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Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to explore an integrative model which includes specific intentions that may explain the contradictory citizenship behaviors and misbehaviors among superintendents in Israel.

Design/methodology/approach – In total, 518 superintendents from seven Israeli Ministry of Education district offices were randomly selected. Based on sequence theory, the study examined motivational perceptions of authentic leadership, psychological empowerment and collective efficacy, and their relationships toward intentions to engage in organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and organizational misbehavior (OMB) which may lead to OCB and OMB. The research combined self-reports and computer records. The model was analyzed using Mplus statistical packages.

Findings – The authors found that intentions to be late positively predicted lateness, while intentions to leave predicted OMB. In addition, the study indicates several mediating relationships. For example, intentions to engage in OCB-organization and OCB-individual fully mediated the relationship between “self-determination” of psychological empowerment and OCB. In addition, intention to leave mediated the relationship between authentic leadership and lateness.

Originality/value – Across nationalities, superintendents greatly impact the educational processes in their districts. Their high status in the educational system makes them role models. Therefore, it is important to investigate their behaviors and motivations. The findings may contribute toward developing an integrative approach that can predict the superintendents’ behaviors by suggesting specific intentions that can explain corresponding behaviors. This model may also help in developing educational policies for reducing the superintendents’ OMB and increasing their OCB.
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Introduction

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and organizational misbehavior (OMB) have been studied on principals and teachers in cross-national studies in various educational systems (Shapira-Lishchinsky and Raftar-Ozery, 2018). However, their effects on superintendents have never been studied. Although superintendents’ roles vary across countries, their importance in stimulating policy in schools, and their status as responsible to school principals, teachers and students, make them natural role models. Therefore, it is important to investigate their motivational perceptions and attitudes toward OCB and OMB. Obviously, such high level in the educational system should be motivated to act in citizenship behavior. However, their workload and their autonomy in designing their roles, may reveal misbehaviors, which can reduce the district’s effectiveness. Understanding this problematic context led us to explore the perceptions, intentions and behaviors of the superintendents in the different Israeli districts.

Our study adopted Ajzen’s (2012) sequence theory which argues that psychological mechanisms, including an individual’s perceptions and specific intentions, lead to corresponding behaviors. We further chose the self-determination theory (SDT) (Ryan and Deci, 2017) as the conceptual framework for selecting perceptions of psychological empowerment, collective efficacy and authentic leadership, since these perceptions
include motivational elements toward intentions to engage in OCB and OMB, and could provide a broad perspective to explain OCB and OMB among superintendents in the different Israeli districts.

Based on these theories, the main goal of this study was to examine an integrative model of motivational aspects, such as perceptions of psychological empowerment, collective efficacy and authentic leadership toward OCB and OMB intentions (including intention to be late and leave) that correspond to OCB and OMB (including lateness) among superintendents in the different Israeli districts.

We begin with a description of the superintendents’ roles and the sequence theory. We then discuss the predictors, in terms of their motivational aspects: authentic leadership, psychological empowerment and collective efficacy (the independent variables), and OCB and OMB (the dependent variables). We finally discuss the relationships between intent to engage in OCB, intent to engage in OMB (the mediators) and OCB and OMB.

Theoretical background

Superintendents’ roles in Israel

Israel is divided into seven districts with the Ministry of Education managing the financial, administrational and pedagogical aspects through multiple superintendents in each district under a district head (Shapira-Lishchinsky and Litchka, 2018). Some superintendents are “general superintendents” whose responsibility is the educational processes in schools, and others are subject specific superintendents (e.g. math, English, biology, etc.). Israeli superintendents in the different districts, regardless of their roles, are obligated to adhere to the same policies and educational changes, based on a centralized educational system that is under the supervision of the Ministry of Education (Nir and Eyal, 2003). This creates high levels of bureaucratic structure (Arar and Avidov-Ungar, 2019).

Superintendents in Israel have both instructional leadership and managerial responsibilities, being responsible for the administrative educational processes and teaching in schools (Schechter, 2011). More specifically, the Ministry of Education appoints the superintendents in each district and they are responsible to supervise and implement the Ministry’s policies and regulations (Bogler and Nir, 2017). The superintendents have several roles: implementing educational visions, goals and initiatives while adapting the curriculum to the school’s needs. This includes promoting a positive school climate for changes and encouraging teacher training and professional development; coordinating between various educational stakeholders, mobilizing school resources toward the community’s needs; obtaining relevant information regarding school outcomes and teaching methods to evaluate and analyze school achievements for improving the educational system; organizing, supervising and planning resource allocation and principal and teacher appointments and dismissals (Addi-Raccah, 2015).

Israeli superintendents are obligated to spend one day a week in their offices for meeting with teachers and administrative work. The other days are dedicated toward visits, meetings and activities in their district schools. There are written values in the code of ethics of the public sector which includes the Ministry of Education. These values include upholding human dignity, equality, equity, integrity and social justice, which can affect the superintendents’ behaviors toward promoting an ethical climate in schools (Shapira-Lishchinsky, 2019).

Sequence theory

Ajzen and Fishbein (2005) developed the sequence theory, which includes the notion of “perception–intention–behavior.” This theory argues that there is a strong link between perceptions, intentions and behaviors. Intentions are determined by the attitude toward
the behavior. Intentions reflect the employees’ motivations to take action, and the level of effort they are willing to invest to carry out the behavior (Ajzen, 2012). Based on Ajzen and Fishbein (2005), those specific intentions serve as predictive criteria for corresponding behavior. We expect that intentions toward misbehavior (e.g. the intention to be late) will predict improper behaviors (e.g. lateness) better than other general attitudes.

Supporting this model, turnover intention has been shown to be among the best predictors of turnover (Cohen and Golan, 2007). In addition, Foust et al. (2006) found that among 130 undergraduate students and 298 employees working at a university and health care facility, the specific measure to lateness, “lateness attitude,” predicted lateness behaviors over a six-month period, and it improved prediction of lateness behavior above and beyond predictions made with only general job attitudes such as job involvement, job satisfaction and affective commitment. Moreover, in the educational field, it was found that among 443 teachers from 21 secondary schools, the specific measure of absenteeism, “absenteeism acceptance,” predicted teachers’ absence better that other general job attitudes such as collective self-efficacy, organizational commitment and organizational justice (Shapira-Lishchinsky and Ishan, 2013).

Motivational aspects of perceptions of psychological empowerment, collective efficacy, authentic leadership and their relationships to behavioral intentions

Extensive research has been conducted in the field of motivation in organizational contexts, in general, and in education, in particular (e.g. Avolio et al., 2009; Bandura, 1997). SDT posits that there are two main types of motivation, intrinsic and extrinsic, and that both shape who we are and how we behave (Ryan and Deci, 2017). According to Deci and Ryan (2008), extrinsic motivation is a drive to behave in certain ways that comes from external sources and results in external rewards. Such sources include grading systems, employee evaluations, awards and the respect and admiration of others. Conversely, intrinsic motivation comes from within. There are internal drives that motivate us to behave in certain ways, including our core values, our interests and our personal sense of morality.

Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation seem to be diametrically opposed, with intrinsic driving behaviors that match our “ideal self” and extrinsic leading us to conform with the standards of others. However, there is another way of classifying motivation, which the present study focuses. SDT differentiates between autonomous motivation and controlled motivation (Ryan and Deci, 2017). Autonomous motivation includes motivation that comes from internal sources, but it also includes motivation from extrinsic sources if the individual has identified with an activity’s value and feels that it aligns with that individual’s sense of self. Controlled motivation is comprised of external regulations, types of motivation in which the individual’s behavior is directed by external rewards and punishment. This can be from regulations, or motivations as avoiding shame, seeking approval, and protecting the ego.

When an individual is driven by autonomous motivations, he or she feels self-directed and autonomous. When the individual is driven by controlled motivation, he or she feels pressured to behave in a certain way and experiences little to no autonomy (Ryan and Deci, 2017).

This study, which was based on the motivational aspect of SDT, focused on perceptions that include motivational elements toward engaging in OCB and OMB, such as psychological empowerment, collective efficacy and authentic leadership.

Psychological empowerment – Conger et al. (2000) defined psychological empowerment as a process of enhancing feelings of self-efficacy among organizational members by both formal and informal practices. Short and Rinehart (1992) focused on psychological empowerment in education and defined it as a process in which participants develop the competence to take
charge of their own growth and solve their own problems. In this study, we adopted Spreitzer’s (1995) definition of psychological empowerment, which is the employees’ perceived sense of control in the workplace. This empowerment has four dimensions.

“Meaning” is defined as employees’ perceptions of their work as being valued. It refers to the professional respect and appreciation that employees receive from colleagues for their knowledge and expertise; “competence” is defined as the employees’ beliefs that they possess the necessary skills to perform skill-related tasks in a successful manner. It refers to the employees’ perceptions that they are equipped with the skills to develop programs in the workplace; “self-determination” is defined as the employees’ sense of freedom in working in the manner they choose. It refers to the feeling of control that employees have at work. Self-determination also refers to employees’ participation in critical decisions that directly affect their work, for example, concerning budgeting and scheduling issues. “Impact” is defined as the degree to which employees feel that their achievements make a difference. It refers to employees’ perceptions of their influence on what happens in the workplace.

When employees see their jobs as meaningful, or feel that they can influence the organization, they are likely to be motivated to care more deeply about what they do in the workplace than people who do not see their work as meaningful. These employees will have fewer intentions to misbehave (e.g. be late, miss work or leave) than employees who exhibit a low sense of psychological empowerment (Meyerson and Kline, 2008).

Perceptions of collective efficacy reflect shared beliefs concerning capabilities to organize and execute behaviors required to produce given goals. Given that collective efficacy focuses on interactive dynamics, the outcome of collective efficacy is more than the sum of individual contributions (Bandura, 1997). Previous studies, in different work settings, indicate that there is a strong, positive relationship between collective efficacy and employee performance (e.g. Tasa et al., 2007; Ware and Kitsantas, 2007).

Schechter and Tschannen-Moran (2006) distinguish between two types of collective efficacy. Collective efficacy strategies refer to the employees’ collective competence within the group with whom they work, to carry out goals, objectives and work plans to achieve desired results. Collective efficacy discipline refers to the employees’ collective efficacy regarding the ability of the group to deal with disciplinary procedures and organizational issues. According to Kelloway et al. (2010), lower perceptions of collective efficacy reflect a lack of motivation toward engaging in OCB. Therefore, the intention to engage in OMB can be seen as frustration or as a kind of protest against the group or the organizational members.

Authentic leadership is a synergistic combination of self-awareness, sensitivity to the needs of others, honesty and transparency regarding self and others. Authentic leaders trust those under their charge and express confidence in their own capabilities and in the capabilities of the people they lead. They know how to set limits, to stand their ground, and to fearlessly voice their honest opinion. They are motivated to treat their employees with respect, and they encourage their employees’ motivation (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Authentic leadership is advantageous to organizations and encourages collegial relationships among employees (Avolio et al., 2009). Authentic leadership that produces employee motivation can lead to high effectiveness and performance (Walumbwa et al., 2010). Thus, we may assume that among superintendents:

**H1a.** Psychological empowerment, authentic leadership and collective efficacy will relate positively to motivational aspects.

**H1b.** Motivational aspects of perceptions of psychological empowerment, collective efficacy and authentic leadership, will have a positive relationship with intention to engage in OCB and have a negative relationship with intention to engage in OMB.
Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)

Previous studies have identified antecedents and consequences of OCB, behaviors that promote effective organization functioning, which are not directly recognized by the formal reward system (e.g. Nasra and Heilbrunn, 2016). Thus, OCB is an employee’s contribution to the organization beyond the formal obligations (Somech and Khotaba, 2017). These “extra-role” behaviors are important and even crucial for an organization’s survival (Vigoda-Gadot et al., 2007). OCB is important to organizations because formal job descriptions cannot encompass the whole range of behaviors needed for organizations to achieve their goals. These behaviors develop in the workplace due to voluntary efforts of employees to exceed expectations when given instructions and tasks (Organ et al., 2006). Williams and Anderson (1991) divided OCB into two different concepts: citizenship behaviors that support specific individuals, for example, colleagues – termed OCB-individual (OCB-I); and citizenship behavior that benefits the organization, as a whole – termed OCB-organization (OCB-O).

Today, schools are becoming more dependent on superintendents who are willing to exert considerable effort beyond formal job requirements, namely, engaging in OCB (Shapira-Lishchinsky, 2018). Applying OCB to the educational system, Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2000) describe different dimensions of OCB: on the individual level (e.g. donating behaviors); on the team level (e.g. sharing and cooperative behaviors); and on the organizational level (e.g. organizing social activities for the schools). In our study context, OCB consists of contributions that superintendents freely choose to make or withhold, knowing that their actions are neither sanctioned nor incentivized (Organ et al., 2006).

Organizational misbehavior (OMB)

OMB is defined as voluntary employee behavior, committed by choice, that contradicts significant organizational norms, core societal values and standards of proper conduct. It is considered a threat to the well-being of the organization and/or to its members (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). Vardi and Weitz (2016) perceive that misbehavior is influenced by two factors, norms which develop in the organization and norms that are anchored in more general social values. Behaviors, such as employee lateness, using the organization’s equipment for personal use, taking unnecessary breaks, delivering poor quality work, and political harm, such as gossiping about colleagues and creating conflict groups, are considered deviant workplace behaviors (Ben-Sasson and Somech, 2015). In actuality, OMB expresses negative aspects of employees’ behaviors that are liable to harm the organization’s welfare, its members and community.

Today, misbehavior is an integral part of everyday organizational worklife. As a result, superintendents may accept lateness or absenteeism as a given, and not as something that is extraordinary, including the inadequate functioning that accompanies such behaviors. This might influence superintendents to also engage in such behaviors in the future and to decrease their investment of time in their districts because of these behaviors (Shapira-Lishchinsky and Tsemah, 2014).

The relationship between intention to engage in OCB and OMB and corresponding behaviors

There has been scant research on links between employees’ intentions to engage in OCB and actual OCB behaviors. Williams et al. (2002) found that OCB is an outcome of intentions to engage in OCB that relate to the degree to which employees tend to engage in a specific type of OCB. These authors found that intentions to engage in OCB positively relates to actual OCB. In addition, other studies have shown that there is a positive relationship between intention to engage in OMB and OMB (Henle et al., 2010; Vardi and Weitz, 2016).
When employees’ intentions to misbehave are based on perceptions of their leaders or work group, there can be negative behaviors, such as ignoring the value of work time, violating regulations, being late, absenteeism and attrition (Shapira-Lishchinsky and Raftar-Ozery, 2018).

Based on Ajzen (2012), which avers that specific attitudes are predictive criteria for behavior itself, we expect that intentions to engage in OMB (e.g. intention to be late) will be better predictors of OMB (e.g. lateness) than other general attitudes, such as organizational commitment or organizational justice. For example, the intention to leave has been shown to be among the best predictors of turnover (Griffeth et al., 2000). Furthermore, several studies (e.g. Cohen and Golan, 2007; Shapira-Lishchinsky and Raftar-Ozery, 2018) have used the intention to leave a job as indicative of actual turnover behavior. This is due to the evidence that intentions are the immediate determinants of actual turnover behavior.

Based on the above studies that show a positive relationship between intention to engage in OMB and OMB, and intention to engage in OCB and OCB, we can assume that among superintendents:

**H2a.** Intentions to engage in OCB will be positively related to OCB.

**H2b.** Intentions to engage in OMB will be positively related to OMB.

Based on Ajzen’s (2012) psychological model of perception–intention–behavior, and the mediating role of intentions, we can assume that when the motivational aspects of perceptions of authentic leadership, psychological empowerment and collective efficacy increase, intention to engage in OCB will increase, while intention to engage in OMB will decrease. This may lead to higher OCB and reduced OMB. Thus, we hypothesize that among superintendents:

**H3.** Intention to engage in OCB and in OMB will mediate the relationship between the motivational aspects of perceptions of psychological empowerment, collective efficacy and authentic leadership, and OCB and OMB.

Figure 1 summarizes the proposed psychological model: motivational aspects of perceptions of different dimensions of psychological empowerment, collective efficacy and authentic leadership relate to intention to engage in OMB and OCB, which relate, respectively, to OMB and OCB among superintendents.
Method

The context of the study

The Israeli educational system consists of three levels: elementary, junior high schools and high schools. Almost all schools in the education system are public. Schools generally are divided by their language of instruction, Hebrew in the Jewish sector and Arabic in the Arab sector. Within each sector, schools are grouped under supervision frameworks, which represent different cultural and religious subsectors in Israel (Mullis et al., 2016).

Sampling

We received a list of 950 superintendents from the seven Israeli districts (approximately all of the superintendents) from the Israeli Ministry of Education. Considering our limited research budget, we gave every superintendent on the list a number. The numbers were entered into a table in a random order (marked in digits 1–980). Then, 580 numbers were chosen at random from the table. Thus, the choice of one digit is unaffected by the choice of any other given digit. By using this procedure, we eliminated bias by giving all superintendents an equal chance to be chosen (Moore and McCabe, 2006). We also had a big enough initial sample to make inferences about the entire superintendent population (Etikan et al., 2016).

After receiving approval from the district heads, our research assistants coordinated with contact people numerous visits in each district. The research assistants explained in detail the aims and importance of the research during data collection that took place during the workday in each district. They also provided instructions and answered any questions the participants had. We also wrote on the first page of the questionnaire that we would maintain anonymity and confidentiality. The superintendents were asked to sign the informed consent forms and to fill in the questionnaires when they were at work, in front of their personal computers, allowing them to access the computerized lateness reports. The questionnaires were gathered by the research assistants. At the end of the data collection process, we received 518 completed questionnaires (an 89 percent response rate).

In the total sample (518 superintendents), 73 percent were women and 27 percent were men, and 84.4 percent were Jewish and 15.6 percent were Arab. The average age of the participants was $M = 48.98$ (SD = 10.52). Over 80 percent of the superintendents held a master’s degree, while the rest held Bachelor of Arts degrees.

Variables and measures

Psychological empowerment. To determine the superintendents’ perspectives regarding psychological empowerment, we used 12 items from Spreitzer’s (1995) questionnaire, which is based on the four following dimensions. Impact (e.g. “I have a strong impact on what happens in my organization,” three items, $\alpha = 0.83$); self-determination (e.g. “I have great freedom to decide how to carry out my work,” three items, $\alpha = 0.71$); meaning (e.g. “The work I do is very important to me,” three items, $\alpha = 0.83$); and competence (e.g. “I have considerable independence in my job,” three items, $\alpha = 0.79$). The general reliability of the questionnaire was $\alpha = 0.83$.

Authentic leadership. To determine the superintendents’ perspectives regarding authentic leadership, we used the 16-item questionnaire designed by Walumbwa et al.’s (2008) that queries perceptions of authentic leadership. Sample items included: “My boss makes decisions based on his/her core values” and “My boss listens carefully to different points of view, before coming to conclusions.” The general reliability of the questionnaire was $\alpha = 0.91$.

Collective efficacy. To determine the superintendents’ perspectives regarding team collective efficacy, we used Schechter and Tschannen-Moran’s (2006) 12-item questionnaire,
which has two subscales. In the collective efficacy strategies subscale (five items, \(a = 0.85\)), a sample item included: “My team promotes collaboration strategies among educational staff”; and in the collective efficacy discipline subscale (seven items, \(a = 0.88\)) a sample item included: “My team encourages teachers to act according to the rules, circulars and regulations.” The general reliability of the questionnaire was \(a = 0.87\).

**Motivation at work.** To justify the study approach, i.e., testing together psychological empowerment, authentic leadership and collective efficacy based on common motivational aspects that may predict OCB and OMB, we based our analysis on the Tremblay et al. (2009) questionnaire, referring to two main dimension: the autonomous motivation (six items, \(a = 0.84\), a sample item included: “This work is a significant part of what I am”); and controlled motivation (three items, \(a = 0.82\). a sample item included: “I want to be very good at my work, and if I will not succeed, I will be very disappointed”). The general reliability of the nine-item questionnaire was \(a = 0.83\).

**Intention to engage in OMB.** To determine superintendents’ intentions toward OMB, we used Vardi and Weitz’s (2002) measure that was updated for educational context. We presented three different hypothetical scenarios accompanied by the question, “If you were in that situation, would you have acted similarly or differently?” The Likert-type response scale used anchors of 1: “I would definitely not act this way” and 5: “I would definitely act this way.” For example: “Occasionally, you join a fellow inspector for rides to visit schools. In such cases, would you report those trips for reimbursement to increase your income?” The general reliability of the questionnaire was \(a = 0.94\).

**Intention to be late.** We used Foust et al.’s (2006) measure that was updated for educational context. According to Foust et al. (2006), we may define intention to be late as how one feels and thinks about being late for work. This measure includes items that focus specifically on affective and cognitive reactions to lateness behavior. We focused on three content domains: an individual’s affective response to his/her own lateness for work (three items, e.g. “It aggravates me when I am late for work”); an individual’s affective response to his coworkers’ lateness for work (three items, e.g. My coworkers let me down when they are late); and an individual’s beliefs or cognitions in general about work lateness (three items, e.g. lateness from work should be acceptable as long as the work gets done). A high score on the lateness attitude measure is indicative of a positive or tolerant attitude about being late to work, thereby describing a superintendent who may not have a problem with being late to work. The general reliability of the nine-item questionnaire was \(a = 0.84\).

**Intention to leave.** This measure was adopted from Walsh et al. (1985) and tapped into superintendents’ tendency to leave their workplace. One sample item is, “I often think about leaving my work” (five items, \(a = 0.94\)).

**Intention to engage in OCB.** To determine superintendents’ intentions toward OCB, we used Williams et al.’s (2002) 12-item measure. Six items indicate the extent of intention to engage in OCB-I (individual/colleague). A sample item included the intention of “helping a colleague who needs help, due to his/her work load” (\(a = 0.72\)). Six items indicated the extent of intention to engage in OCB-O (organization). A sample item included the intent to “propose ideas to streamline the work processes” (\(a = 0.74\)). The general reliability of the questionnaire was \(a = 0.70\).

**Organizational misbehavior.** This questionnaire had a series of 23 descriptive items, which followed the lead statement addressing the extent to which people typically behave in different situations in the organization (Vardi and Weitz, 2016). Superintendents were asked to rate their endorsement of a wide range of work-related types of misconduct, such as lateness without permission or absence without true justification. To minimize the potential social desirability bias, superintendents were not asked whether they themselves tended to misbehave but whether they were willing to accept the misconduct of others (Vardi, 2001).
Respondents were asked to indicate whether certain behaviors in their district were acceptable to them. A sample item included “Employees in the district are late to work or leave early without permission.” The general reliability of the questionnaire was $\alpha = 0.84$.

Organizational citizenship behavior. This 23-item scale was developed and validated in the school context, and taken from Somech and Drach-Zahavy’s (2000) work, pertaining to the dimensions: extra-role behavior toward individuals in schools; sample item: “I go to work on my free days to prevent problems with my school principals” ($\alpha = 0.98$); extra-role behavior toward the organization; sample item: “I organize social activities for my schools.” ($\alpha = 0.95$), and extra-role behavior toward the team; sample item: “I offer my colleagues worksheets that I have prepared for my schools” ($\alpha = 0.97$). The general reliability of the questionnaire was $\alpha = 0.90$.

All questionnaire answers were ranked on a Likert-type scale that ranged from one to five. Lateness was defined as arriving six or more minutes after the hour, since studies have shown that arriving 6 min late is unacceptable in many organizations (Blau, 2002). The superintendents were asked to report their frequency of lateness in the past 30 days, and the reasons for their lateness. They were asked to return their reports along with the system’s computerized frequency of lateness record in an anonymous fashion (by erasing their names). We thus strengthened the accuracy and quality of the study by using in addition to self-reporting, lateness records, which reduced one source bias.

To summarize, we used the measures of intention to leave and intention to be late, in addition to intention to engage in OMB, to measure the concept of intention to engage in different aspects of OCB. We measured lateness (self-reports, system’s computerized records) demonstrating additional aspect to OMB as corresponding behavior to intention to be late. However, we could not measure “leave” as corresponding to intention to leave, because this measure is difficult to measure in the Israeli educational system (e.g. implicit through different definitions, such as a sabbatical longer than one year, or unpaid vacations).

Data analysis

The data were analyzed using the Mplus 7.0 statistical package. The study methodology approach was based on individual-level variables based on previous studies arguing that variables (e.g. collective efficacy) can emerge as group-level variables, but they originate at the individual level (Kark et al., 2003; Kristof-Brown et al., 2014). Moreover, the study variables were based on a self-rating scale, measured with no interdependence between the study participants, as most of the superintendents belonged to different work teams.

Results

Exploratory factor analysis

The first step of the analysis was based on an exploratory factor analysis on a random sample ($n = 102$). In the second phase, a confirmatory factor analysis was done on the remainder of the sample ($n = 416$). The confirmatory factor analysis yielded four factors for psychological empowerment: “impact,” “meaning,” “competence” and “self-determination.” Furthermore, it yielded one factor for authentic leadership; two factors for collective efficacy: “strategy” and “discipline”; two factors for intent to engage in OCB: toward individuals (OCB-I) and toward the organization (OCB-O); one factor for intent to engage in OMB; one factor for OCB; and one factor for OMB.

Examining the study hypotheses

$H1a$ which argued that psychological empowerment, authentic leadership and collective efficacy will relate positively to motivational aspects (dimensions) was confirmed. We found that all of the factors were positively and significantly correlated (see Table I). The significant, relatively high correlations between the study predictors (psychological behavior and misbehavior
empowerment, authentic leadership and collective efficacy) and the different dimensions of motivation (autonomous and controlled) justified the study approach, since these dimensions relate and reflect motivational aspects according to the theory, leading to intentions, and OCB and OMB.

H1b, which argued that perceptions of motivational predictors, such as psychological empowerment, collective efficacy and authentic leadership, would positively relate to superintendents’ intention to engage in OCB and negatively relate to their intention to engage in OMB, was confirmed. We found, based on the standardized coefficients, (see Table II) that “self-determination” of psychological empowerment correlates positively with intention to engage in OCB-I (toward individuals/colleagues) ($\beta = 0.35, p < 0.05$) and with OCB-O ($\beta = 0.21, p < 0.05$). Similarly, perceptions of the “strategy” dimension of collective efficacy positively relate to intentions to engage in OCB-I ($\beta = 0.22, p < 0.05$), and negatively relate to the intention to engage in OMB ($\beta = -0.22, p < 0.05$).

The study shows a negative relationship between perception of authentic leadership and one aspect of intention to engage in OMB, the intent to leave ($\beta = -0.26, p < 0.001$). When focusing on the dimension of impact of psychological empowerment, we found that participants, who perceived themselves as psychologically empowered, had a decreased intent to be late ($\beta = -0.24, p < 0.01$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Controlled motivation</th>
<th>Autonomous motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership</td>
<td>$0.24^* (0.06)$</td>
<td>$0.21^{**} (0.05)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment – impact</td>
<td>$0.49^{***} (0.046)$</td>
<td>$0.47^{***} (0.04)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment – meaning</td>
<td>$0.62^{***} (0.04)$</td>
<td>$0.70^{***} (0.034)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment – self-determination</td>
<td>$0.40^{***} (0.055)$</td>
<td>$0.35^{***} (0.05)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment – competence</td>
<td>$0.30^{***} (0.06)$</td>
<td>$0.25^{***} (0.06)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination – discipline</td>
<td>$0.34^{***} (0.05)$</td>
<td>$0.30^{***} (0.05)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination – strategies</td>
<td>$0.40^{***} (0.05)$</td>
<td>$0.38^{***} (0.05)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $n = 416$. Standard error in parentheses. $^* p < 0.05; ^{**} p < 0.01; ^{***} p < 0.001$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intention to engage in OMB</th>
<th>Intent to be late</th>
<th>Intention to leave</th>
<th>Intention to engage in OCB-O</th>
<th>Intention to engage in OCB-I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td>Psychological empowerment “strategy”</td>
<td>$-0.22^{*} (0.1)$</td>
<td>$-0.11 (0.10)$</td>
<td>$-0.08 (0.09)$</td>
<td>$0.22^{*} (0.10)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological empowerment “discipline”</td>
<td>$0.10 (0.11)$</td>
<td>$0.09 (0.10)$</td>
<td>$0.11 (0.09)$</td>
<td>$-0.13 (0.11)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological empowerment “competence”</td>
<td>$0.06 (0.06)$</td>
<td>$-0.03 (0.06)$</td>
<td>$0.13 (0.08)$</td>
<td>$-0.05 (0.08)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological empowerment “self-determination”</td>
<td>$-0.01 (0.09)$</td>
<td>$0.14 (0.08)$</td>
<td>$-0.10 (0.07)$</td>
<td>$0.21^{*} (0.09)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological empowerment “meaning”</td>
<td>$-0.16 (0.09)$</td>
<td>$-0.11 (0.09)$</td>
<td>$-0.21^{*} (0.09)$</td>
<td>$-0.09 (0.10)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological empowerment “impact”</td>
<td>$-0.07 (0.11)$</td>
<td>$-0.24^{**} (0.09)$</td>
<td>$0.11 (0.08)$</td>
<td>$0.03 (0.10)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authentic leadership</td>
<td>$-0.01 (0.06)$</td>
<td>$-0.07 (0.05)$</td>
<td>$-0.26^{***} (0.06)$</td>
<td>$0.10 (0.07)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $n = 416$. Standard error in parentheses. $^* p < 0.05; ^{**} p < 0.01; ^{***} p < 0.001$
H2 asserted that the intention to engage in OCB would positively relate to OCB and intention to engage in OMB would positively relate to OMB. The results generally supported the study approach (Table III). One aspect of intention to engage in OMB, intent to be late, was positively related to actual lateness ($\beta = 0.38$, $p < 0.01$) and intention to engage in OCB-I and in OCB-O were positively related to OCB ($\beta = 0.15$, $p < 0.05$; $\beta = 0.32$, $p < 0.001$, respectively). Intention to leave (one aspect of the intention to engage in OMB) was found to be positively related to lateness ($\beta = 0.14$, $p < 0.05$), OMB ($\beta = 0.10$, $p < 0.01$), and unexpectedly positively related to OCB ($\beta = 0.16$, $p < 0.01$).

H3 asserted that the intention to engage in OCB and in OMB would mediate the relationship between motivational aspects of psychological empowerment, collective efficacy and authentic leadership, and OCB and OMB among the superintendents. This hypothesis was supported by the data.

The study indicated several mediators of behavioral intentions (Table IV). As expected, intention to leave mediated the relationship between authentic leadership and lateness (the relationship between authentic leadership and intention to leave, $\beta = −0.26$, $p < 0.001$; the relationship between intention to leave and actual lateness, $\beta = 0.14$, $p < 0.05$; the indirect effect $\beta = −0.04$, $p < 0.05$). However, we had an unexpected finding. Intention to leave mediated the relationship between authentic leadership and OCB in a different manner (the relationship between authentic leadership and intention to leave, $\beta = −0.26$, $p < 0.001$; the relationship between intention to leave and OCB, $\beta = 0.16$, $p < 0.01$; the indirect effect $\beta = −0.04$, $p < 0.01$).

As expected, intention to engage in OCB-O mediated the relationship between the dimension of "self-determination" of psychological empowerment and OCB (the higher "self-determination"

---

### Table III.

Relationships between the mediating and dependent variables – standardized coefficients of structural equation model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Intention to engage in OCB-I</th>
<th>Intention to engage in OCB-O</th>
<th>Intention to leave</th>
<th>Intention to be late</th>
<th>Intention to engage in OMB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>0.15* (0.07)</td>
<td>0.32*** (0.08)</td>
<td>0.16** (0.05)</td>
<td>−0.16 (0.09)</td>
<td>−0.12 (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMB</td>
<td>−0.09 (0.08)</td>
<td>−0.06 (0.09)</td>
<td>0.10* (0.05)</td>
<td>−0.18 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.18 (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateness</td>
<td>−0.12 (0.08)</td>
<td>0.07 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.14* (0.06)</td>
<td>0.38* (0.17)</td>
<td>−0.04 (0.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $n = 416$. Standard error in parentheses. *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$

### Table IV.

Testing the mediating relationships in the integrative model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Indirect effect</th>
<th>Direct effect $c^*$</th>
<th>Between mediator and dependent b</th>
<th>Between independent and the mediator a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership</td>
<td>Intention to leave</td>
<td>Actual lateness</td>
<td>−0.04* (0.02)</td>
<td>0.05 (0.08)</td>
<td>0.14* (0.06)</td>
<td>−0.26*** (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership</td>
<td>Intention to leave</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>−0.04*** (0.01)</td>
<td>−0.04 (0.05)</td>
<td>0.16** (0.05)</td>
<td>−0.26*** (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment “self-determination”</td>
<td>Intention to engage in OCB-O</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>0.06* (0.03)</td>
<td>−0.02 (0.08)</td>
<td>0.32*** (0.08)</td>
<td>0.21* (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment “impact”</td>
<td>Intention to engage in OCB-I</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>−0.03*** (0.02)</td>
<td>0.10 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.15* (0.07)</td>
<td>−0.21** (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment “self-determination”</td>
<td>Intention to engage in OCB-I</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>0.05** (0.02)</td>
<td>−0.02 (0.08)</td>
<td>0.15* (0.07)</td>
<td>0.35** (0.10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $n = 416$. Standard error in parentheses. *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$
of psychological empowerment, the higher intent to engage in OCB-O, leading to higher OCB (the relationship between psychological empowerment, self-determination and intent to engage in OCB-O, \( \beta = 0.21, p < 0.05 \); the relationship between intent to engage in OCB-O and OCB, \( \beta = 0.32, p < 0.001 \); the indirect effect: \( \beta = 0.06, p < 0.05 \)).

We also found, as expected, that intention to engage in OCB-I fully mediated the relationship between “self-determination” and OCB (the higher “self-determination,” the higher OCB-I, positively predicting OCB. The relationship between psychological empowerment, self-determination and intention to engage in OCB-I, \( \beta = 0.35, p < 0.01 \); the relationship between intention to engage in OCB-I and OCB, \( \beta = 0.15, p < 0.05 \); the indirect effect: \( \beta = 0.05, p < 0.01 \)). However, contrary to expectations, we found that the intention to engage in OCB-I mediated the relationship between the “impact” dimension of psychological empowerment and OCB differently (the relationship between psychological empowerment impact and intent to engage in OCB-I, \( \beta = -0.21, p < 0.01 \); the relationship between intent to engage in OCB-I and OCB, \( \beta = 0.15, p < 0.05 \); the indirect effect: \( \beta = -0.03, p < 0.01 \)). In all these cases, the direct effect \( c' \) was not significant. Therefore, these relationships demonstrated full mediation. Figure 2 illustrates the significant relationships and full mediating relationships.

**Discussion**

Although the definition and roles of superintendents vary across countries and within countries, their impact is palpable. Their OCB can increase district effectiveness while their
OMB can inflict damage to the educational processes in their district. Moreover, due to their high status, their behaviors are examples to others in their districts. Thus, their OCB and OMB are amplified, increasing their effect in the district. Therefore, the goal of this study was to focus on superintendents’ behaviors and their predictors to understand the mechanisms leading to these behaviors. This may help educational leaders gear their actions toward increasing OCB and reducing OMB.

Our study was unique in that it was based on a model that proposed that specific intentions lead to specific corresponding behaviors. In general, the results of our study confirmed our approach. Considering the mediating effect, we found that higher perceived psychological empowerment (self-determination) was related to a higher intent to engage in both dimensions of OCB (individual and organization), which further related positively to OCB. Additional support for our approach was that in our integrative model, the “intention to be late” positively predicted lateness, while intent to leave, one aspect of intention to OMB, predicted OMB. These findings may contribute to more specifically explain what leads to superintendents’ OCB and OMB.

The results indicate that the intention to leave mediates the relationship between authentic leadership and OCB, as well as the relationship between authentic leadership and lateness. Meaning, authentic leadership negatively relates to intentions to leave, which positively relates to lateness and to OCB. In other words, superintendents’ intention to leave positively relates to two opposing behaviors. One was perceived as positive, OCB, and one was perceived as negative, lateness. These findings lend support to previous studies which indicate that the same predictor could simultaneously predict two behaviors perceived as being counterproductive (Shapira-Lishchinsky and Raftar-Ozery, 2018; Spector and Fox, 2010).

A possible explanation for our result that there is a positive relationship between intention to leave and lateness is that they belong to the same group of behaviors entitled “withdrawal behaviors.” Thus, superintendents who intend to withdraw by leaving may also withdraw by coming late to work. The additional positive relationship between intention to leave and OCB may be explained by the fact that superintendents hold contradictory attitudes and engage in contradictory behaviors. For example, when a superintendent wants to leave his/her job to be promoted to a better job in the district, she/he still will engage in citizenship behaviors. In a second example, when the superintendent wants to leave his/her district, due to dissatisfaction at work, if she/he has not found another job, or is afraid that she/he will not find one, the superintendents might continue to invest in his/her work by engaging in citizenship behaviors.

As expected, we also found that intention to engage in OCB-I and OCB-O mediated the relationship between the dimension of “self-determination” of psychological empowerment and OCB. In other words, a high level of self-determination increases the intention to engage in OCB-O and OCB-I, which may correspondingly increase OCB. These findings reinforce results from previous studies (Chen and Chen, 2008) that found that employees, who feel empowered by their organizations, tend to contribute to their organizations through OCB. This reveals actual OCB.

The results also reinforce Spreitzer’s (1995) psychological empowerment theory. Specifically, the finding that the dimension of “meaning” of psychological empowerment negatively related to the intention to leave is consistent with a few previous studies. For example, Yao and Cui’s (2010) study indicate that high perceptions of psychological empowerment among employees reduce their intention to leave the job. Meyerson and Kline’s (2008) study also demonstrates that low levels of empowerment are positively related to high levels of intentions to leave the job. Thus, we can say that superintendents who feel psychologically empowered and significant in their organizations, will be less inclined to think about leaving their jobs.
Unexpectedly, we found a negative relationship between the “impact” dimension of psychological empowerment and the intention to engage in OCB-I. We can explain this negative relationship by the fact that superintendents in the different districts, who perceive that they have a strong impact on what happens in their district, are less intent to focus on how to promote their colleagues (intention to engage in OCB-I). This is because of their motivation to implement organizational goals and focus on school impact. Furthermore, increasing the intention to engage in OCB-I explained the increase of OCB, which provided support for the study’s approach.

The expected relationship between the “strategy” dimension of collective efficacy and intention to engage in OCB-I can be explained by group norms of collaboration, group cohesion and collegial relationships. Superintendents, who feel collectively capable of mobilizing the cognitive and behavioral resources required to complete group tasks will develop motivation to contribute to the workplace. As a result, their intention to promote the organization, reflected by the intention to engage in OCB-I, will increase their OCB. This relationship is supported by previous studies (Goddard et al., 2004; Ware and Kitsantas, 2007).

The present study also shows that superintendents’ perceptions of authentic leadership reduce their intent to leave. This finding supports previous studies concerning the importance of authentic leadership in organizations, and its contribution to remain in the organization (Laschinger and Fida, 2014), which may be explained by a moral perspective of being aware of the damage that intent to leave causes by investing less in the educational systems.

Conclusions and implications
Based on the sequence theory (Ajzen, 2012), this study proposes a new psychological model that links superintendents’ perceptions with motivational aspects toward positive and negative behavioral intentions. This further relates to actual positive and negative behaviors which can impact the practice of superintendents reflected by their instructional leadership and managerial responsibilities.

The findings contribute to the developing of an integrative approach that can more specifically predict superintendents’ behaviors, by considering motivational aspects of their behaviors, and by suggesting specific intentions that can explain their corresponding behaviors. Unlocking the mechanism of the sequence theory may impact superintendents’ practices, including their managing, leadership, coordinating, supervising and evaluating.

The study points to a number of paths that simultaneously connect the concepts of motivational aspects of superintendents’ perceptions, their behavioral intentions, and corresponding behaviors. Therefore, the study outlines a possible conceptual direction for further research that will examine motivational predictors, intentions and their corresponding specific behaviors among superintendents. Our findings suggest that these motivational mechanisms lead to different contradictory behaviors. Furthermore, different motivations exist in different contexts, which can simultaneously lead to OMB and OCB. Therefore, the relationship between OMB and OCB should be explored and challenged among superintendents.

Based on the study results, it seems that OCB and OMB do not represent distinct performance domains. Rather, we can think of OCB and OMB as being different points on a single continuum. Adopting such an assumption makes it possible for us to position performances on both scales: OMB, which is usually perceived as being negative, and OCB, which is usually considered positive. A superintendent can be relatively high in OCB and low in OMB or a superintendent who is relatively high in OMB and low in OCB, and a superintendent who is relatively high in OCB and OMB.

Practically, the suggested model may impact not only superintendents, but also their superiors, who design and implement Ministry of Education policies, and may use the findings in their decision making process to increase motivation among superintendents in...
the different districts, which may reduce OMB and encourage OCB. This should be part of the Ministry of Education’s policy to promote the district effectiveness and improve their services to schools and their staff (principals and teachers). Being aware of OMB should encourage educational leaders to develop and implement a code of ethics for the districts’ superintendents to reduce these behaviors. These educational leaders may increase the level of authentic leadership in their districts by choosing superintendents based on a high ranking of authentic leadership measures or by professional development programs dedicated to increase their authentic leadership, which may motivate superintendents to reduce their intent to leave and increase their OCB.

Limitations of the study and future research
Some of the research variables dealt with sensitive issues related to the intent to misbehave, and actual misbehavior, such as lateness. It is difficult to research misbehaviors in organizations because of the sensitivity of these issues and the complexity of their measurement. Misbehavior in the workplace belongs to the “dark side” of an organization, which receives little exposure. Due to superintendents’ fears of revealing information related to these areas, it is difficult to gather information that can assist in generating theoretical models in this field, since superintendents may be reticent to share intentions concerning such behaviors with researchers, especially, when they hold high-ranking positions in educational systems, as in this study’s context.

In continuation to Ajzen’s (2012) sequence theory, this study focused on the relationships between perceptions, attitudes and behaviors. Future studies may consider the opposite direction of whether superintendents’ behaviors predict their attitudes and perceptions.

Furthermore, Israel’s economic status, with its move to liberal-capitalism, might be affecting the motivation of the study’s participants to withdraw, misbehave or to behave above expectations. Therefore, future studies should consider these factors in addition to the participants’ demographic factors, when examining the psychological model proposed in this research.

In any case, it is very important to deal with these issues to promote the study of misbehavior, in general, and in the public sector, including the education system, in particular. Since the organizational factors examined in the study are sometimes hidden from the eye, to realize the potential inherent in this subject, we recommend conducting qualitative research that includes in-depth interviews with superintendents. Such a method can help elicit their perceptions of the predictors of OMB and OCB in the organization.
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