

# ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR IN HIGHER EDUCATION: DEFINITION, INFLUENCE AND CHALLENGES

DR. RUPA MAHAJAN

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, PG DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, UNIVERSITY OF JAMMU, J&K

---

## Abstract

The study of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour has been receiving prominent focus and scholarly attention. It is one of those emerging subjects/topics that explore the working mechanisms and dynamic features of an organization, with special emphasis on human behavioural patterns. This subject recognizes that organizations rely on both formal and informal duties/behaviors of workers/members to function effectively. Earlier, such conceptualizations basically identified these behaviours as discretionary actions, ones that are neither mandated by job descriptions nor financially compensated, yet somehow manages to aid or enhance the functioning of the organization with collective inputs. In this paper, we break the tip of this iceberg, further delving into the concept of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, to understand its theoretical background, and its relevance in shaping the unhindered functioning of institutions/organizations, with a keen focus on higher education.

**Keywords** - Organizational citizenship behaviour, education, institution, pedagogy, faculty, academic performance.

---

## INTRODUCTION

Firstly, let us begin by stating that the idea of choice is central to the understanding of OCB (Organizational Citizenship Behaviour). In this context, the individual engages in certain behaviours or actions simply because the person wants to, not because he/she is required to. Scholars have also observed that discretion differentiates citizenship behaviours from routine performances, altogether highlighting the person's connection to personal initiatives and professional values. OCB reflects an ethical side of one's personality, wherein the notion of being strictly utilitarian within work spaces becomes blurry, and individual thought patterns, humane understandings and informal contributions lead to successful functions. Research in this field kept progressing and scholars began expanding their research towards multiple directions. While some had already approached citizenship behaviour as an indicator of prosocial orientations and personality traits, others had also significantly examined the concept through observable behavioural patterns like helping a fellow co-worker in a task the individual isn't assigned to, demonstrating initiative and spreading optimism/positivity within the workspace. There are debates concerning whether the actual role or essence of citizenship behaviour is really different from in-role performance. This debate gets lengthier in the case of professions where informal cooperation or out-of-role actions are essential components. This further led to broader disclosures and interpretations, putting citizenship behaviour as part of a continuum of workplace conduct rather than a strictly bounded category.

These behaviours are also described as actions comprising extra-roles, ones that extend way beyond the individual's formal or designated responsibilities. It is worth noting that such contributions manifest positively in the workplace. They differ from actions or behaviours that lead to resignations, withdrawal, conflict and negligence towards official duties. Research has shown that citizenship behaviour is directly linked to favoured workplace outcomes, like boosting morale, building stronger interpersonal relationships, improving retention and increasing productivity. These outcomes also suggest that organizations benefit significantly from the willingness of individuals to act in ways that support collective goals without the expectation of any formal reward. Another recurring theme in this expansive body of research is the vivid connection between citizenship behaviour and the perceptions of fairness and respect within the workplace. To boost collaboration and transparency, a strict set of norms may not always be an effective measure. Sometimes collaboration and collective performance is achieved when people are willing to work together. That is achieved when employees are treated fairly by one another. Employees who realize that they are treated justly and who may also value fair treatment themselves, are more likely to engage in cooperative and supportive behaviours. People who are attentive to social cues and mindful of how their actions affect others also tend to display higher levels of citizenship behaviour, reflecting one's potential for emotional reasoning, empathy and interpersonal awareness. Altruistic tendencies and sensitivity to the needs of colleagues frequently accompany such behaviours, reinforcing a culture of mutual assistance. One of the features that seem significant is the relationship between citizenship behaviour and organizational performance. Studies have thoroughly showcased how various sectors or organizations displayed tremendous performances because of employees regularly engaging in voluntary and supportive actions towards one another. These behaviours inevitably result in smoother coordination, communication and enhanced adaptability in the workplace.

Evidence from varied sectors and industries indicate that the positive effects of citizenship behaviour are not merely limited to specific organizational types, but these behaviours represent a broadly applicable phenomenon, a concept that can be scientifically applied to boost effectively in institutions. However, in the higher education sector, one comes across a different picture. Higher educational institutes or organizations present a different, rather distinguished, environment. Our conventional understanding of OCB cannot accurately assess organizational performance. The operations of universities and colleges are different from the industrial or other sectors. While some administrative functions may resemble aspects of service provision, the central mission of higher education involves intellectual development, critical inquiry and personal growth, which are difficult to quantify using traditional efficiency measures. To overcome these rifts, scholars have proposed a diverse criteria for evaluating institutional quality, ranging from financial sustainability and access to employment outcomes and research productivity. Yet, variables like graduation rates and research output still remain as central indicators of institutional success. It is worth noting that amid this complex environment, faculty members play an important role in shaping institutional success. They are basically the core members, or agents of teaching and learning. Teachers/professors are the fundamental contributors to research and knowledge creation in the university/college. Even if leadership, legal frameworks and infrastructure reflect institutional quality, it is actually the engagement of faculty members, in classrooms and projects that directly influences educational outcomes. Their daily interactions with students and colleagues position them as critical contributors to institutional performance. In this sense, understanding citizenship behaviour among faculty members provides a valuable and legitimate insight into how voluntary, extra-role actions can influence the broader success of higher educational institutions.

### **Definition and Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour**

Insights towards why employees contribute in ways that exceed their required tasks or formal duties, to the organization, have been presented by various scholars. Through this brief review of literature and an overview of the theoretical background shall shed vivid light on the definition and varied dimensions of OCB. Dennis Organ's observed OCB as some sort of discretionary behaviour. These actions would not invite any formal reward or bonus, yet boosts the effective functioning of the organization. Organ's definition marked a conceptual shift, wherein researchers have stopped viewing work performance only through prescribed roles, and have gone on to acknowledge the relevance of informal and voluntary contributions, like the few ones mentioned above, in sustaining organizational life. Organ's early classification of OCB into altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue ultimately provides a theoretical foreground to understanding these behaviours. Altruism refers to those voluntary actions that assist individuals/colleagues with work-related issues. Conscientiousness captures behaviours that exceed minimal role expectations, like conformism, adherence to rules, punctuality, diligence and so on, beyond what is formally required. Sportsmanship represents the willingness to tolerate inconvenience without complaint, thereby preserving a positive environment free from conflict. Courtesy involves anticipatory actions to prevent misunderstandings and civic virtue denotes responsible participation in organizational governance, including regular collective affairs.

The theoretical foundation of these dimensions is closely tied to role theory and prosocial organizational behaviour. Building upon Organ's interpretation, Katz and Kahn distinguish between in-role and extra-role behaviour. They have stressed on the fact that organizations rely not only on prescribed performance but also on spontaneous cooperation. Prosocial behaviour theory further explains OCB as voluntary actions intended to benefit others or the organization without the expectation of any reward. Over time, scholars argued that OCB should be understood not merely as a set of isolated behaviours but as a reflection of employees' orientation toward collective well-being. Podsakoff and colleagues expanded this same idea by distinguishing between OCB directed toward individuals (OCB-I) and OCB directed toward the organization (OCB-O). This distinction made it clear that some citizenship behaviors mainly support coworkers, while others benefit the entire organization. They also introduced additional aspects like institutional compliance, personally motivated initiatives and sharing knowledge, to better understand how work has changed over time, especially in the academic or education fields. Knowledge sharing and teamwork have become crucial forms of OCB in situations where intellectual collaboration impacts the overall organization's success. As a result, the literature has evolved from a narrow list of behaviors to a rather complex understanding of citizenship as an important part of organizational effectiveness.

### **Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in the Context of Higher Education**

Higher education institutions are integrated with a distinctive, highly specified environment, to aid the process of knowledge sharing and creation. Unlike industries and corporations, higher educational institutions function through a system of shared governance, maintaining academic freedom and rules/policies that encourage voluntary participation. So, OCB in this context appears to be an essential element of academic functioning. In the case of faculty members, OCB can be observed when teachers take out extra time to teach their students, mentoring them beyond formal teaching responsibilities, guiding junior colleagues through peer support, serving at committees without necessarily getting rewards or incentives. These behaviours have always been deeply embedded in the professional ethos of academia, where teaching, research and service intersect. Faculty members indulge in interdisciplinary projects and courses, peer reviewing processes that rely heavily on goodwill and professional commitment rather than formal mandates. Nowadays it can be seen in newly emerging universities

and their innovative curriculums. There's a freedom of acting independently while achieving the required objectives. In this sense, universities have shaped a system wherein students and professors work together, socialize together, even outside the confines of their classrooms, through virtual platforms to achieve academic success, not necessarily following the strict notions of being inside classrooms or learning only within college hours.

Moving on to higher education's administrative bodies, people involved with the administration, support staff similarly demonstrate OCB through flexibility, showing a genuine concern to assist and solve problems and showing dedication to improve student services, oftentimes under limited resources. The significance of OCB to higher education institutions can also be understood through institutional theory and professional commitment theory. Institutional theory states that members of an organization conform or operate under specified norms, adhering towards values that define legitimacy within one's respective field, especially industrial and corporate sectors. In contrast, the norms of mentorship, collegiality and scholarly cooperation in academia tends to encourage extra-role actions or behaviour as part of a professional identity. In other words, the academic sector encourages OCB by default, so as to create a healthy learning environment for everyone. Someone who doesn't indulge in extra-role activities might actually invite flak in the rarest of cases. The latter, professional commitment theory, further explains that academics identify more strongly with their profession instead of the employer, motivating them to engage in behaviours that uphold the integrity of the academic community and keeping the actual objectives of the educational institutions alive, which is to produce and share knowledge and pave the way for innovation in society. Empirical research shows that OCB is directly linked to increased retention rates, better student satisfaction, more productive research and easier organizational adaptation during times of transition. This is only specific to the field of higher education. Students benefit from increased academic support and administrative responsiveness when faculty and staff voluntarily go above and beyond their designated responsibilities. It can very well be said that OCB serves as a stabilizing mechanism that not only preserves continuity and morale during institutional restructuring, but also creates a space for freedom and organization to thrive simultaneously and in a controlled manner..

#### **Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in Higher Education Institutions**

It is necessary to stress on both psychological and organizational factors to understand why people display organizational citizenship behaviour. Researchers argue that with voluntary contributions individuals reciprocate perceived organizational support. When staff members or the faculty perceive fairness, support and respect from their institutions, they get inherently motivated to indulge in activities or behaviours that benefit the organization beyond formal requirements. If we were to narrow it down to an individual level, then factors like intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction and professional commitment become vivid predictors of OCB. The theoretical framework of Self-Determination can help us in explaining this connection. The theory argues that persons who experience autonomy, relatedness and competence in their workplace are more inclined to indulge in outer role tasks and contribute voluntarily to the organization.

The autonomy associated with academic work and the sense of satisfaction derived from learning, teaching and research manifests the same motivation that leads individuals into voluntary behaviours as described above. Organizational factors such as leadership style, transformational leadership and willingness to perform with the teams has been shown to foster OCB. Such traits go on to inspire a shared sense of vision and provide individualized consideration, altogether encouraging intellectual stimulation. Organizational justice theory further suggests that perceptions of fairness in procedures, interactions and outcomes strongly influence employees' willingness to go beyond their formal roles. A workplace categorized by traits like transparency, recognition, open communication, collegial respect, all collectively manifests a fertile ground for citizenship behavioural patterns. Social factors like peer norms and team cohesion are also worth noting. In academic departments where collaborative norms are strong, individuals seem more likely to adopt OCB. Individuals tend to model or replicate behaviours that they observe in respected colleagues. So, over the course of time, OCB gets intertwined in the culture of the university or college.

#### **Manifestations of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in Higher Education**

In higher education institutions, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour can be observed in the everyday practices that maintain academic life. Extra-role behaviours have become quite evident or consequential inside campuses, mainly because of the collegial nature of universities, where the primary mission is knowledge sharing and creation, altogether motivating individuals to engage in extra-role activities, like helping colleagues or students with work that doesn't necessarily require their presence or cooperation. One of the obvious manifestations of OCB in academia is instructional support. Faculty members frequently invest time and effort to teach students outside official/formal classroom hours. They further act as mentors in research projects, offering career advice and providing emotional support. In other words, a personalized approach is what categorizes OCB in educational settings. These actions take us back to the concepts of altruism and conscientiousness discussed previously in Organ's framework. However, in the academic context these actions also showcase a professional ethic that is embedded in mentorship traditions and the moral responsibility of educators.

To shed more light on this understanding, Role Theory presents a helpful explanation. It states that academics tend to internalize broader role expectations than those formally defined in contracts. The “teacher-scholar” identity, by default, carries the inherent norms of care, mentorship, availability, and all that extends beyond the formal rules of the classroom or one's designation. Another prominent expression of OCB is collegial collaboration. Studies have shown that faculty members collaborate with each other, share teaching materials, team-up on research projects/activities, assist in peer review processes and even go on to mentor junior colleagues without formal incentives/compensation. Such actions/behaviour can also be understood through the arguments presented by the Communities of Practice Theory. This one states that professional learning happens through collaborative efforts, participation in shared practices and mutual engagement. In academia, knowledge sharing and mentoring are not simply acts of generosity but essential mechanisms through which disciplinary knowledge is reproduced and advanced. Actions relating to OCB also align with the perspectives of civic virtue, wherein individuals voluntarily participate in the governance and intellectual life of the institution. Non-teaching staff administrative contributions also represent OCB. Administrative staff frequently go above and beyond official directives to create student-friendly policies, handle unforeseen issues, and improve departmental communication. These activities demonstrate how OCB functions at various levels of hierarchy, supporting the notion that informal, voluntary initiatives that improve organizational responsiveness are just as important to successful higher education as formal structures.

### **Antecedents in Higher Education Settings**

One of the key antecedents in higher educational settings is professional autonomy. Academics traditionally have a high degree of freedom or independence when it comes to teaching and research. When faculty members are entrusted with their professional responsibilities, they naturally get inclined to respond or reciprocate by engaging in extra-role behaviours. This autonomy also explains the emergence of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour toward the environment (OCBE), where faculty members contribute to institutional sustainability, governance and academic culture, through said extra-role activities. The state of leadership and management practices also shapes the environment in which OCB flourishes. Transformational leadership theory states that leaders who strongly present their vision, provide intellectual stimulation and offer personalized support inspire followers to move past or transcend the confines of self-interest and indulge in collective-roles to fulfill institutional goals. An atmosphere that is favorable to civic engagement is produced in universities by department heads and administrators who value voluntary contributions, promote involvement, and set an example of cooperative behavior. When faculty and staff see leadership as motivating and encouraging rather than controlling and bureaucratic, they are more inclined to go above and beyond their assigned responsibilities. Further explaining why OCB rises when organizations recognize voluntary work is Perceived Organizational Support, which has its roots in Social Exchange Theory. Employees feel obligated to return the favor when they perceive that their organization appreciates their contributions and is concerned about their welfare. Thus, appreciation, justice, and recognition serve as motivators for voluntary work. This understanding is supported by organizational justice theory, which highlights how faculty and staff are encouraged to put forth discretionary effort when workload distribution, promotions, and decision-making procedures are fair.

It is quite difficult to claim that faculty citizenship behaviour alone determines whether an institution becomes high performing. What the evidence does indicate, however, is that the attitudes, commitments, and professional dispositions of faculty members are deeply connected to institutional success. In addition, the findings underscore the importance of staff commitment in ensuring that organizational processes function effectively. When staff members feel closely attached to the institution, they are more likely to ensure that decisions taken at senior administrative levels are translated into consistent practice at operational levels. In this sense, institutional effectiveness depends not only on strategic decision-making but also on the dedication of those responsible for carrying out these decisions in everyday contexts. The study further revealed that faculty who tend to display higher levels of citizenship behaviour are also more likely to engage in other cooperative and supportive activities, such as serving on committees, maintaining accessible office hours, and participating in departmental initiatives. These behaviours reflect a broader orientation toward collegiality and professional responsibility. Although the present analysis did not directly measure the relationship between these behaviours and institutional outcomes, earlier scholarship suggests that such individual-level engagement contributes indirectly to organizational effectiveness by strengthening cooperation and communication.

At the same time, the findings point to a tension within research-intensive universities, where institutional cultures often emphasize individual productivity, particularly in terms of research output. In such settings, faculty members who devote substantial time to service, mentoring, and other citizenship-oriented tasks may find that their personal performance metrics suffer. The demands of committee work, student support, and collegial assistance can compete with time needed for publishing and grant acquisition. This suggests that the value of citizenship behaviour may vary across career stages. Senior faculty, whose reputations and research trajectories are already established, may be better positioned to invest in citizenship activities, whereas early-career academics may feel compelled to focus more narrowly on individually rewarded tasks. A similar distinction can be observed between faculty and administrative staff roles. As universities have grown more complex, professional staff have assumed increasingly significant responsibilities in supporting institutional operations. For these employees, citizenship behaviour may have a more direct and uniformly positive impact on work outcomes, particularly in fostering

teamwork, efficient service delivery, and positive workplace climates. The study's observation that faculty and staff differ in their levels of citizenship behaviour likely reflects the differing expectations and reward structures associated with their roles rather than differences in willingness to contribute.

The concept of organizational citizenship offers valuable insights for academic leadership and professional development initiatives. By understanding how voluntary actions contribute to institutional functioning, leaders can design strategies that encourage constructive behaviours without undermining academic independence. Future investigations could broaden the scope of inquiry to include a wider range of institutions and disciplinary contexts, enabling more robust models for predicting how citizenship behaviour relates to performance. Such research may also inform the design of professional development programs that help faculty and staff recognize how their everyday actions influence institutional outcomes. These discussions must carefully distinguish between encouraging cooperation and preserving academic freedom, ensuring that expectations for citizenship do not become coercive. From a practical standpoint, the study suggests that cultivating institutional commitment is likely to foster higher levels of citizenship behaviour. This can be achieved through supportive leadership, recognition of effort, and the development of workplace cultures that value collaboration and mutual respect. Rather than relying solely on formal incentives, institutions may find that citizenship behaviour grows naturally in environments where employees feel valued and connected to the organizational mission. In this respect, promoting citizenship is closely linked to broader human resource development practices and the creation of a positive organizational climate. Ultimately, higher education institutions depend heavily on the actions of the people who sustain them. When faculty and staff willingly extend themselves beyond formal obligations to support students, colleagues, and institutional goals, the overall effectiveness of the university is strengthened. Institutional success, therefore, is closely tied to the everyday willingness of its members to contribute in ways that exceed what is formally required, reinforcing the idea that human commitment remains at the heart of academic excellence.

### **A Case Study**

A noteworthy empirical case examining OCB in an educational setting was conducted in the district of Quetta, Pakistan, where researchers investigated how secondary school teachers exhibit OCB across various demographic groups. In this study, a sample of 250 teachers from both public and private secondary schools was surveyed using a structured questionnaire designed around the established dimensions of OCB, such as conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, and altruism. Teachers responded to items on a Likert-type scale, enabling the researchers to quantify their extra-role behaviours that support school functioning beyond formal duties. The study's findings demonstrated that teachers overall displayed significant levels of OCB, indicating that many educators willingly engage in behaviours that exceed their prescribed responsibilities to benefit their schools. Interestingly, the analysis revealed no significant difference in OCB levels between male and female teachers, nor between those working in public versus private institutions. However, differences emerged when age and teaching experience were considered, with older and more experienced teachers tending to show higher discretionary behaviours. These results suggest that demographic factors such as maturity and years in the profession may influence an educator's likelihood of engaging in citizenship behaviour, potentially because experienced teachers have stronger institutional ties and a broader understanding of their school's needs. The implications of this case study are especially relevant for educational leadership and human resource practices in schools. By recognizing and fostering conditions that support discretionary pro-social behaviour—such as professional development, supportive school climates, and opportunities for collaboration—administrators can enhance the informal support structures that contribute to educational effectiveness. The study highlights that while formal job descriptions outline core responsibilities, it is often the extra-role efforts of teachers that strengthen collegial cooperation and enrich students' learning environments, reinforcing the value of OCB in academic institutions.

### **Outcomes and Barriers**

The presence of OCB has significant consequences for institutional functioning. One major outcome is enhanced organizational performance. Universities operate in complex, dynamic environments that require adaptability, innovation, and collaboration. OCB contributes to these capacities by fostering informal networks of support, encouraging knowledge sharing, and facilitating problem solving beyond bureaucratic procedures. Resource-based views of organizations suggest that intangible assets such as trust, cooperation, and shared commitment are crucial for sustained performance. OCB helps build these intangible assets. Another important outcome is the improvement of the student experience. When faculty and staff willingly invest additional effort in mentoring, advising, and supporting students, the quality of student engagement increases. Students perceive the institution as caring and responsive, which contributes to higher satisfaction and retention rates. This aligns with service quality theories, which argue that customer satisfaction in service organizations depends heavily on discretionary employee behaviours. OCB also strengthens organizational culture by fostering collegial support and mutual trust. Over time, repeated acts of cooperation create norms of helpfulness and solidarity. Social capital theory helps explain this process by showing how networks of trust and reciprocity enhance collective action. In academic settings, such social capital supports interdisciplinary collaboration, smooth governance, and resilience during institutional change.

Despite its advantages, OCB in higher education faces significant barriers. One of the primary challenges is work overload. Faculty and staff often experience heavy teaching, research, and administrative demands. According to the Job Demands–Resources model, when demands exceed available resources, individuals conserve energy by limiting their efforts to essential tasks. Burnout and stress reduce the capacity and willingness to engage in voluntary behaviours. Another barrier arises from reward structures that prioritize formal achievements such as publications, grants, and measurable outputs. When performance evaluation systems ignore or undervalue citizenship behaviours, faculty and staff may perceive little incentive to invest in such activities. Expectancy theory explains this dynamic by suggesting that individuals are motivated when they believe their efforts will lead to valued outcomes. If OCB is not recognized in appraisal systems, motivation for such behaviours diminishes. Cultural misalignment within institutions can also inhibit OCB. In environments where competition outweighs collaboration, or where bureaucratic rigidity suppresses initiative, voluntary cooperation declines. Institutional culture theory indicates that norms and values shape behaviour. If institutional norms do not promote collegiality and shared responsibility, OCB becomes less likely to emerge. Thus, while OCB contributes substantially to the effectiveness of higher education institutions, its presence depends on supportive structures, fair recognition, manageable workloads, and cultures that value cooperation over competition.

## CONCLUSION

Organizational Citizenship Behaviours have attracted sustained scholarly attention since the late twentieth century, when researchers began to recognize that organizations depend not only on formally prescribed duties but also on voluntary, informal contributions made by their members. Early conceptualizations described these behaviours as discretionary actions that are neither mandated by job descriptions nor directly compensated, yet collectively enhance the functioning of the organization. Central to this understanding is the idea of choice: individuals engage in such behaviours because they wish to, not because they are required to. The emphasis on discretion distinguishes citizenship behaviours from routine performance and highlights their connection to personal initiative and professional values. As research progressed, scholars expanded the concept in multiple directions. Some approached citizenship behaviour as a reflection of personality traits and prosocial orientations, while others examined it through observable behavioural patterns such as helping colleagues, demonstrating initiative, and maintaining a positive work climate. Debates also emerged about whether citizenship behaviour is truly separable from in-role performance, especially in professions where informal cooperation is essential for daily operations. This led to broader interpretations in which citizenship behaviour is viewed as part of a continuum of workplace conduct rather than a strictly bounded category. Citizenship behaviours are often described as extra-role actions that extend beyond formal job responsibilities while contributing positively to the work environment. They stand in contrast to behaviours that undermine organizational functioning, such as withdrawal, conflict, or neglect of duties.

Research consistently links citizenship behaviour with desirable workplace outcomes, including higher morale, stronger interpersonal relationships, improved retention, and greater productivity. These outcomes suggest that organizations benefit significantly from the willingness of individuals to act in ways that support collective goals without expectation of formal reward. A recurring theme in this body of research is the connection between citizenship behaviour and perceptions of fairness and respect in the workplace. Employees who feel that they are treated justly and who themselves value fair treatment of others are more likely to engage in cooperative and supportive behaviours. Individuals who are attentive to social cues and mindful of how their actions affect others also tend to display higher levels of citizenship behaviour, reflecting a capacity for empathy and interpersonal awareness. Altruistic tendencies and sensitivity to the needs of colleagues frequently accompany such behaviours, reinforcing a culture of mutual assistance. Perhaps most significant is the established relationship between citizenship behaviour and organizational performance. Studies across a variety of sectors have demonstrated that organizations in which employees regularly engage in voluntary, supportive actions tend to function more effectively. These behaviours contribute to smoother coordination, better communication, and enhanced adaptability. Evidence from different national and industrial contexts indicates that the positive effects of citizenship behaviour are not limited to specific organizational types but represent a broadly applicable phenomenon. Higher education, however, presents a distinctive environment that does not easily align with conventional models used to assess organizational performance.

Universities and colleges do not operate according to industrial production logics, nor can they be fully understood through the lens of customer service models. While certain administrative functions resemble service provision, the central mission of higher education involves intellectual development, critical inquiry, and personal growth, which are difficult to quantify using traditional efficiency measures. As a result, scholars have proposed diverse criteria for evaluating institutional quality, ranging from financial sustainability and access to employment outcomes and research productivity. Despite this diversity, measures such as graduation rates and research output often remain central indicators of institutional success. Within this complex environment, faculty members play a particularly pivotal role. They are the primary agents of teaching and learning and the principal contributors to research and knowledge creation. Although leadership, policy, and infrastructure shape institutional conditions, it is faculty engagement in the classroom and in scholarly work that most directly influences educational outcomes.

Their daily interactions with students and colleagues position them as critical contributors to institutional performance. For this reason, examining citizenship behaviour among faculty provides valuable insight into how voluntary, extra-role actions can affect the broader success of higher education institutions.

## REFERENCES

1. Alreck, Pamela L., and Robert B. Settle. *The Survey Research Handbook*. Irwin, 2022.
2. Bergeron, Diane, et al. "The Dual Effects of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Relationships to Research Productivity and Career Outcomes in Academe." *Human Performance*, vol. 27, no. 2, 2023, pp. 99–128.
3. Chughtai, Aamir A. "Impact of Job Involvement on In-Role Job Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior." *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2024, pp. 169–183.
4. Emmerik, Hetty H. van, et al. "Associations among Altruism, Burnout Dimensions, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior." *Work & Stress*, vol. 19, no. 1, 2022, pp. 93–100.
5. Fincher, Stacy E. *An Exploration of Performance-Based Funding at Four-Year Public Colleges in the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools*. University of Arkansas, 2023. Doctoral dissertation.
6. Giroux, Henry A. "Vocationalizing Higher Education: Schooling and the Politics of Corporate Culture." *Beyond the Corporate University*, edited by Henry A. Giroux and Kostas Myrsiades, Rowman and Littlefield, 2024, pp. 29–44.
7. Harvey, Lee, and Diana Green. "Defining Quality." *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2022, pp. 9–26.
8. Kelloway, E. Kevin, et al. "Self-Reported Counterproductive Behaviors and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Separate but Related Constructs." *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, vol. 10, nos. 1–2, 2023, pp. 143–152.
9. Podsakoff, Philip M., et al. "Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research." *Journal of Management*, vol. 26, no. 3, 2024, pp. 513–563.
10. Bakker, Arnold B., and Evangelia Demerouti. "Job Demands–Resources Theory: Taking Stock and Looking Forward." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, vol. 22, no. 3, 2022, pp. 273–285.
11. Bolino, Mark C., et al. "Citizenship Behavior and the Creation of Social Capital in Organizations." *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 27, no. 4, 2023, pp. 505–522.
12. Eisenberger, Robert, et al. "Perceived Organizational Support." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 71, no. 3, 2024, pp. 500–507.
13. Organ, Dennis W. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington Books, 2022.
14. Podsakoff, Philip M., et al. "Transformational Leader Behaviors and Their Effects on Followers' Trust in Leader, Satisfaction, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors." *The Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2023, pp. 107–142.
15. Somech, Anit, and Anat Drach-Zahavy. "Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Employees' Strain: Examining the Buffering Effects of Leader Support and Participation in Decision Making." *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 13, no. 3, 2024, pp. 339–363.