empathy: A social psychological approach*. Brown & Benchmark.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychology Inquiry*, 11, 227-268.
- Dennis, R. S. & Bocamea, M. (2004). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 26(8), 600-615.
- Dipaola, M. (2020, October 24). *Research Tools*. William & Mary University.
<https://wmpeople.wm.edu/site/page/mfdipa/researchtools>
- DiPaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11, 424-447.
- DiPaola, M. F., Tarter, C. J., & Hoy, W. J. (2005) Measuring organizational citizenship of schools: The OCB scale, In W. Hoy & C. Miskel (Eds.), *Educational leadership and reform*, 319-341. Information Age Publishing.
- Donia, M. B. L., Johns, G. & Raja, U. (2016). Good soldier or good actor? Supervisor accuracy in distinguishing between selfless and self-serving OCB motives. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 31, 23-32.
- Dutta, V., & Sahney, S. (2016) School leadership and its impact on student achievement: The mediating role of school climate and teacher job satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30(6), 941-958. doi:10.1108/IJEM-12-2014-0170

- Eisenberger, N., & Miller, P. A. (1987). The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviors. *Psychological Bulletin*, 101, 91-119. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.101.1.91
- Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 42-51. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.42
- Finkelstein, M. A. (2011). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and organizational citizenship behavior: A functional approach to organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of psychological Issues in Organizational Culture*, 2(1), 19-34.
- Fowler, F. J. (2009). *Survey Research Methods* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Fullan, M. (2008). *The six secrets of change: What the best leaders do to help their organizations survive and thrive*. Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact*. Jossey-Bass.
- Geringer, J. M., Frayne, C. A., & Milliman, J. F. (2002). In search of 'best practices' in International human resource management: Research design and methodology. *Human Resource Management*, 41(1), 5-30.
- Gerstner, C. R. & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and Construct Issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 827-844.
- Graen, G. B. & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-down perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Greenfield, W. (1985a, April). *Being and becoming a principal: Responses to work contexts and socialization processes*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American

- Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Greenfield, W. (1985b). Moral, social, and technical dimensions of the principalship. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 63(1), 130-149.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*. 16(2), 399-432.
- Grube, J.A. & Piliavin, J. A. (2000). Role identity, organizational experiences, and volunteer performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(9), 1108-1119.
- Gurley, D. K., Anast-May, L., & Lee, H. T. (2015). Developing instructional leaders through assistant principals' academy: A partnership for success. *Education and Urban Society*, 47(2), 207-241.
- Hamstra, M. R. W., Van Yperen, N. W., Wisse, B., & Sassenburg, K. (2014). Transformational and transactional leadership and followers' achievement goals. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 29(1), 413-425. doi: 10.1007/s10869-013-9322-9
- Hauserman, C. P. & Stick, S. L. (2013). The leadership teachers want from principals: Transformational. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 36(3), 184-203.
- Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J. P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 474-487.
- Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (2004). Organizational justice in schools: No justice without trust. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18, 250-259.
- Hoy, W. K., Hannum, J., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1998). Organizational climate and student achievement: A parsimonious and longitudinal view. *Journal of School Leadership*, 8, 336-359.

- Hoy, W.K., Smith, P.A. and Sweetland, S.R. (2002), "The development of organizational climate index for high schools: its measure and relationship to faculty trust", *The High School Journal*, 86(2), pp. 38-49.
- Huang, Y. K., McDowell, J., & Vargas, P. (2015). How old I feel matters: Examining age-related differences in motives and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 33(1), 20-39.
- Jaiswal, N. K., Dhar, R. L. (2015). Transformational leadership, innovation climate, creative self-efficacy and employee creativity: A multilevel study. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 51, 30-41.
- Jiang, M. & Lu, S. (2020). To empathize, or not empathize in educational leadership. *Journal of Organizational & Educational Leadership*, 5(1), 1-16.
- Johnson, A. D. (2016). Principal perceptions of the effectiveness of university educational leadership preparation and professional learning. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 11(1), 2-17.
- Kastenbaum, R., Derbin, V., Sabatini, P., & Artt, S. (1972). 'The ages of me': Toward personal and interpersonal definitions of functional age. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 3(2), 197–211.
- Kerr, S. & Jermior, J. M. (1978) Substitues for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 22, 375-403.
- Klotz, A. C., Bolino, M. C., Song, H., & Stornelli, J. (2018). Examining the nature, causes, and consequences of profiles of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(5), 629-647.

- Kouze, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (2016). *Learning leadership: The five fundamentals of becoming an exemplary leader*. Wiley.
- Kriekard, J. (1985). *A validation of competencies for the secondary school assistant principal*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Arizona State University, Phoenix, AZ.
- Laub, J.A. (1999). Assessing the servant organization: Development of the organizational leadership assessment (OLA) model. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(2), 308.
- Leithwood, K. & Sun, J. (2012). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership: A meta-analytic review of unpublished research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(3), 387-423.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. and Steinbach, R. (1999), *Changing Leadership for Changing Times*, McGraw-Hill International.
- Lemmon, G. & Wayne, S. J. (2015). Underlying motives of organizational citizenship behavior: Comparing egoistic and altruistic motivation. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 22(2), 129-148.
- Liden, R. C. & Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management*, 24, 43-72.
doi:10.1016/S0149-2063(99)80053-1
- Lovakov, A. & Agadullina, E. R. (2021). Empirically derived guidelines for effect size interpretation in social psychology. *European Journal Social Psychology*, 00, 1-20.
doi:10.1002/ejsp.2752
- Malik, W. U., Javed, Muqaddas, M., & Hassan, S. T. (2017). Influence of transformational leadership components of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Pakistan*

- Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 11(1), 146-165.
- Marshall, C., & Davidson, E. P. (2016). As assistant principals enter their careers: a case for providing support. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 5(3), 272–278. doi: 10.1108/ijmce-04-2016-0038
- Marshall, C., & National Center for Educational Leadership, C. M. (1992). *The Cultural Chasm between Administrator and Teacher Cultures: A Micropolitical Puzzle. Occasional Paper No. 12*. Retrieved from <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED350692>
- Martin, S. T. (2009). *Relationship between the leadership styles of principals and school culture* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mathieu, C., Fabi, B., Lacoursière, R., & Raymond, L. (2016). The role of supervisory behavior, job satisfaction and organizational commitment on employee turnover. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 22(1), 113-129.
- McBrayer, J. S., Jackson, T., Pannell, S., Sorgen, C. H., Gutierrez de Blume, A. P., & Melton, T. D. (2018). Balance of instructional and managerial tasks as it relates to school leaders' self-efficacy. *Journal of School Leadership*, 28, 596-617.
- McCarley, T. A., Paters, M. L., Decman, J. M. (2016). Transformational leadership related to school climate: A multi-level analysis. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(2), 322-342.
- Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and*

- application*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538–551.
- Militello, M., Fusarelli, B.C., Mattingly, A., & Warren, T. (2015). “We do what we’re told”: How current assistant principals practice leadership and how they wish they could. *Journal of School Leadership*, 25, 194-222.
- Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P., & Organ, D. W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee and Rights Journal*, 6(3), 209-225.
doi:10.1007/BF01419445
- Neves, P., & Caetano, A. (2009). Commitment to change: Contributions to trust in the supervisor and work outcomes. *Group & Organization Management*, 34, 623–644.
- Niehoff, B. P. & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-556.
- Ogbonnaya, C. N., Nielson, K. (2016). Transformational leadership, high performance work practices, and an effective organization. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, 1, 1-31.
- Okan, T., & Akyüs, A.M. (2015). Exploring the relationship between ethical leadership and job satisfaction with the mediating role of the level of loyalty to supervisor. *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 6(4), 155-177.

- Oleszewiski, A., Shoho, A., & Barnett, B. (2012). The development of assistant principals: A literature review. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 50(3), 264-286.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12, 43-72.
- O'Rourke, T., Catrett, J. & Houchins, D. (2008). Teacher retention in the Georgia DJJ: A plan that works. *Corrections Today*, 70(1), 40-43.
- Ostroff, C. (1992), "The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: an organizational level analysis", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(6), pp. 963-964.
- Ozgenel, M. (2020). An organizational factor predicting school effectiveness: School climate. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 7(1), 38-50.
- Penner, L. A. & Finkelstein, M. (1996). *Prosocial personality orientations and volunteerism*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Penner, L. A., Midili, A. R., & Kegelmeyer, J. (1997). Beyond job attitudes: A personality and social psychology perspective on the causes of organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 111-131.
- Peters, G. B., Gurley, D. K., Fifolt, M., Collins, L., & McNeese, R. (2016). Assistant principals' perceptions regarding the role and the effectiveness of an educational leadership program. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 5(1), 183-199. doi:10.5430/ijhe.v5n1p183
- 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., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22(2), 259-298.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2001). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestion for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- Ponnack, A. P., Torsney, B. M., & Lombardi, D. (2018). Motivational differences throughout teachers' preparation and career. *New Waves Educational Research & Development*, 21(2), 26-45.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T. & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Porto, J. B., & Tamayo, A. (2003). Desenvolvimento e validação da escala de civismo nas organizações [Development and validation of the organizational civism scale]. *Estudos de Psicologia*, 8(3), 393-402. doi: 10.1590/S1413-294X2003000300006
- Poynton, T. A., DeFouw, E. R., & Morizio, L. J. (2019). A systematic review of online response

- rates in four counseling journals. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 97(1), 33-42.
- Qiu, Y., Lou, M., Zhang, L., Wang, Y. (2020). Organizational citizenship behavior motives and thriving at work: The mediating role of citizenship fatigue. *Sustainability*, 12, 17.
- Quin, J., Deris, A., Bischoff, G. & Johnson, J.T. (2015) Comparison of transformational leadership practices: Implications for school districts and principal preparation programs. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 14(13), 71-85. doi:1012806/V14/13/R5
- Reaves, S. J., & Cozzens, J. A. (2018). Teacher Perceptions of Climate, Motivation, and Self-Efficacy: Is There Really a Connection. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 6(12), 48. doi: 10.11114/jets.v6i12.3566
- Richardson, R. (2011). *Business applications of multiple regressions: Vol. 1st ed.* Business Expert Press. www.eds.b.ebscohost.com
- Rioux, S. M., & Penner, L. A. (2001). The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A motivational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1306-1314.
- Rodrigues, A. O., & Ferreira M. C. (2015). The impact of Transactional and Transformational Leadership Style on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Prisco-USF, Braganca Paulista*, 20(3), 493-504.
- Ross, D., & Cozzens, J. (2016). The principalship: Essential core competencies for instructional leadership and its impact on school climate. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 4(9), 162-176. doi: 10.11114/jets.v4i9.1562
- Russell, Z. A., Steffensen, D. S., Ellen III, B. P., Zhang, L. Bishoff, J. D., & Ferris, G., R. (2018). High performance work practice implementation and employee impressions of line manager leadership. *Human Resource Management Review*, 28, 258-270.

- Sahin, S. (2013). Examining organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBS) of teacher candidates at the faculty of education. *Croatian Journal of Education*, 15(3), 73-97.
- Schulz, J., Mundy, M., Kupczynski, L., & Jones, D. (2016). A comparison of practical leadership skills of principals and assistant principals. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, 34(4), 1 – 10.
- Shaw, J., & Newton, J. (2014). Teacher retention and satisfaction with a servant leader as principal. *Education*, 135(1), 101-106.
- Singh, B. & Townsley, M. (2020). Making sense of Georgia school leader evaluation: Climate, engagement and the district office. *Georgia Educational Researcher*, 17(1), 39-61.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Dimensions of teacher burnout: relations with potential stressors at school. *Social Psychology of Education*, 20(4), 775–790. doi: 10.1007/s11218-017-9391-0
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2018). Job demands and job resources as predictors of teacher motivation and well-being. *Social Psychology of Education*, 21(5), 1251–1275. doi: 10.1007/s11218-018-9464-8
- Smith, J. B. (2015) *Organizational citizenship, achievement press, and student achievement*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653–663.
- Stewart, J. (2006) Transformational leadership: An evolving concept examined through the works of Burns, Bass, Avolio, and Leithwood. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 54, 1-28.

- Stein, K. C., Macaluso, M., & Stanulis, R.N. (2016). The interplay between principal leadership and teacher leader efficacy. *Journal of School Leadership*, 26, 1002-1032.
- Takeuchi, R., Bolino, M. C., & Lin, C. C. (2015). Too many motives? The interactive effects of multiple motives on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(4), 1239-1248.
- Taylor-Backor, K., & Gordon, S. P. (2015). Preparing principals as instructional leaders: Perceptions of university faculty, expert principals, and expert teacher leaders. *NASSP Bulletin*, 99(2), 105-126.
- Thibodeaux, A. K., Labat, M. B., Lee, D. E., & Labat, C. A. (2015). The effects of leadership and high stakes testing on teacher retention. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 19(1), 227-249.
- Turban, D. B., & Jones, A. P. (1988). Supervisor-subordinate similarity: Types, effects, and mechanisms. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 228-234. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.73.2.228
- Wasserman, E., Ben-eli, S., Yehoshua, O., & Gal, R. (2016). Relationship between the principal's leadership style and teacher motivation. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching, and Educational Research*, 15(10), 180-192.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire. University of Minnesota, MN: Industrial Relations Center.
- Weller, I., Süß, J., Evanschitzky, H., & von Wangenheim, F. (2019). Transformational Leadership, High-Performance Work System Consensus, and Customer Satisfaction. *Journal of Management*. Advance online publication.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318817605>

- White, J. (2018). *The moderating effect of prior principal athletic coaching experience on the relationship between transformational leadership and teacher organizational citizenship behavior in secondary schools in Mississippi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617.
- Willis, V. K. (2015). *School structure, leadership, and organizational citizenship behavior* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK.
- Wingate, T. G., Lee, C. S., & Bourdage, J. S. (2019). Who helps and why? Contextualizing organizational citizenship behavior. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science* 51(3), 147-158.
- Yang, Y. F. (2016). Examining competing models of transformational leadership, leadership trust, change commitment, and job satisfaction. *Psychological Reports*, 119(1), 154-173.
- Yaylaci, A. F. (2015). Rights and responsibilities of teachers and parents as school citizens: A qualitative study based on organizational citizenship. *Education*, 137(2), 233-247.
- Yeager, P. A. (2016). *The relationship between principal's leadership style and teachers' organizational citizenship behavior of contemporary educational settings* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Capella University, Minneapolis, MN.
- Zhu, W., Newman, A., Miao, Q., & Hooke, A. (2013). Revisiting the mediating role of trust in transformational leadership effects: Do different types of trust make a difference? *The*

Leadership Quarterly, 24, 94–105.

APPENDIX A

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

MOTIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

Transformational Leadership Inventory (TLI) / (Podsakoff et al., 1990)

Below is a set of statements that may or may not describe the actions of your principal. Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree (or disagree) that each statement is descriptive of your principal.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

The principal ...

1. Shows us that he/she expects a lot from us.
2. Always gives me positive feedback when I perform well.
3. Acts without considering my feelings (R)
4. Leads by “doing,” rather than simply “telling.”
5. Shows respect for my personal feelings.
6. Provides a good model for me to follow.
7. Behaves in a manner thoughtful of my personal needs.
8. Insists on only the best performance.
9. Has a clear understanding of where we are going.
10. Gives me special recognition when my work is very good.
11. Will not settle for second best.

12. Inspires others with his or her plans for the future.
13. Challenges me to think about old problems in new ways.
14. Encourages employees to be “team players.”
15. Has stimulated me to rethink the way I do things.
16. Is always seeking new opportunities for the organization.
17. Gets the group to work together for the same goal.
18. Personally compliments me when I do outstanding work.
19. Leads by example.
20. Has ideas that have challenged me to reexamine some of basic assumptions about my work.
21. Develops a team attitude and spirit among employees.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior School Scale (OCBSS) / (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005)

Below is a set of statements that may or may not describe you as a teacher. Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree (or disagree) that each statement is descriptive of you at school.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. I help students on my own time.
2. I waste a lot of class time. (R)
3. I voluntarily help new teachers.
4. I voluntarily serve on new committees.
5. I voluntarily sponsor extracurricular activities.
6. I arrive to work and meetings on time.
7. I introduce myself and assist substitutes.
8. I begin class promptly and use class time effectively.
9. I give colleagues advance notice of changes in schedule or routine.
10. I give extra work to keep students busy. (R)
11. I make innovative suggestions to improve the overall quality of our school.

Citizenship Motive Scale (CMS) / (Rioux & Penner, 2001).

Below is a set of motives that may or may not influence people to engage in work related behaviors. Using the scale below, please indicate the extent the importance of the motive for you to engage in these kinds of behaviors at work.

Strongly Not Important			Neutral			Strongly Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. Because I feel it is important to help those in need.
2. To avoid a reprimand from my boss.
3. Because I want to be fully involved in the company.
4. To avoid looking bad in front of others.
5. Because I am concerned about other people's feelings.
6. To look better than my co-workers.
7. Because I care what happens to the organization.
8. To look like I am busy.
9. Because the organization values my work.
10. Because I want to help my co-workers in any way I can.
11. Because I feel pride in the organization.
12. Because I want to understand how the organization works.
13. Because I believe in being courteous to others.
14. Because it is easy for me to be helpful.
15. To avoid looking lazy.

Demographics

1. What is your gender?
2. What school level (Elem., Middle, High) do you teach?
3. How many years have you been teaching?
4. Did your current principal hire you?
5. How long have you worked with your current principal?

APPENDIX B


QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS ASSIGNED TO DIMENSION

Variable	Questionnaire (Item Number)
Gender	Demographic (1)
School Level	Demographic (2)
Teaching Experience	Demographic (3)
Principal Hired	Demographic (4)
Years with Principal	Demographic (5)
Articulating Vision	TLI (9, 12, 16)
Appropriate Model	TLI (4, 6, 19)
Acceptance of Group Goals	TLI (14, 17, 21)
High Performance Expectations	TLI (1, 8, 14)
Individualized Support	TLI (3, 5, 7)
Intellectual Stimulation	TLI (13, 15, 20)
Contingent Reward	TLI (2, 10, 18)
OCB	OCBSS (All Items)
Organizational Concern	CMS (3, 7, 9, 11, 12)
Prosocial Values	CMS (1, 5, 10, 13, 14)
Impression Management	CMS (2, 4, 6, 8, 15)

APPENDIX C

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP MOTIVE

QUESTIONNAIRE IN QUALTRICS



**GEORGIA SOUTHERN
UNIVERSITY**

I am leading a research project and quantitative study examining the transformational leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, and citizenship motives. This project is in partial fulfillment of the requirements set forth by Georgia Southern University to complete a Doctorate in Educational Administration. I invite you to participate in this survey.

This online survey, using Qualtrics, will be kept anonymous, and you will be asked to rate the transformational leadership practices you observe in regard to your principal. Your participation is completely voluntary. Participants have the opportunity to ask questions about the survey, skip over survey questions, or opt out of the survey. If you choose to participate, please complete the survey with the understanding that your completion of the survey serves as your informed consent. The survey should take you approximately 25 minutes to complete. Your participation in this survey has minimum risks, no more than those associated with daily life experiences. All data collected is anonymous and will remain confidential. Information is only shared with my research committee (Georgia Southern University College of Education Dissertation Committee). All results will be compiled and presented as generalizable findings.

The Educational Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Motive Questionnaire is a merger of Podsakoff et al.'s (1990) Transformational Leadership Inventory (TLI), DiPaola & Hoy's (2005) Organizational Citizenship Behavior School Scale (OCBSS), and Rioux and Penner's (2001) Citizenship Motive Scale (CMS).

As a participant in this survey, you have the right to ask questions and to have each question answered. If you have any concerns, questions, and/or comments regarding this study, please contact me, Jeremy Davis, at jd04351@georgiasouthern.edu or my faculty advisor, Dr. Juliann Sergi McBrayer, at jmcbayer@georgiasouthern.edu. If the survey or a question or a portion of the survey causes any discomfort, please contact Dr. McBrayer or me at the information above. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact the Georgia Southern University Office of Research Integrity at irb@georgiasouthern.edu. Regardless of your participation of the survey, please email me if you would like a summary of findings.

If you agree to participate in this study, click on the arrows below to complete the survey.

If you do NOT agree to participate in this study, close this browser window at this time.

→



Below is a set of statements that may or may not describe you as a teacher. Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree (or disagree) that each statement is descriptive of you at school.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I help students on my own time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I waste a lot of class time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I voluntarily help new teachers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I voluntarily sponsor extracurricular activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I arrive to work and meetings on time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I introduce myself and assist substitutes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I begin class promptly and use class time effectively.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I give colleagues advance notice of changes in schedule or routine.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I give extra work to keep students busy.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I make innovative suggestions to improve the overall quality of our school.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>





In a workday, teachers engage in prosocial or helpful behaviors. These behaviors are not a part of a teacher's job description and are not formally rewarded (e.g. jeans passes, stipends, etc.) Yet these behaviors are very important to the functionality of the school day. Examples include:

- Not taking long lunch breaks.
- Not complaining over small things.
- Attending extracurricular activities.
- Helping coworkers with a heavy workload.

Teachers are motivated differently to engage in these behaviors. Below is a list of motives that may influence people to engage in these behaviors. For each motive listed, please indicate how important that motive is for you to engage in these kinds of behaviors at school.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Because I feel it is important to help those in need.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To avoid a reprimand from my boss.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I want to be fully involved in the school.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To avoid looking bad in front of others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I am concerned about other people's feelings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To look better than my co-workers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I care what happens to the school.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To look like I am busy.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because the school values my work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I want to help my co-workers in any way I can.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I feel pride in the organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I want to understand how the school works.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I believe in being courteous to others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because it is easy for me to be helpful.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To avoid looking lazy.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



**GEORGIA SOUTHERN**
UNIVERSITY

What is your gender?

☐ Male

☐ Female

What is your current age?

20 26 31 37 42 48 53 59 64 70 75

Age

How many years have you been teaching?

0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50

Years of Experience

Did your current principal hire you?

☐ Yes

☐ No

How long have you worked with your current principal?

0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50

Years worked with principal

What level of school do you teach?

☐ Elementary School

☐ Middle School

☐ High School

→

APPENDIX D

ORIGINAL INSTRUMENTS BEFORE ALTERATIONS

Transformational Leadership Inventory (TLI)

1. Shows us that he/she expects a lot from us.
2. Always gives me positive feedback when I perform well.
3. Acts without considering my feelings (R)
4. Paints an interesting picture of the future for our school.
5. Leads by “doing,” rather than simply “telling.”
6. Gives me special recognition when my work is very good.
7. Shows respect for my personal feelings.
8. Provides a good model for me to follow.
9. Behaves in a manner thoughtful of my personal needs.
10. Insists on only the best performance.
11. Treats me without considering my personal feelings. (R)
12. Has a clear understanding of where we are going.
13. Commends me when I do a better than average job.
14. Will not settle for second best.
15. Personally compliments me when I do outstanding work.
16. Fosters collaboration among work groups.
17. Frequently does not acknowledge my good performance (R)
18. Inspires others with his or her plans for the future.
19. Challenges me to think about old problems in new ways.

- 20. Is able to get others committed to his/her dream.
- 21. Asks questions that prompt me to think.
- 22. Encourages employees to be “team players.”
- 23. Has stimulated me to rethink the way I do things.
- 24. Is always seeking new opportunities for the organization.
- 25. Gets the group to work together for the same goal.
- 26. Leads by example.
- 27. Has ideas that have challenged me to reexamine some of basic assumptions about my work.
- 28. Develops a team attitude and spirit among employees.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior School Scale (OCBSS)

1. Teachers help students on their own time.
2. Teachers waste a lot of class time. (R)
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 advance notice of changes in schedule or routine.
10. Teachers give an excessive amount of busywork. (R)
11. Teacher committees in this school work productively.
12. Teachers make innovative suggestions to improve the overall quality of our school.

Citizenship Motive Scale (CMS)

1. Because I have a genuine interest in my work.
2. Because I feel it is important to help those in need.
3. To avoid a reprimand from my boss.
4. Because I fear appearing irresponsible.
5. Because I want to be fully involved in the company.
6. Because I want a raise.
7. To avoid looking bad in front of others.
8. Because I am concerned about other people's feelings.
9. Because I want to be a well-informed employee.
10. To have fun with my co-workers.
11. Because rewards are important to me
12. To look better than my co-workers.
13. Because I care what happens to the company.
14. Because I like interacting with my co-workers.
15. To look like I am busy.
16. Because the organization values my work.
17. Because I want to help my co-workers in any way I can.
18. Because I feel pride in the organization.
19. Because I can put myself in other people's shoes.
20. Because I want to understand how the organization works.
21. Because I believe in being courteous to others.

- 22. To impress my co-workers.
- 23. To keep up with the latest developments in the organization.
- 24. Because it is easy for me to be helpful.
- 25. To stay out of trouble.
- 26. Because I am committed to the company.
- 27. To get to know my co-workers better.
- 28. Because the organization treats me fairly.
- 29. To be friendly with others.
- 30. To avoid looking lazy.

APPENDIX E

RECRUITMENT AND PREPARATORY INFORMATION EMAIL

Dear Teacher,

My name is Jeremy Davis, and I am currently a student in the College of Education at Georgia Southern University. I am leading a research project and quantitative study examining the transformational leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, and citizenship motives. This project is in partial fulfillment of the requirements set forth by Georgia Southern University to complete a Doctorate in Educational Administration. You are receiving this email because I understand that you are a teacher within the Columbia County School District, and I invite you to participate in this survey that will support my investigation of transformational leadership practices and the degree to which these practices predict teacher organizational behavior and motives. In approximately one week, I will share an invitation to participate which will include additional information regarding the questionnaire as well as a link to the survey.

Thank you in advance for participating in this research of transformational leadership practices, organizational citizenship behavior, and citizenship motives.

Jeremy Davis
Student
Georgia Southern University
College of Education, Educational Leadership

APPENDIX F

INVITATION TO SURVEY EMAIL

Dear Teacher,

I am leading a research project and quantitative study examining the transformational leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, and citizenship motives. This project is in partial fulfillment of the requirements set forth by Georgia Southern University to complete a Doctorate in Educational Administration. I invite you to participate in this survey.

This online survey, using Qualtrics™, will be kept anonymous, and you will be asked to rate the transformational leadership practices you observe in regard to your principal. Your participation is completely voluntary. Participants have the opportunity to ask questions about the survey, skip over survey questions, or opt out of the survey. If you choose to participate, please complete the survey with the understanding that your completion of the survey serves as your informed consent. The survey should take you approximately 25 minutes to complete. Your participation in this survey has minimum risks, no more than those associated with daily life experiences. All data collected is anonymous and will remain confidential. Information is only shared with my research committee (Georgia Southern University College of Education Dissertation Committee). All results will be compiled and presented as generalizable findings.

To complete the survey, please use this link

https://georgiasouthern.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_bDgR1QZVlQVcMQt. The survey window is...TBD

As a participant in this survey, you have the right to ask questions and to have each question answered. If you have any concerns, questions, and/or comments regarding this study, please contact me, Jeremy Davis, at jd04351@georgiasouthern.edu or my faculty advisor, Dr. Juliann Sergi McBrayer, at jmcbrayer@georgiasouthern.edu. If the survey or a question or a portion of the survey causes any discomfort, please contact Dr. McBrayer or me at the information above. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact the Georgia Southern University Office of Research Integrity at irb@georgiasouthern.edu. Regardless of your participation of the survey, please email me if you would like a summary of findings.

Thank you in advance for participating in this research of transformational leadership practices, organizational citizenship behavior, and citizenship motives.

Jeremy Davis
Student
Georgia Southern University
College of Education, Educational Leadership

APPENDIX G

REMINDER AND FOLLOW-UP EMAIL

Dear Teacher,

Approximately one week ago, your principal shared an invitation to participate in a survey regarding a research project and quantitative study examining the transformational leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, and citizenship motives. This email serves only as a reminder of the invitation seen below.

Thank you in advance for participating in this research of transformational leadership practices, organizational citizenship behavior, and citizenship motives.

If you have already participated in the survey, I appreciate your participation.

Jeremy Davis
Student
Georgia Southern University
College of Education, Educational Leadership

APPENDIX H

LAST REMINDER AND FOLLOW-UP EMAIL

Dear Teacher,

Approximately three weeks ago, your principal shared an invitation to participate in a survey regarding a research project and quantitative study examining the transformational leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, and citizenship motives. If you have already participated in the survey, I appreciate your participation. If you have not completed the survey, I wanted to follow-up and remind you of the invitation and request your participation. This email serves only as a reminder of the invitation seen below.

Thank you in advance for participating in this research of transformational leadership practices, organizational citizenship behavior, and citizenship motives.

Jeremy Davis
Student
Georgia Southern University
College of Education, Educational Leadership

APPENDIX I

INFORMED CONSENT

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF LEADERSHIP, TECHNOLOGY, AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

**Informed Consent
for
Educational Transformational Leadership and Teacher Organizational Citizenship
Behavior Motives**

My name is Jeremy Davis, and I am currently a student in the College of Education at Georgia Southern University. I am leading a research project and quantitative study examining the transformational leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, and citizenship motives. This project is in partial fulfillment of the requirements set forth by Georgia Southern University to complete a Doctorate in Educational Administration. I invite you to participate in this survey.

This online survey, using Qualtrics, will be kept anonymous, and you will be asked to rate the transformational leadership practices you observe in regard to your principal. Your participation is completely voluntary. Participants have the opportunity to ask questions about the survey, skip over survey questions, or opt out of the survey. If you choose to participate, please complete the survey with the understanding that your completion of the survey serves as your informed consent. The survey should take you approximately 25 minutes to complete. Your participation in this survey has minimum risks, no more than those associated with daily life experiences. All data collected is anonymous and will remain confidential. Information is only shared with my research committee (Georgia Southern University College of Education Dissertation Committee). All results will be compiled and presented as generalizable findings.

The Educational Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Motive Questionnaire is a merger of Podsakoff et al.'s (1990) Transformational Leadership Inventory (TLI), DiPaola & Hoy's (2005) Organizational Citizenship Behavior School Scale (OCBSS), and Rioux and Penner's (2001) Citizenship Motive Scale (CMS).

As a participant in this survey, you have the right to ask questions and to have each question answered. If you have any concerns, questions, and/or comments regarding this study, please contact me, Jeremy Davis, at jd04351@georgiasouthern.edu or my faculty advisor, Dr. Juliann Sergi McBrayer, at jmcbrayer@georgiasouthern.edu. If the survey or a question or a portion of the survey causes any discomfort, please contact Dr. McBrayer or me at the information above. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact the Georgia Southern University Office of Research Integrity at irb@georgiasouthern.edu. Regardless of your participation of the survey, please email me if you would like a summary of findings.

If you agree to participate in this study, click on the arrows below to complete the survey.

If you do NOT agree to participate in this study, close this browser window at this time.

APPENDIX J

ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table A1

ANOVA Results and Descriptive Statistics for Articulating Vision by School Level

School Level	Mean	SD	N
Elementary	5.54	1.22	89
Middle	5.83	1.28	63
High	5.29	1.54	56

Source	SS	df	MS	F
School Levels	8.874	2	4.437	2.508
Error	362.720	205	1.769	

Note: $R^2 = .024$, adj. $R^2 = .014$

* $p < .05$

Table A2

Multiple Comparisons and Mean Differences in Articulating Vision by School Level

Comparison	Mean Difference	s.e.	Bonferroni Adjusted 95% CI
Elem. vs. Middle	-.293	.219	-.822, .235
Elem. vs. High	.252	.227	-.296, .799
Middle vs. High	.293	.219	-.235, .822

* $p < .05$, where p-values are adjusted using the Bonferroni method.

Table A3

ANOVA Results and Descriptive Statistics for Appropriate Model by School Level

School Level	Mean	SD	N
Elementary	5.58	1.37	89
Middle	5.70	1.43	63
High	5.23	1.71	56

Source	SS	df	MS	F
School Levels	7.127	2	3.564	1.604
Error	455.403	205	2.221	

Note: $R^2 = .015$, adj. $R^2 = .006$

* $p < .05$

Table A4

Multiple Comparisons and Mean Differences in Appropriate Model by School Level

Comparison	Mean Difference	s.e.	Bonferroni Adjusted 95% CI
Elem. vs. Middle	-.119	.245	-.711, .427
Elem. vs. High	.352	.254	-.262, .966
Middle vs. High	.472	.274	-.189, 1.132

* $p < .05$, where p-values are adjusted using the Bonferroni method.

Table A5

ANOVA Results and Descriptive Statistics for Acceptance of Group Goals by School Level

School Level	Mean	SD	N	
Elementary	5.72	1.34	89	
Middle	5.76	1.40	63	
High	5.29	1.72	56	

Source	SS	df	MS	F
School Levels	8.070	2	4.035	1.869
Error	442.628	205	2.159	

Note: $R^2 = .018$, adj. $R^2 = .008$

* $p < .05$

Table A6

Multiple Comparisons and Mean Differences in Acceptance of Group Goals by School Level

Comparison	Mean Difference	s.e.	Bonferroni Adjusted 95% CI
Elem. vs. Middle	-.042	.242	-.627, .541
Elem. vs. High	.424	.251	-.181, 1.029
Middle vs. High	.467	.270	-.184, 1.119

* $p < .05$, where p-values are adjusted using the Bonferroni method.

Table A7

ANOVA Results and Descriptive Statistics for High Performance Expectations by School Level

School Level	Mean	SD	N
Elementary	5.78	1.08	89
Middle	5.96	1.08	63
High	5.82	1.31	56

Source	SS	df	MS	F
School Levels	1.235	2	.618	.473
Error	267.857	205	2.334	

Note: $R^2 = .005$, adj. $R^2 = .005$

* $p < .05$

Table A8

Multiple Comparisons and Mean Differences in High Performance Expectations by School Level

Comparison	Mean Difference	s.e.	Bonferroni Adjusted 95% CI
Elem. vs. Middle	-.179	.188	-.633, .276
Elem. vs. High	-.036	.195	-.507, .434
Middle vs. High	.142	.210	-.365, .649

* $p < .05$, where p-values are adjusted using the Bonferroni method.

Table A9

ANOVA Results and Descriptive Statistics for Contingent Reward by School Level

School Level	Mean	SD	N
Elementary	5.48	1.48	89
Middle	5.70	1.54	63
High	4.99	1.82	56

Source	SS	df	MS	F
School Levels	15.396	2	7.698	3.027
Error	521.381	205	2.543	

Note: $R^2 = .029$, adj. $R^2 = .019$

* $p < .05$

Table A10

Multiple Comparisons and Mean Differences in Contingent Reward by School Level

Comparison	Mean Difference	s.e.	Bonferroni Adjusted 95% CI
Elem. vs. Middle	-.215	.263	-.849, .419
Elem. vs. High	.489	.272	-.167, 1.146
Middle vs. High	.704	.293	-.003, 1.411

* $p < .05$, where p-values are adjusted using the Bonferroni method.

Table A11

ANOVA Results and Descriptive Statistics for OCBSS by School Level

School Level	Mean	SD	N
Elementary	5.42	.45	89
Middle	5.51	.61	63
High	5.37	.46	56

Source	SS	df	MS	F
School Levels	.617	2	2.737	2.659
Error	52.747	205	.257	

Note: $R^2 = .012$, adj. $R^2 = .002$

* $p < .05$

Table A12

Multiple Comparisons and Mean Differences in OCBSS by School Level

Comparison	Mean Difference	s.e.	Bonferroni Adjusted 95% CI
Elem. vs. Middle	-.048	.167	-.451, .356
Elem. vs. High	.343	.173	-.075, .761
Middle vs. High	.391	.186	-.059, .841

* $p < .05$, where p-values are adjusted using the Bonferroni method.

Table A13

ANOVA Results and Descriptive Statistics for Organizational Concern by School Level

School Level	Mean	SD	N
Elementary	5.83	.98	89
Middle	5.87	1.10	63
High	5.48	.97	56

Source	SS	df	MS	F
School Levels	5.474	2	2.737	2.659
Error	210.992	205	1.029	

Note: $R^2 = .025$, adj. $R^2 = .016$

* $p < .05$

Table A14

Multiple Comparisons and Mean Differences in Organizational Concern by School Level

Comparison	Mean Difference	s.e.	Bonferroni Adjusted 95% CI
Elem. vs. Middle	-.048	.167	-.451, .356
Elem. vs. High	.343	.173	-.075, .761
Middle vs. High	.391	.186	-.059, .841

* $p < .05$, where p-values are adjusted using the Bonferroni method.

Table A15

ANOVA Results and Descriptive Statistics for Prosocial Values by School Level

School Level	Mean	SD	N	
Elementary	6.37	.54	89	
Middle	6.13	.97	63	
High	6.07	.63	56	
Source	SS	df	MS	F
School Levels	2.309	2	1.155	2.253
Error	105.051	205	.512	

Note: $R^2 = .022$, adj. $R^2 = .012$

* $p < .05$

Table A16

Multiple Comparisons and Mean Differences in Prosocial Values by School Level

Comparison	Mean Difference	s.e.	Bonferroni Adjusted 95% CI
Elem. vs. Middle	.177	.118	-.107, .462
Elem. vs. High	.241	.122	-.054, .536
Middle vs. High	.061	.132	-.253, .381

* $p < .05$, where p-values are adjusted using the Bonferroni method.

Table A17

ANOVA Results and Descriptive Statistics for Impression Management by School Level

School Level	Mean	SD	N	
Elementary	2.86	1.20	89	
Middle	3.22	1.38	63	
High	3.20	1.40	56	
Source	SS	df	MS	F
School Levels	6.211	2	3.105	1.813
Error	351.097	205	1.713	

Note: $R^2 = .017$, adj. $R^2 = .008$

* $p < .05$

Table A18

Multiple Comparisons and Mean Differences in Impression Management by School Level

Comparison	Mean Difference	s.e.	Bonferroni Adjusted 95% CI
Elem. vs. Middle	-.359	.216	-.879, .161
Elem. vs. High	-.337	.223	-.876, .202
Middle vs. High	.022	.240	-.558, .602

* $p < .05$, where p-values are adjusted using the Bonferroni method.

Table A19

Collinearity Diagnostics for Multiple Regression where all TLI variables are Independent Variables

Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions							
			(Constant)	Articulating Vision	Appropriate Models	Acceptance of Group Goals	High Performance	Individualized Support	Intellectual Stimulation	Contingent Reward
1	7.845	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
2	.064	11.041	.26	.00	.01	.00	.05	.04	.02	.02
3	.032	15.733	.12	.02	.00	.00	.04	.34	.16	.00
4	.019	20.503	.10	.00	.01	.00	.12	.03	.46	.36
5	.015	23.097	.30	.07	.04	.05	.13	.03	.12	.55
6	.011	26.870	.00	.14	.57	.22	.05	.00	.05	.02
7	.008	30.821	.22	.02	.36	.17	.53	.56	.12	.00
8	.007	33.602	.00	.74	.01	.56	.08	.01	.07	.04