

## The Relationship between University Autonomy, Lecturer Empowerment, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Indonesian Universities

Ahmad Suriansyah<sup>1</sup>, Aslamiah<sup>2</sup>, Noorhapizah<sup>3</sup>, Iwan Winardi<sup>4</sup>, Juhriyansyah Dalle<sup>5</sup>

### Abstract

The purpose of this study was to bring forth academics' opinion or assessment regarding university autonomy, lecturer empowerment, and organizational citizenship behavior, and to establish the existing correlations among these three variables. A descriptive and correlational survey method was used, taking into consideration 350 lecturers from five universities, all found in South Kalimantan, Indonesia. Data were collected using a research instrument comprising of 199 items. These items were categorized into three forms, basing on the three variables, that is University autonomy, which was identified as UA with 77 items; Lecturer empowerment, shortened to LE with 52 items; and Organizational citizenship behavior, coded as OCB with 69 items. A pilot study was conducted to ensure that all items and instruments used were tested for validity and reliability. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. The results reveal that university academics sampled from the five premier universities believe that their universities meet the criteria for the established three variables of UA, LE, and OCB. It is, therefore, concluded that there is a moderate understanding of the variables and also a significant relationship existing among them.

**Keywords:** *university autonomy, lecturer empowerment, organizational citizenship behavior.*

### Introduction

Organizationally, a university can be considered as an institution with an open system that is constantly being affected by the change in both its external and internal operations (Akech, 2014). Globalization and internationalization trends greatly affect this change, hence influencing most of these Universities' mission and vision statements, making them behave as corporate bodies in the pursuit of knowledge creation, innovation, quality, and excellence teaching at national and international levels (Reisberg et al., 2012).

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin, Indonesia, a.suriansyah@ulm.ac.id

<sup>2</sup> Prof. Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin, aslamiah.fkip.unlam@gmail.com

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin, Indonesia, noorhapizah@ulm.ac.id

<sup>4</sup> Kementerian Riset Teknologi dan Pendidikan Tinggi Republik Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>5</sup> Dr. Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin, Indonesia, j.dalle@ulm.ac.id

Most changes have been brought about by the rapid developments from the fields of digital information technologies, the democratization of higher education, and the diversification of production of new kinds of knowledge workers (Kromydas, 2017). For instance, in the U.S.A., the national priorities in terms of defense and economy have constantly shaped the orientation and development of knowledge production in university laboratories since the 1940s until today (Hussin, 1996). On the other hand, internally the faculties, departments, and academics have to make necessary responses proactively and positively towards the changing trends and developments in the external environment, thereby putting new challenges to their autonomy and empowerment in terms of their knowledge expertise, research, curriculum development, instruction, management, and organizational performance (Hussin & Ismail, 2009; Ohlin, 2019; Tarman, 2016).

Arguably, using the open system perspective, the university has always been considered as an autonomous academic community in which research activities and knowledge generation must not be influenced and tempered by no other motives than the pursuit of truth, for enhancing human understanding on the concepts and theories embedded in the universe, and which consequently might contribute directly to technological and societal development, both at the national and global levels. Technological and societal development in return would sustain the many functions of a robust university. There is a piece of sample evidence has supported this dual interaction between the university and society, which then influences to some extent the organizational citizenship behavior of academic and management staff of universities (Fumasoli et al., 2014). Consequently, it is an important point of research to examine exactly how Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Lecturer Empowerment (LE), and University Autonomy (UA) may impact a university and whether these factors contributed to overall academic success.

### **Research Questions**

Followings are the research questions of this research as observed through research hypotheses:

- 1) Is there any relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Lecturer Empowerment (LE), and University Autonomy (UA)?
- 2) What are the correlation coefficients for Lecturer Empowerment (LE) and University Autonomy (UA) variables?
- 3) What is the Correlation Coefficients between Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Lecturer Empowerment (LE) variables?

- 4) What is the Correlation Coefficients for Lecturer Empowerment (OCB) and University Autonomy (UA) variables?

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this research is to analyze the relationship between the various factors under the title of autonomy, lecturer empowerment, and organizational citizenship behavior. The reason for examining the relationship between the stated variables is Literature work has provided good support for the relationship between them. Secondly, various universities are starting to empower their employees specifically the teaching faculty/lecturers through which significant need is required to examine those factors having their association with the empowerment of the teachers. Therefore, this study has conducted correlational analyses through data collected from the questionnaire with the targeted sample.

### **Literature Review**

#### **University Autonomy (UA)**

UA is related to the European notions of *territorial neutrality* and the *guild of artisans*, both of which rely on independence and self-rule to repel any form of invasion and interference by bodies or governments outside the university's jurisdiction. Some argue, however, that the university's ideological foundation as an autonomous institution has undergone fundamental changes in recent decades (Maassen et al., 2017).

In today's competitive era of globalization, autonomy is not simply an institutional dimension of most public universities but concerns government relations as well (Roversi-Monaco et al., 2005). Thus, UA also refers to constantly changing relations between the state and higher education institutions as well as the degree of control exerted by state agencies, which is context-dependent (Hussin & Ismail, 2009). In centralized education systems, the Minister of Education determines who fills the positions of University Presidents or Vice-Chancellors, which provides a means by which the government can assert its informal chain of command and influence over university affairs (Asimiran & Hussin, 2012), and thus distort UA (Ordorika, 2003). This mechanism of control, however, does not necessarily restrict the university's autonomy and freedom as an institution of knowledge.

Although most universities operate as public or private corporations, the bicameral system of university governance – a Senate and a Board of Directors – remains one of its distinctive features when compared to business corporations' well-defined lines of authority (Asimiran & Hussin, 2012; Houdyshell & Kirk, 2018). Further, university management has relatively little control over the institution's fragmented daily operations, which are inundated with various academic activities (Patterson, 2001; Yigit, 2018), even though unique knowledge generation and dissemination are the institution's fundamental premise. This can be a problem for university daily operations, as not everyone may be on the same page. As such, strong leadership can help by setting good examples for others even if they are not involved in decision-making processes (Newman et al., 2017; Tarman, 2012).

Although self-efficacy is beneficial for academic unity, university students often have little say in important decisions made. Fast et al. (2014) examined the importance of student involvement, such as sharing opinions in the classroom or furthering leadership into a future work environment. This can lead to employee empowerment, enabling the generation of substantial diverse ideas (Han et al., 2016). Moreover, this heightens employee satisfaction, which can improve a business' success. Since this specific study explores universities in Indonesia, specifically how these academic institutions are affected by university autonomy and lecturer empowerment, it is important to locate universities that have been attempting to implement these programs into their teaching methods. Consequently, the information that is collected will be relevant, observed in real-time and able to be assessed in reference to the literature and desired goals for this study.

### **Lecturer Empowerment**

Empowerment's theoretical perspectives and practices can be divided into two approaches. First, the relational approach stresses empowerment resulting from power-sharing managerial strategies, practices, and techniques (Asimiran & Hussin, 2012). Within this system, managers and subordinates are advised to play to their strengths, including intellectual talent, skills, backgrounds, and networking. Empowerment occurs when organizational goals, values, and structures change to accommodate power-sharing outcomes and new, shared aspirations (McElyea, 2002). Empowered teachers are more likely to take responsibility for educational pursuits and encourage student success (Avidov-Ungar et al., 2014). The second approach, a cognitive approach,

conceptualizes empowerment in terms of its psychological-cognitive effects, focusing on the perceptions of those targeted by managers rather than on enabling management behaviors. Self-efficacy is manifested in four dimensions of employees' orientation to their work roles: (1) meaning, (2) competence, (3) self-determination, and (4) impact. Considering these factors can help improve university management and learning cultures (Klein, 2016).

In this context, decision-making assesses the extent to which teachers are involved in making critical decisions that directly affect their work. Those involved made better job-related choices and found their jobs to be more meaningful than individuals who were not involved (Somech, 2005). Teachers empowered to make professional choices are satisfied with their jobs because they believe that they have the capacity to be successful educators (Hoy & Miskel, 2008).

Professional growth refers to teachers' perceptions that their work provides them with opportunities to develop professionally, learn continuously, and expand their skills throughout their careers (Moran & Larwin, 2017). Teachers who perceive professional growth opportunities have a positive impact on the school organization and the teaching profession (Bogler&Somech, 2005). Desimone (2009) found that professional development enhances teachers' knowledge and skills and realigns their attitudes and beliefs toward excellence in performance.

Status, as used in the SPES, is tied to teachers' perceptions that they are doing an important job and have societal respect, admiration, and collegial support. Individuals who perceive that their status gives them a greater sense of empowerment tend to feel dignified, align their organization's goals with their own expectations, and consequently have a greater commitment to their schools and profession (Dee et al., 2003). Status, however, is also influenced by other elements such as salaries, community values regarding education, and media reports about teachers and schools.

Autonomy refers to teachers' beliefs regarding whether they have the trust and freedom to organize and conduct their duties as professionals without overbearing regulations and restrictions (Hemmings & Kay, 2015). The hallmarks for autonomy are a sense of freedom to make certain decisions (Andrews, 2019; Hemmings & Kay, 2015), and the confidence to express opinions, while also learning from and engaging with others. The increased autonomy can promote individuals' sense of responsibility and allow them greater flexibility in role definition (van Lankveld et al., 2016). Teachers tended to exhibit high professionalism when they felt a sense of control over and autonomy in their jobs, which can benefit an overall work environment.

In the existing, the word empowerment is significantly addressed under the title of professional empowerment, specifically in the educational sector like universities (Ddungu, 2014). It is widely accepted that the word empowerment indicates the process of increasing the emotional and cognitive capacity of the individuals in order to make some significant choices while translating them into actions (Dust et al, 2018; Rodrigues et al, 2018). Professional empowerment is regarded under the shadow through which teachers are properly facilitated through teaching resources, time management, and various indicators of job innovation (Ddungu, 2014). As per the findings of (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Wei et al., 2009), the essential element of professional empowerment in teaching is to enable the teaching faculty with their relative experience, tacit knowledge and wisdom too. Meanwhile, the process of professional empowerment indicates the building of teacher's capacity and efficiency (Ddungu, 2014). All these factors explain how the professional empowerment of the teachers will take place, but not the way out of turnover in the education sector. However, professional empowerment explains the approach which helps to gain capacity building and contribution in the society (Huda et al., 2017; Salamon et al., 2017).

In addition, some authors have defined the dimensions of professional empowerment through psychological and technical terms and the same is observed for the teachers (Aelterman et al., 2016; Ddungu, 2014). The word psychological empowerment explains the state of motivation which is felt by the persons like teachers in terms of cognitive constructs (Flaherty et al, 2017; Khany & Tazik, 2016). Whereas the cognitive measure shows the concept of self-determination, and competence too (Szymanski, 2016). For the proper management of professional empowerment, there is a significant need to combine the psychological and technical dimensions which are further strengthened through providing the employees with the proper level of job-meaning, skills, knowledge, and opportunity for self-administration (Conway, 2008). In this regard, it is observed that those educational institutions which promote professional empowerment for their staff like teachers can enjoy a higher level of staff retention (Ddungu, 2014). However, it is also believed that this idea is just a theoretical implication which needs to be proved in more empirical context.

For the empowerment of the teachers, various points are highlighted in the literature which can work for the management of teacher empowerment. For example, Wynn-godbold (2013) have pointed out the following points to manage the teacher's empowerment:

- Clear definition of the vision
- Establishing the procedures for exploring the issues and problems
- Provision of resources for personal and professional development
- Managing the time for the activities specifically outside the school
- Encouraging teachers for professional partnership

Meanwhile, some other points are also highlighted covering the title of seeking empowerment for the teachers. These are:

- Clear definition of what teachers believe being a great teacher
- Activities for professional and personal development
- Focus and devotion of time and attention for the achievement of goals and objectives

### **Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)**

Recent studies have sought to better understand the origins of OCB and its effects on the development of corporations. OCB has contributed favorably to organizational outcomes such as service quality (Koning & Kleef, 2015), organizational commitment (Carpenter, Berry & Houston, 2014), job involvement (Dimitriades, 2007), and leader-member exchange (Bhal, 2006). Some have postulated that OCB, when aggregated over time and across people, is likely to result in higher levels of organizational performance and effectiveness (Takeuchi et al., 2015). OCB enhances organizational performance by reducing organizational dependence on scarce resources needed to sustain its functions, thereby relieving employees of other burdens (Shin et al., 2017).

The Circumplex Model of Citizenship, introduced by Moon and Marinova (2003), provides a framework for analyzing OCB. This model can be represented as a circle with two major axes. The vertical axis represents organizational/interpersonal ends, while the horizontal axis symbolizes promotive/protective ends. The model, then, has four behavioral quadrants: (1) *helping* (interpersonal and promotive), (2) *innovation* (organizational and promotive), (3) *sportsmanship* (interpersonal and protective), and (4) *compliance* (organizational and protective) (Moon et al., 2004).

However, the Circumplex Model is severely limited because it fails to consider citizenship as a political term and the interactive exchanges between citizens and the state as a social contract.

Since citizenship is a socio-political term describing bilateral interactions and duties, we posit that OCB can transcend its humanistic-psychological perspective by incorporating the socio-political dimension into the Circumplex Model. A strong sense of citizenship underscores citizens' loyalty, commitment, and patriotism when carrying out their duties to enhance communal and state well-being and civility. The Athenian model of citizenship proposed by Manville and Ober (2003) is useful for expanding the socio-political meanings of citizenship, and, thus, the Circumplex Model's scope.

From a sociological angle, citizenship describes an ongoing exchange between citizens and the state. Social exchange requires individuals to be motivated by intrinsic and extrinsic returns (Chen, 2005). However, recipients of voluntarily rendered benefits are obligated to reciprocate with a corresponding gesture or action, although the obligation is unspecified and cannot be enforced. A social exchange depends on a trust-based relationship, in which it is assumed that a second party will reciprocate the preferential treatment given by the first party. According to social exchange theory, university academics might be willing to perform certain non-prescribed OCBs beneficial to the university in exchange for professional autonomy and a sense of workplace empowerment (Bogler & Somech, 2005). Zhong et al. (2009) posited that when a university's structure, policies, and practices facilitate faculty empowerment, OCBs can be stimulated. Thus, university autonomy from government intervention is of paramount importance. Given globalization, however, university governance worldwide tends to be characterized by the American corporate model rather than the democratic Athenian model.

## Methods

This research used a descriptive and correlational survey method to obtain information regarding individuals' beliefs and attitudes (Creswell, 2008; Baharuddin et al., 2019; Baharuddin & Dalle, 2019). The study employed three survey instruments with 199 items in total: (1) UA (77 items), (2) LE (52 items), and (3) OCB (69 items). All items in the instruments were based on a five-point Likert scale (1–5), ranging from *strongly disagree* (1), *disagree* (2), *fairly agree*(3), *agree*(4), to *strongly agree*(5). A Likert scale is similar to a rating scale as it utilizes a set scale for comparison to show both extreme ends of the spectrum and everything in between. Consequently, participants are able to select answers that directly relate to how strongly they feel about the given topic. Used



in previous studies, the instruments were modified to suit new conceptual definitions and the study's university context.

Adapted from Hussin and Ismail (2009), the UA survey instrument had nine major dimensions: (1) academic program, (2) postgraduate educational program, (3) research and consultation, (4) teaching and learning, (5) management, (6) human resources, (7) finances, (8) infrastructure, and (9) student affairs. The survey instrument on LE was adapted from the SPES Questionnaire developed by Short and Rhinehart (1992), which have assessed the teacher's perception of empowerment. The SPES questionnaire was modified slightly to suit the university context. It consisted of 52 items across seven dimensions of LE: (1) participative decision-making, (2) professional growth, (3) status, (4) self-efficacy, (5) autonomy at work, (6) impact, and (7) execution of power.

The researcher also adopted the four dimensions of the Circumplex Model of Citizenship – (1) helping, (2) innovation, (3) sportsmanship, and (4) compliance – and adapted the OCB scale developed by Moon et al. (2004) to include newly identified political dimensions of citizenship and self-developed items based on the Athenian Model (Manville & Ober, 2003). The revised OCB scale had ten dimensions: (1) community orientation by helping, (2) innovation for improvement, (3) collegial harmony, (4) compliance, (5) openness, (6) responsive leadership, (7) progressive advancement, (8) an entrepreneurial spirit, (9) individual resilience, and (10) agility.

To ensure the items' suitability and reliability in all three instruments, we first conducted a pilot study. Based on a statistical analysis of the data, we selected items that had reliability values between .600 and .950 for further use. Pilot testing of the three survey instruments identified that the reliability values of all items were acceptable (between .600 and .890).

For the actual study, we administered the surveys with a one-week gap between each instrument to prevent participants from becoming tired or bored while responding. The core participants of this research for the data collection were the senior academics who are entitled as our respondents. The reason for selecting academicians like university lecturers was that they are significantly linked with the study variables and research questions research purpose too. For the purpose of data collection, We mailed the questionnaires to 350 who are coming from five premier universities in South Kalimantan, Indonesia, randomly selected from academic staff lists. After three months, we received 319 completed questionnaires. Subsequently screening for data outliers

and inappropriate responses, 307 questionnaires were accepted for analysis using descriptive statistics and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. Descriptive findings are providing a good understanding of the data trends through the mean score, standard deviation and other measures of dispersion. Whereas research questions are reasonably addressed through correlation matrix and hypotheses testing processes. Following research hypotheses are developed for this study:

H1: There is a significant correlation between OCB, LE, and UA variables.

H2: There is a significant correlation between LE and UA variables.

H3: There is a significant correlation between OCB and LE variables.

H4: There is a significant correlation between OCB and UA variables.

## Results

The following section outlines the results of this study collected using surveys with participants who rate questions based on a Likert scale to answer the research questions through stated hypotheses. The first part is descriptive statistics UA, LE, and OC, the second part is correlation between OCB, LE, and UA variables, third part is correlation between LE and UA variables, fourth part is correlation between OCB and LE variables, and the fifth part is correlation between OCB and UA variables as follows.

### *Descriptive Statistics of UA, LE, and OCB*

The results of the descriptive statistical analysis of respondents' responses to UA, LE, and OCB measured on the Likert scale or the five-scale shown in Table 1 that provides information about the means and standard deviation.

**Table 1**

*Means and Standard Deviations for all UA, LE, and OCB Domains*

Variables	Code	Domain	Mean	SD
University autonomy	UA	Overall	3.89	0.224
	AA	Academic programs	4.23	0.643
	AB	Postgraduate academic programs	4.27	0.611
	AC	Research and consultation	4.13	0.623
	AD	Teaching and learning	4.05	0.609
	AE	Management	3.61	0.745
	AF	Human resources	3.96	0.659
	AG	Finance	3.74	0.701
	AH	Infrastructure facilities	3.95	0.610

Lecturer empowerment	LE	Overall	<b>3.88</b>	<b>0.455</b>
	LA	Participative decision-making	3.62	0.755
	LB	Professional growth	4.03	0.681
	LC	Status	4.24	0.556
	LD	Self-efficacy	4.46	0.476
	LE	Autonomy on the job	3.83	0.772
	LF	Professional impact	3.93	0.656
	LG	Execution of power	3.19	0.870
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	OCB	Overall	<b>4.01</b>	<b>0.287</b>
	BA	Community orientation by helping	4.03	0.593
	BB	Innovation for improvement	4.01	0.665
	BD	Compliance	4.36	0.531
	BE	Openness	4.31	0.571
	BF	Responsive leadership	3.55	0.817
	BG	Competitive desire to excel	4.19	0.579
	BH	An entrepreneurial spirit	3.54	0.723
	BI	Individual resilience	4.03	0.583
	BJ	Agility	4.10	0.614

Note: N = 307

In relation to mean, the presented descriptive data from the three variables show that most respondents highly emphasized, the variable OCB to be having the highest mean average, followed by UA and LE respectively. Regarding standard deviation, the respondents showed the same perception on UA, indicating that variables OCB and LE had the lowest value when it came to standard deviation.

During the analysis, the domain of UA in relation to mean was ranked high when it came to the domain of postgraduate academic programs, however, management had the lowest mean. In reference to LE, respondents held self-efficacy in high esteem, while the lowest was the execution of power. While for OCB, respondents ranked highly the domain of compliance and the lowest being leadership.

### ***Correlation Between OCB, LE, and UA Variables***

Table 2 shows the extent to which UA, LE, and OCB variables in South Kalimantan public universities are correlated. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) reveals how strongly two variables are linked. Ranging from zero to 1.00, correlation coefficients above 0.70, between 0.30 and 0.70, and below 0.30 indicate high, moderate, and weak degrees of correlation, respectively. We found significant positive correlations between the three variables, suggesting that the three variables are interrelated; that is, OCB embodies UA and LE.

**Table 2***Correlation Coefficients for OCB, LE, and UA Variables*

Variables	OCB	LE	UA
OCB	1.00		
LE	.743**	1.00	
UA	.578**	.628**	1.00

Note: N = 307, \*\* correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

***Correlation Between LE and UA variables***

As shown in Table 3, the correlation coefficients of UA and LE domains are either moderate or low and are significant at  $p \leq 0.001$ . We found several variables moderately correlated with UA items; for instance, lecturer status is moderately correlated with postgraduate academic programs ( $r = .362$ ), self-efficacy is moderately correlated with teaching and learning ( $r = .450$ ), job autonomy is moderately linked with research and consultation ( $r = .342$ ), and so forth. In contrast, there were certain weak correlations, such as lecturers' status with academic programs ( $r = .280$ ), and lecturers' execution of power with human resources ( $r = .285$ ). The highest correlation coefficient value in Table 3 is 0.487, which implies sufficient discriminant validity between LE and UA.

**Table 3***Correlation Coefficients for LE and UA*

	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI
LA	.315**	.357**	.414**	.407**	.455**	.398**	.382**	.410**	.273**
LB	.416**	.433**	.541**	.468**	.486**	.434**	.436**	.469**	.398**
LC	.285**	.361**	.398**	.411**	.280**	.285**	.267**	.315**	.269**
LD	.317**	.414**	.389**	.450**	.277**	.310**	.281**	.324**	.333**
LE	.266**	.364**	.342**	.435**	.351**	.361**	.296**	.351**	.311**
LF	.280**	.323**	.389**	.386**	.354**	.331**	.324**	.369**	.243**
LG	.201**	.213**	.273**	.287**	.319**	.285**	.341**	.281**	.278**

Note: N = 307, \*\* correlation is significant (2-tailed) at .001, \* correlation is significant (2-tailed) at .005

***Correlation Between OCB and LE variables***

As portrayed in Table 4, the correlations between OCB and LE are all significant at  $p \leq 0.001$  and are correlated at two different degrees: "moderate" and "low." For instance, moderate and significant correlations were found with regard to professional growth ( $r = .333$ ), status ( $r = .539$ ), competitive urgency to excel and participative decision-making ( $r = .439$ ), agility and participative decision-making ( $r = .385$ ), compliance and status ( $r = .474$ ), individual resilience and participative decision-making ( $r = .480$ ), among others. However, low correlations were found between both

compliance and an entrepreneurial spirit, on the one hand, and most LE domains, on the other. The highest correlation coefficient value calculated was 0.584, suggesting sufficient discriminant validity between OCB and LE.

**Table 4**

*Correlation Coefficients between OCB and LE*

	BA	BB	BD	BE	BF	BG	BH	BI	BJ
LA	.374**	.474**	.236**	.268**	.564**	.439**	.418**	.480**	.385**
LB	.333**	.358**	.276**	.380**	.548**	.511**	.464**	.535**	.348**
LC	.429**	.539**	.413**	.574**	.277**	.541**	.287**	.544**	.450**
LD	.454**	.469**	.387**	.572**	.207**	.516**	.264**	.527**	.425**
LE	.268**	.265**	.218**	.263**	.343**	.301**	.292**	.390**	.243**
LF	.442**	.584**	.277**	.470**	.343**	.528**	.369**	.530**	.402**
LG	.130**	.214**	.088**	.137**	.330**	.176**	.242**	.223**	.178**

Note: N = 307, \*\* correlation is significant (2-tailed) at .001, \* correlation is significant (2-tailed) at .005

**Correlation between OCB and UA variables**

Table 5 shows that the correlations between OCB and LE are all significant at 0.001, at two different degrees: “moderate” and “low.” Table 5 indicates that all OCB domains are significantly correlated with all UA domains. However, there are significant but moderate correlations between the four OCB domains (responsive leadership, competitive urgency to excel, entrepreneurial spirit, and individual resilience) and all UA domains. For instance, responsive leadership is moderately correlated with university autonomy in postgraduate academic programs ( $r = .386$ ) and with research and consultation ( $r = .370$ ). Similarly, Table 5 also displays that individual resilience is moderately correlated with all UA domains.

**Table 5**

*Correlation Coefficients for OCB and UA*

	BA	BB	BD	BE	BF	BG	BH	BI	BJ
AA	.257**	.157**	.240**	.244**	.355**	.259**	.359**	.305**	.179**
AB	.269**	.257**	.272**	.277**	.328**	.377**	.320**	.415**	.320**
AC	.276**	.241**	.247**	.323**	.440**	.370**	.440**	.409**	.301**
AD	.362**	.261**	.288**	.312**	.377**	.377**	.440**	.461**	.317**
AE	.291**	.195**	.255**	.182**	.547**	.370**	.536**	.467**	.201**
AF	.232**	.166**	.203**	.240**	.432**	.315**	.423**	.420**	.239**
AG	.239**	.168**	.171**	.244**	.414**	.311**	.515**	.355**	.241**
AH	.211**	.209**	.207**	.228**	.439**	.355**	.401**	.422**	.235**
AI	.255**	.214**	.227**	.220**	.334**	.306**	.359**	.349**	.249**

Note: N = 307, \*\* correlation is significant (2-tailed) at .001, \* correlation is significant (2-tailed) at .005

There are low correlations between three OCB domains (community orientation, innovation for improvement, and compliance) and UA domains, suggesting UA domains may constitute part of

university academics' OCB. The highest correlation coefficient value calculated was 0.548, suggesting sufficient discriminant validity between OCB and UA.

### **Discussion**

In this discussion, in accordance with the objectives of the study, the first section will discuss the descriptive findings from UA, LE, and OCB and the second section discusses the correlation findings between UA, LE, and OCB.

Firstly, it has been revealed that university academics believe that OCB plays a big role compared to UA and LE in five universities studied, though these universities behave as a corporate organization. These findings are in line with Koning and Kleef (2015) who state that OCB contributes to the quality of services in all universities. The findings from this study are also supported by Carpenter et al. (2014) who state that OCB leads to a work commitment in the university, Dimitriades (2007) reemphasizes that OCB promotes work engagement and cooperation, while Bhal (2006) is of that OCB has a positive effect on leader-member exchanges.

Many other experts such as Shin et al. (2017), Takeuchi et al. (2015), Zhong et al. (2009), Bogler and Somech (2005), Moon et al. (2004), Moon and Marinova (2003), Manville and Ober (2003) in their studies also established that OCB contributes to higher levels of organizational performance and effectiveness and something which also leads to improvement in organizational performance and reduces dependence on diminishing resources which helps to maintain proper functioning of the employees by reducing on their burdens. It is also believed that OCB is able to go beyond its humanistic-psychological perspective with the socio-political dimension. Researchers like earlier on noted in this paragraph, still on OCB aspect, believe that without a specific prescription can still be beneficial for universities more so where there is the exchange of professionals since there exist a sense of empowerment among university workers.

UA has been found to be a second determining factor for the sustainability of universities. The results of this study are in line with Maassen et al. (2017) who suggest that the ideological foundation of universities as autonomous institutions has undergone fundamental changes in the last few decades and Roversi-Monaco et al. (2005) also supports the results of this study that in the current era of competitiveness, autonomy is a government's component to hold university leaders accountable. Regarding this perception, Hussin and Ismail (2009) also state that UA is an ever-changing relationship between higher education institutions and the government

accompanied by control according to the context, this condition is strengthened by Asimiran and Hussin (2012) who also states that in a centralized Education arrangement, The Minister of Education extends his support through a rector and deputy rectors using the existing facilities and infrastructure provided by the government. Ordorika (2003) describes this as a chain of command of the informal government's influence on UA which does not limit the universities to play there of knowledge creation and innovation.

Results of this study are also in line with several previous studies such as Newman et al. (2017), Han et al. (2016), and Fast et al. (2014), where a university whether public and or private company, the governance system is the same, comprising of the Senate and Board of Directors, where the rector is a strong leader who must serve by example not only to his subordinates but also to people who are not directly involved in decision making.

In this study, it has been revealed that LE is a third determinant in the survival of the university, which is in line with McElyea (2002) who is also of the opinion that a leader, in this case, the rector or dean must play a role in intellectual talent, skills, portfolio growth and establish networks for the academics so that there is proper distribution of power and aspirations together. Avidov-Ungar et al. (2014) argue that teachers in schools or lecturers at universities must function and be responsible for the success of their students. Furthermore, Klein (2016) in his study states that education institution stakeholders are important self-efficacy manifesting in meaning as competence, self-determining individuals who play management and teaching culture role. According to Somech (2005) and Hoy and Miskel (2008), they feel involved and satisfied with the capacity for a successful education. Other previous researchers such as Dee et al. (2003), Bogler and Somech (2005), Desimone (2009), Hemmings and Kay (2015), van Lankveld et al. (2016), and Moran and Larwin (2017) provide support for the results of this study by saying that LE is a role holder in the day to day running of higher education institutions. They argue that professional development refers to the perception of stakeholders (lecturers) who feel they have broad opportunities in academic and non-academic development in addition to rewards such as salaries, community values and media reports about them and the institutions.

Today's governance of public universities follows a corporate model, which assumes that to be sustainable, popular, and globally ranked, universities must be competitive and responsive to global higher education trends (Privot & Estermann, 2018). The traditional collegial model is no

longer relevant (Singh, 2005). Theoretically, universities ought to behave as open systems that are continuously learning and evolving in tandem with changing standards, expectations, and demands from internal and external environments (Jongbloed et al., 2008). Universities should thus function as unified organizations, characterized by strong OCB, common goals, and values such as loyalty, commitment, compliance, trust, and a shared vision (Mohammad et al., 2010). Managerialism is necessary to some degree but not at the cost of suppressing academic autonomy and empowerment, which could affect academics' morale, performance, and job satisfaction (Abraiz et al., 2012). Neither should managerialism involve bureaucratic red tape aimed at standardization, which could lead to demoralization and frustration among students and academics (Ng & Feldman, 2011). Empowerment arises when one believes one has sufficient professional autonomy to execute one's duties, tasks, and roles in innovative ways (Varekamp et al., 2009). In this regard, treating university academics as corporate employees, strictly monitored by management, can be detrimental to the university, creating a climate of distrust, insecurity, and irrational control.

A corporate style of university governance is pragmatically relevant in the context of globalization and internationalization, stiff competition among universities for students and grants, and the rapid pace of change occurring in many university organizations (Bartell, 2003). Politically, however, autonomy and empowerment are now negotiated against sustainability and accountability, despite university academics' long-held expectation of organizational citizenship, rooted in the collegial spirit of a community of scholars (Popescu, 2019).

It has been revealed that in this study, there is a significant positive correlation between UA, LE, and OCB which can be interpreted as the interrelationship existing amongst the three variables. UA and LE have been found to be correlating with one another, while OCB and LE domains have a significant correlation. Raquib et al. (2010) state that LE and OCB significantly associated that Shelton (2010) mentioned implies in organizational life, positive UA perception that was inextricably linked to organizational justice perception displayed more OCB than others.

The interaction between UA and LE is in line with Morshidi Sirat (2010) and Marginson (1997) who state that the concept of social interaction draws attention to the nature of government actions directed to higher education policy and interventions. It is also stated that the domain in UA, namely lecturer status is correlated with academic programs, self-efficacy is correlated with teaching, work autonomy is correlated with research and consultation while there is a less strong



correlation between lecturer status with academic programs and implementation of lecturer powers with sources human resources where the results of this study are in line with what has been done by Guskey (1988), Andiny (2008), and Yuliani (2013). Sufean (1996) also supports the results of this study that the establishment of military-industry universities in the United States is a good case of how national defense priorities have shaped scientific activities at research universities and triggered the growth of new specialized fields of knowledge, ranging from agriculture to aerospace.

The results of the study indicate that the domains in OCB and LE are significantly correlated such as professional growth, competitive urgency to excel and participatory decision making, participatory decision making and competence, compliance and status, individual resilience and participatory decision making where these results are in line with studies which have been carried out previously by Nadeak (2016). Thompson et al. (2005) state that OCB and LE are two variables that determine one another because, without OCB, LE is not anything and vice versa. Bogler and Somech (2004), and Veza and Sabzikaran (2010) also support this result which states that the influence of LE is a variable that affects OCB as well as Saleem et al. (2017) which in their study results found that LE is the variable that determines OCB.

The results of the study indicate a correlation between OCB domains and UA domains. These domains are responsive leadership, competitive urgency to excel, entrepreneurial spirit, and individual resilience at OCB, and responsive leadership, university autonomy in postgraduate academic programs with research and consultation at UA. The results of this study are in line with the results of studies conducted by several previous researchers such as Damayanti (2006), Dimitriade (2007), Kumar et al. (2009), Fadhilah and Uswatun (2014), Chiang (2004), and Pruvot and Esterman (2018).

### **Conclusion**

This research has examined the factor of university autonomy, lecturer empowerment and organization citizenship behavior in the region of Indonesia. For the analysis purpose, descriptive findings are presented to examine the trends of data set and responses as collected through the questionnaire. Whereas the correlation matrix is generated and discussion is provided to cover the research questions with the help of hypotheses testing. It is observed that there is a significant and positive correlation between autonomy, lecturer empowerment, and organizational citizenship

behavior as observed through the responses from academicians in five universities of Indonesia. More specifically, there is a moderate understanding of the variables and also a significant relationship existing among UA, LE, and OCB. The study findings are widely suggested to the university administration and related policymakers in the ministry of education for applicable decision making. It is recommended that university administration and other authorities should reasonably contribute to promoting the idea of teacher empowerment as it is important for the growth of the education sector. For this purpose, concern authorities should emphasize those factors which can further enhance the empowerment of teaching faculty. For this purpose, different strategies for the benefits of the teachers/lecturers according to the UA, LE, and OCB can play a vital role. Lastly, this research work is based on various limitations. The first study has only focused on the correlation matrix to provide the statistical inference under stated research questions. Second, the causal relationship between the stated variables and their impact on the retention of teaching faculty like lecturers is also missing in this research. Third, the sampling method could also be diversified for combining the online survey to face to face surveys too. Future studies can reasonably address these limitations for more contribution to the related field of research.

### References

- Abraiz, A., Tabassum, T.M., Raja, S., & Jawad, M. (2012). Empowerment effects and employees job satisfaction. *Academic Research International*, 3(3), 392-400.
- Aelterman, N., Vansteenkiste, M., Van Keer, H., & Haerens, L. (2016). Changing teachers' beliefs regarding autonomy support and structure: The role of experienced psychological need satisfaction in teacher training. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 23, 64-72.
- Akech, L.O. (2014). *Response strategies to changes in external environment by sonysugar company limited*(Master Thesis). Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org>
- Andiny, L. (2008). *Perbedaan self-efficacy antara guru sma 'plus' dan guru sma non 'plus'*[Differences in self-efficacy between high school teachers 'plus' and high school teachers non 'plus'] (Unpublished Undergraduate Thesis). Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia.
- Andrews, K. (2019). Book Review: Human Rights and Global Diversity: Basic Ethics in Action. *Journal of Curriculum Studies Research*, 1(1), 71-74. Retrieved from <https://curriculumstudies.org/index.php/CS/article/view/10>

- Asimiran, S., & Hussin, S. (2012). *University governance: Trends and models*. Kuala Lumpur: UM Press.
- Avidov-Ungar, O., Friedman, I., & Olshtain, E. (2014). Empowerment amongst teachers holding leadership positions. *Teachers and Teaching*, 20(6), 704-720. DOI: 10.1080/13540602.2014.885706
- Baharuddin., Hadi, S., Hamid, A., Mutalib, A.A., & Dalle, J. (2018). Dilemma between applying coherent principle and signaling principles in interactive learning media. *Open Psychology Journal*, 11, 235-248. DOI: 10.2174/1874350101811010235
- Baharuddin., & Dalle, J. (2019). Transforming learning spaces for elementary school children with special needs. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 10(2), 344-365.
- Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of Universities: A University Culture-Based Framework. *Higher Education*, 45(1), 43-70. DOI: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3447513>
- Bhal, K. T. (2006). LMX-citizenship behavior relationship: Justice as a mediator. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 27(2), 106-117. DOI:10.1108/01437730610646615
- Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2005). Organizational citizenship behavior in school: How does it relate to participation in decision making? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(5), 420-438. DOI:10.1108/09578230510615215
- Carpenter, N. C., Berry, C. M. and Houston, L. (2014). A meta-analytic comparison of self-reported and other-reported organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(4), 547-574.
- Chen, X. P. (2005). *Handbook of organizational citizenship behavior*. New York: Nova Science.
- Chiang, L. C. (2004). The relationship between university autonomy and funding in England and Taiwan. *Higher Education*, 48, 189-212.
- Conway, C. M. (2008). Experienced music teacher perceptions of professional development throughout their careers. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 7-18.
- Cresswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Damayanti, A. (2006). *Pengaruh pemberdayaan kepada dosen terhadap organizational citizenship behavior dengan kebutuhan untuk berprestasi sebagai variabel moderasi (Studi Kasus pada Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta)* [The effect of empowerment on lecturers on organizational citizenship behavior with the need for achievement as a moderating

- variable (Case Study at Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta] (Unpublished Master Thesis). Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Richardson, N. (2009). Research review/teacher learning: What matters. *Educational leadership*, 66(5), 46-53.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R. C., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). Professional learning in the learning profession. *Washington, DC: National Staff Development Council*, 12.
- Ddungu, L. (2014). University Lecturers' Professional Empowerment and Turnover in Uganda. *Makerere Journal of Higher Education*, 6(1), 35–54.
- Dee, J., Henkin, A., & Deumer, L. (2003). Structural antecedents and psychological correlates of teacher empowerment. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(3), 257–277. DOI:10.1108/09578230310474412
- Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies on teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181–191. DOI:10.3102/0013189x08331140
- Dimitriade, Z. S. (2007). The influence of service climate and job involvement on customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior in Greek service organizations: A survey. *Employee Relations*, 29(5), 469-491.
- Dimitriades, Z. S. (2007). The influence of service climate and job involvement on customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior in Greek service organizations: A survey. *Employee Relations*, 29(5), 469–491. DOI:10.1108/01425450710776290
- Dust, S. B., Resick, C. J., Margolis, J. A., Mawritz, M. B., & Greenbaum, R. L. (2018). Ethical leadership and employee success: Examining the roles of psychological empowerment and emotional exhaustion. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(5), 570-583
- Fadhilah, M., & Uswatun, L. (2014). *Hubungan antara keterlibatan kerja dengan organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) di Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta (UMS) [Relationship between work involvement with organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) at Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta (UMS)]* (Unpublished Master Thesis). Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Surakarta, Indonesia.

- Fast, N.J., Burris, E.R., & Bartel, C.A. (2014). Managing to stay in the dark: managerial self-efficacy, ego defensiveness, and the aversion to employee voice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(4), 1013-1034. DOI:10.5465/amj.2012.0393
- Flaherty, A., O'Dwyer, A., Mannix-McNamara, P., & Leahy, J. (2017). The influence of psychological empowerment on the enhancement of chemistry laboratory demonstrators' perceived teaching self-image and behaviours as graduate teaching assistants. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 18(4), 710-736.
- Fumasoli, T., Gornitzka, A., & Maassen, P. (2014). University autonomy and organizational change dynamics. ARENA Working Paper 8/2014. Oslo: University of Oslo ARENA Centre for European Studies.
- Guskey, T.R. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward implementation of instructional innovation. *Journal Teaching and Teacher Education*. 4, 63- 69.
- Han, S.H., Seo, G., Yoon, S.W., Yoon, D.Y. (2016). Transformational leadership and knowledge sharing: Mediating roles of employee's empowerment, commitment, and citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 28(3), 130-149. DOI: 10.1108/jwl-09-2015-0066
- Hemmings, B. & Kay, R. (2015). The relationship between research self-efficacy, research disposition and publication output. *Educational Psychology*, 36(2), 347-361. DOI: 10.1080/01443410.2015.1025704
- Houdyshell, M. & Kirk, P. (2018). Graduate students' perceptions' on a professional pathway for academic advisors. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, 2(1), 77-96.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice*. (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Huda, M., Maselena, A., Jasmi, K. A., Mustari, I., & Basiron, B. (2017). Strengthening interaction from direct to virtual basis: insights from ethical and professional empowerment. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research*, 12(17), 6901-6909.
- Hussin, S., & Ismail, A. (2009). Goals, components, and factors considered in university development. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 10(1), 83-91. DOI:10.1007/s12564-009-9001-8

- Jongbloed, B., Enders, J. & Salerno, C. (2008). Higher education and its communities: Interconnections, interdependencies and a research agenda. *Higher Education*, 56(3), 303–324. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-008-9128-2>.
- Khany, R., & Tazik, K. (2016). On the relationship between psychological empowerment, trust, and Iranian EFL teachers' job satisfaction: The case of secondary school teachers. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 24(1), 112-129.
- Klein, J. (2016). Teacher empowerment, horizontal and vertical organizational learning, and positional mobility in schools. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(2), 238-252.
- Koning, L.F., & Van Kleef, G.A. (2015). How leaders' emotional displays shape followers' organizational citizenship behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(4), 489-501.
- Kromydas, T. (2017). Rethinking higher education and its relationship with social inequalities: past knowledge, present state and future potential. *Palgrave Communications*, 3. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-017-0001-8>
- Kumar, K., Bakhshi, A., & Rani, E. (2009). Linking the big five personality domains to organizational citizenship behavior, *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 1(2), 3-81.
- Maassen P, Gornitzka Å, Fumasoli T. (2017). University reform and institutional autonomy: A framework for analyzing the living autonomy. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 71(3), 239–250. DOI: 71. 10.1111/hequ.12129
- Manville, B., & Ober, J. (2003). *A company of citizens: What the world's first democracy teaches leaders about creating great organizations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation.
- Marginson, S. (2004). Competition and Markets in Higher Education: A 'Glonacal' Analysis. *Policy Futures in Education*, 2(2), 175-244. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2004.2.2.2>
- McElyea, B. (2002). Knowledge management, intellectual capital, and learning organizations: A triad of future management integration. *Futurics*, 26(1 and 2), 59–65.
- Mohammad, J., Habib, F.Q., & Zakaria, S. (2010). Organizational citizenship behavior and commitment: Do age and tenure make any difference? *BMQR*, 1(3), 28-49.
- Moon, H., & Marinova, S. (2003). *Introducing a circumplex model of organizational citizenship behavior*. Paper presented at the 18th annual SIOP conference, Orlando FLA.

- Moon, H., Dyne, L. V., & Wrobel, K. (2004). The circumplex model and the future of organizational citizenship behavior research. In: Turnipseed D. L. (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational citizenship behavior: A review of good soldier activity in organizations* (pp. 3–23). New York: Nova Science Publisher, Inc.
- Moran, K., & Larwin, K. H. (2017). Building administrator's facilitation of teacher leadership: moderators associated with teachers' reported levels of empowerment. *Journal of Organizational and Educational Leadership*, 3(1), Article 2. Available at: <https://digitalcommons.gardner-webb.edu/joel/vol3/iss1/2>
- Nadeak, B. (2016). Pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) dosen di Universitas Kristen Indonesia (UKI) [The influence of organizational culture on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) lecturers at Universitas Kristen Indonesian (UKI)]. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 5(1), 1-10.
- Newman, A., Schwarz, G., & Cooper, B. (2017). How Servant Leadership Influences Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Roles of LMX, Empowerment, and Proactive Personality. *Journal of Business Ethics*.145(1), 49–62. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2827-6>
- Ng, T.W.H., & Feldman, D.C. (2011). Affective Organizational Commitment and Citizenship Behavior: Linear and Non-Linear Moderating Effects of Organizational Tenure. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(2), 528-537. DOI: 10.1016/j.jvb.2011.03.006
- Ohlin, C. (2019). Information and Communication Technology in a Global World. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, 4(2), 41-57. Retrieved from <https://ressat.org/index.php/ressat/article/view/409>
- Ordorika, I. (2003). The limits of university autonomy: Power and politics at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. *Higher Education*, 46(3), 361–388.
- Patterson, G. (2001). The applicability of institutional goals to the university organization. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 23(2), 159–169. DOI:10.1080/13600800120088652
- Popescu, C. (2019). Adaptive sustainable academic management practices. In M. Sarfraz, M.I.Adbullah., A. Rauf (Ed.). *Sustainable Management Practices* (pp. 1-19). London: Intech Open. DOI: 10.5772/intechopen.87018

- Pruvot, B.E., & Estermann, T. (2018). University Governance: Autonomy, structures and inclusiveness. In Curaj, A., Deca, L., & R. Pricopie (Eds.), *European Higher Education Area: The Impact of Past and Future Policies* (pp. 619-638). Springer International Publishing.
- Raquib, M.A., Anantharaman, R.N., Eze, U.C., & Murad, M.W. (2009). Empowerment practices and performance in Malaysia: An empirical study. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(1), 121-130. DOI:10.5539/ijbm.v5n1p123
- Rodrigues, M., Menezes, I., & Ferreira, P. D. (2018). Validating the formative nature of psychological empowerment construct: Testing cognitive, emotional, behavioral, and relational empowerment components. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 46(1), 58-78.
- Roversi-Monaco, F., Felt, U., Gibbons, M., Albornoz, O., Blasi, P., Jonasson, J. T., Magrath, P., & Rysbekov, T. (2005). Managing University Autonomy – University autonomy and the institutional balancing of teaching and research. *Proceedings of the Seminar of the Magna Charta Observatory 15th September 2005*
- Rumbley, L.E., Altbach, P.G., & Reisberg, L. (2012). Internationalization within the Higher Education Context in Deardorff, D.K., de Wit, H., Heyl, J.D., & Adams, T. (Ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education* (pp.3). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452218397.n1>
- Salamon, L. M., Sokolowski, S. W., & Haddock, M. A. (2017). *Explaining civil society development: A social origins approach*: JHU Press
- Saleem, A., Nisar, Q.A., & Imran, A. (2017). Organization citizenship behaviour, psychological empowerment and demographic characteristics: Teachers' perspective. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 4(7), 129-135.
- Shelton, K.D. (2010). *Autonomy and organizational justice as moderators of relationships among creativity, openness to experience, and organizational misbehavior*, [Ph.D. Dissertation], Minneapolis, Walden University.
- Shin, Y., Kim, M.S., Choi, J.N., Kim, M., & Oh, W.K. (2017). Does leader-follower regulatory fit matter? The role of regulatory fit in followers' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management*, 43(4), 1211-1233. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314546867>
- Short, P. M., & Rinehart, J. S. (1992). School participant empowerment scale: Assessment of level of empowerment within the school environment. *Journal of Educational and*



*Psychological Measurement*, 52, 951-960. DOI:  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164492052004018>

- Singh, P. (2005). Use of the Collegial Leadership Model of Emancipation to transform traditional management practices in secondary schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 25(1), 11–18.
- Sirait, M. (2010). Strategic planning directions of Malaysia's higher education: University autonomy in the midst of political uncertainties. *Higher Education*, 59(4), 461-473. DOI: 10.1007/s10734-009-9259-0
- Somech, A. (2005). Teachers' personal and team empowerment and their relations to organizational outcomes: Contradictory or compatible constructs? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(2), 237–266. DOI:10.1177/0013161x04269592
- Szymanski, A. (2016). Examining the Influence of self-determination theory components with students of varying cognitive abilities. *Kentucky Teacher Education Journal: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Kentucky Council for Exceptional Children*, 3(1), 1-23.
- Tarman, B. (2012). Effective leadership in culturally diverse schools. *Energy Education Science and Technology Part B: Social and Educational Studies*, 4(2), 1103-1114.
- Tarman, B. (2016). Innovation and Education. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, 1(1). Retrieved from <http://ressat.org/index.php/ressat/article/view/3>
- Takeuchi, R., Bolino, M. C., & Lin, C.C. (2015). Too many motives? The interactive effects of multiple motives on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(4), 1239-1248. DOI: 10.1037/apl0000001
- Vaezi, R., & Sabzikaran, E. (2010). Organizational structure and employees' empowerment in national iranian petroleum products distribution company employees, tehran region, *Journal of change management*, 2 (3), 1-11.
- van Lankveld, T., Schoonenboom, J., Volman, M., Croiset, G., & Beishuizen, J. (2016). Developing a teacher identity in the university context: a systematic review of the literature. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(2), 325-342. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1208154>

- Varekamp, I., Heutink, A., Andman, S., Koning, C.E.M., de Vries, G., & van Dijk, F.J.H. (2009). Facilitating empowerment in employees with chronic disease: Qualitative analysis of the process of change. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*. 19(4), 398–408. DOI: DOI: 10.1007/s10926-009-9188-x
- Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: a status report on teacher development in the US and Abroad*. Technical Report: National Staff Development Council.
- Wynn-godbold. (2013). *Empowered teachers will change the world*. Retrieved from: <https://www.seenmagazine.us/Articles/Article-Detail/articleid/2899/empowered-teachers-will-change-the-world>
- Yigit, M. (2018). Does higher education change value perceptions?. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, 1(1), 1-8. Retrieved from <http://cultureandvalues.org/index.php/JCV/article/view/5>
- Yuliani, A. E. (2013). *Kontribusi efikasi guru terhadap minat dan sikap siswa di sma negeri kabupaten pandeglang [teacher efficacy contribution to student interest and attitude in pandeglang district high school]* (Unpublished Undergraduate Thesis). Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia.
- Zhong, J. A., Lam, W., & Chen, Z. (2009). Relationship between leader–member exchange and organizational citizenship behaviors: Examining the moderating role of empowerment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 28(3), 609–626. DOI:10.1007/s10490-009-9163-2