There is an empirical evidence shows the relationship of transformational leadership and individual extra-role performance, organizational citizenship behaviors, OCBs through employees’ work engagement. This study applied those concepts into academic setting. It aims to study the relationship of transformational leadership in classroom and students’ organization citizenship behaviors with the mediating role of students’ work engagement in higher education in Thailand. The data were collected from 463 graduate students registered in the 1st semester of 2014 at National Institute of Development Administration, NIDA, Thailand by pen and paper questionnaire. The hierarchical regression analysis was used to test several of empirical hypotheses. The result showed that there is a significant relationship between transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors with the partial mediating role of work engagement ($p < 0.01$). This study provides valuable contributions with respect to the institution in term of faculty members’ transformational leadership in classroom perceived by students can influence students’ work engagement and their organizational citizenship behaviors.
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HRD practitioner emphasis on organizational effectiveness, which one of the effectiveness’s criteria is job performance. Employees demonstrated their job performance through their in-roles and extra-roles performance (William & Anderson, 1991). Van Dyne, Cummings and McLean-Parks (1995) defined extra-role performance of employee as the organizational citizenship behaviors, OCBs.
There are growing interest in the effect of organizational citizenship behaviors, OCBs that transfer to organizational outcomes (e.g. Allen & Rash, 1998; Chen, 2005; Dunlop & Lu, 2004; Ehrhart & Naumann, 2004; Koys, 2001; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Walz & Niehoff, 2000). To assume that OCBs have an impact on organizational outcomes, it leads to study of those variables that increase the OCBs. There are many studies show the antecedent and consequences of OCB e.g. Williams and Anderson (1991) revealed the predictors of OCB from job satisfaction and organization commitment from various organizations’ employees who attended MBA class, Babcock-Roberson and Stricland (2010) showed the empirical support of mediation relation among charismatic leadership, work engagement, and OCBs, Ahmed, Rasheed, and Jehazeb (2012) explored the prediction of OCBs from employee engagement in banking sector. Koy (2001) did longitudinal study on the effect of employee satisfaction, OCBs, and turnover on organizational effectiveness at unit-level in restaurant chain. Several studies showed the leadership behaviors are the potential antecedent of OCBs (Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990).

To the extent that employees who engage in OCBs, they help their organization from individual to organizational level as increase more competitive for organization, develop working environment in which enhance individual and team productivity, attract and retain the best employee, and, most of all, they help to increase organizations’ abilities to adapt to the environmental change (Organ, Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 2006).

**Statement and Significance of the Problem**

Thailand is in an urgent need of new and systematic education reform. Therefore, Thailand’s first National Education Act 1999 has been stated which aims to improve the educational system. After decades of debate and analysis by national and international institutions, it is the duty of Thai scholars to scrutinize the state of education in Thailand (Mounier & Tangchuang, 2010). According to National Education Act, chapter 7 is contributed to teacher, faculty member and educational personnel. As far as the quality of student is concerned, faculty members cannot avoid their responsibilities because they foster a multitude of relationships with their students and perform duties ranging from advisors, to mentors, to instructors (Walumbwa, Wu, & Ojode, 2004).

There are empirical results showed that the concept of OCBs, transformational leaders, and work engagement were positively related to organizational effectiveness. This study applied those concepts into academic setting; it may influence the organizational (institution) outcomes.
Employees may feel they want to engage in OCBs for several reasons but leader can shape the environment and take other step to enhance the extent to which employees can engage in OCBs. Transformational leadership theory explained that the leader recognized the unique needs and abilities of their employees, treat employees as individuals, build one-to-one relationships with them, understand and consider their differing skills (Avolio & Bass 1995).

Many research have shown the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational outcomes and also revealed that there are significant relationships among transformational leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational trust (Hikmet, Tar, Tekingunduz, & Top2013), and OCBs (Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990).

Bolkan and Goodboy (2010) revealed the influence of teachers’ transformational leadership in the classroom makes students feel empowered by, and perceive that they learn more from, professors who get them inspirations and involved in the learning process, challenge them to be the best students they can be, show them that hard work is worth, and help them think deeply and critically about course concepts. The role of teacher as leader in the classroom seems to impact students’ engagement and OCBs. Several researchers support the notion that faculty members who function as leaders in their classrooms (e.g., Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009; Koh, Steers, & Terborg, 1995; Pounder, 2003, 2006, 2008) and suggest that leadership models developed in business settings are applicable to the study of faculty members’ behaviors (e.g., Baba & Ace, 1989; Chory & McCroskey, 1999).

Transformational leadership has had positive relationships with follower job satisfaction, satisfaction with the leader, follower motivation, perceived leader effectiveness (Judge & Piccolo, 2004), follower empowerment, job satisfaction, and affective commitment (Castro, Perinan, & Bueno, 2008). Babcock-Roberson and Strickland (2010) revealed the positive significant relation of charismatic leadership to OCBs as charismatic is one of the components of transformational leadership. They studied in the academic environment in university in the United States and the result showed the full mediation of transformational leadership.

Research Problem and Question

This research aims to study the relationship of teachers’ transformational leadership with students’ organization citizenship behaviors with mediating role of students’ work engagement in higher education in Thailand. Therefore, the research question is what is the relationship between teachers’ transformational leadership with students’ organization citizenship behavior with mediating role of students’ engagement?
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Transformational Leadership

Political scientists, and sociologists have recognized that leaders is not just only those who are on the higher position and have such only social exchange with their followers, but leaders must be able to address followers to see their values and create the positive impact in organization (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Transformational leadership theory proposes that leaders are those who stimulate and inspire followers to achieve extraordinary outcomes and develop their own leadership capacity (Burns, 1978). They foster the growth of their followers and empower them to align with the goal of individual, the group, and the larger organization. According to Bass (1985, 2006), there are four components of transformational leadership, idealized influence, individual consideration, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation. He demonstrated that transformational leaders could move followers to exceed expected performance, to high level of followers’ satisfaction and commitment to the organization. In business setting, the study shows the links between transformational leadership and work related attitudes and behaviors, such as job satisfaction, organizational trust and organizational commitment. Essentially, both empirical and meta-analytic studies suggest that followers working with transformational leaders are more involved, satisfied, empowered, motivated, trusted and committed to their organizations and demonstrate fewer withdrawal behaviors (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996; Bono & Judge, 2003; Walumbwa & Lawler, 2003). The significant relationship of transformational leadership and work engagement is also applicable in China (Aryee, Walumbwa, Zhou & Hartnell, 2012).

Bogler, Caaspi, and Roccas (2013) studied instructor’s transformational leadership in university under the virtual environment setting. They revealed that transformational leadership positively correlated with students’ satisfaction. The concept of teacher leadership reflects their behaviors of how teacher positively guide, lead, motivate, and develop their student. Although a variety of models may be used to examine leadership style (Zorn & Violanti, 1993), effective classroom leadership behaviors may be considered under the term of transformational leadership (Pounder, 2006). Bolkan, Goodboy and Griffin (2011) studied a specific component of transformational leadership in classroom to investigate how communicating intellectual stimulation transforms the nature of the classroom by encouraging student motivation and, subsequently, students’ approaches to their studying. In their studied, there are 3 components of teachers’ transformational leadership, interactive teaching style, ITS, challenging students, CS, and encouraging independent thought, EIT. They revealed that when teachers influence students’ intrinsic motivation through the use of intellectually stimulating behaviors, students
approach their learning in deep and strategic ways, and are less likely to adopt a surface-level approach to their studies.

In conclusion, transformational leadership has been studied in different business and academic sectors and revealed that has positively relationship with performance at individual and organizational level, employees’ engagement, employees’ organizational citizenship behaviors, and organizational commitment. (e.g. Carter, Armenakis, Field, & Mossholder, 2013; Cavazotte, Moreno, & Hickmann, 2012; Faisal, Azeem, Aysha, Amina, Saleem, & 2012; Chuang, Judge, & Liaw, 2011; Gracia-Morales, Llorens-Montes, & Verdu-Jover, 2008; Gracia-Morales, Jimenez-Barrionuevo, & Gutierrez-Gutierrez, 2010; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Salanova, Lorente, Chambel, & Martinez, 2011; Song, Kolb, Lee, & Kim, 2012).

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) are presumed as one of the emerging management concepts that are being emphasized for the organizational effectiveness (Ahmed, Rasheed, & Jehanzeb, 2012). This study designed to cover the concept of organizational citizenship behavior by Organ (1988). According to Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (2006), employees want to engage in OCBs with several reasons, for themselves, for others – their superiors, and/or for their organizations.

There are five dimensions of OCBs. Conscientiousness means that employee can complete individual performance well beyond minimum requirement. Altruism means that employee gives help to other. Civic virtue means that employees participate the social life in organization. Sportsmanship means that employee has positive attitude and has less complain at work. Courtesy means that they respect others and treat them respectfully. Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, and Blume (2009) revealed in their meta-analysis study that OCBs have significant relationships with a variety of individual and organizational level outcomes.

Leadership behaviors have been related to employees’ OCBs. The study of House and his colleagues (House et. al. cited in Organ et.al, 2006) identified two types of leader behaviors that influence employees’ OCBs, which were instrumental and supportive leadership. Transformational leader inspires followers to perform above and beyond expectation by articulating a vision, providing appropriate role model, fostering both individual and group levels’ performance and expressing organization’s high performance expectation (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990). Transformational leadership is considered to be an
a\ntecedent factor of OCBs; therefore, it assumes that transformational leadership influences OCBs.

H1: Teachers’ Transformational leadership is positively related to students’ OCBs.

Work Engagement

The origin of the term employee engagement is not cleared, but Gallup Organization first used it in 1990 (Bukingham & Coffman, 1999). Employee engagement and work engagement are used interchangeably (Bakker & Leiter, 2010), but, in this study, term work engagement will be used as it is more specific, in which explains the relationship of one with his or her work.

Even though, there is no agreement among scholars and practitioners on the conceptualization of work engagement, but work engagement demonstrates the strong relationship between organization and individual value. Therefore, organizations are responsive for the value of their employees by supporting them in variety of approaches to work (Bakker & Leiter, 2010).

There are two schools of thought of work engagement. The first school, work engagement was defined by Kahn (1990), and, later, was developed by Rothbard (2001). They proposed two dimensions of work engagement, attention (shows how one contributes his thought to his role), and absorption (how much one concentrate on his role) (Rothbard, 2001). The second school of work engagement was developed by Maslach and Leiter (1997). They defined work engagement as the positive antithesis of burnout. In conclusion, the first school focused on work role whereas the second school focused on work activity (Bakker & Leiter, 2010).

In the study of Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker (2002), they concluded both concepts and defined work engagement as “positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption” (p. 74). This definition has been agreed from both academia (Bakker & Leiter, 2010).

Work engagement refers to the construct that captures the variation across individuals and the amount of energy and dedication they contribute to their job (Kahn, 1990). The conceptual of work engagement represents in three dimensions as components: a physical component, an emotional component, and a cognitive component. (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004). Work engagement consists of: (1) vigor is characterized by high level of energy and mental resilience while working, (2) dedication refers to being strongly involved in one’s work,
and (3) absorption is characterized by being fully concentrated and happily at work (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002).

Babcock-Roberson and Strickland (2010) studied from students’ perspectives; they found work engagement was significantly positively related to organizational citizenship behaviors, OCBs, in students. Therefore, students’ work engagement is assumed positively related to students’ organizational citizenship behaviors.

H2: Students’ work engagement is a mediator between the relationship of teachers’ transformational leadership and students’ OCBs.

Method

Participants and Procedure

The data were collected from 463 graduate students (male = 208, female = 255) registered in 2014 at National Institute of Development Administration, NIDA, Thailand by pen and paper questionnaire, in which was sampling conveniently. The participants’ age ranged from 20 to 50 years old, which average age is 27.45 years (M = 27.45 years, SD = 4.29 years). Most of the participants are studying in master program (96.3%) and the rest (3.7%) are in PhD program.

Measures

Questionnaires were administered in Thai but originally constructed in English. The back-translation procedure was used, in which recommended by Brislin (1976) to translate the English language version into Thai and then back into English, peer who was PhD student in HROD (international program) reviewed the content validity, in which reflects the relevance of the assessment tool to its targeted construct (De Vellis, 2012). The Thai version was pilot tested using a sample of 100 graduate students. Reliability and discriminant t-value testing were performed. Questionnaires have been adjusted according to the statistic results before launching to those participants.

Transformational leadership.

This study used the 10 items scale of short form of SISS, student intellectual stimulation scales developed by Bolkan and Goodboy (2010). Responses ranged from 1 (never) to 7 (always). Previous reliabilities (Cronbach alpha) for this scale have been .94 (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2010). From the pilot testing group, the reliability for this study was .89. Examples for SISS subscales, teacher uses unique activities to get the class involved with the course
material, teacher helps students get excited about learning through classroom activities, and teacher stimulates students to help us get involved in the learning process in a variety of ways.

**Organizational citizenship behaviors.**

The 7 items scale had been developed to cover OCBI (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Previous study of measurement tool of Williams and Aderson (1991) reported reliabilities (Cronbach alpha) for this scale at 0.76. In this study, it was adapted to be 7 points range scale. The item has been adopted for educational context by change the word “employee” or “co-worker” to “classmate”. According to the pilot testing group, the reliability for this study was .94. Examples for OCBI subscales are, I help others who have been absent, I take a personal interest in to other classmates, and I pass along information to my classmates.

**Work engagement.**

The 9 items scale short form of UWES engagement measurement (student) (Schaufeli, & Bakker, 2003) will be used in this study. Reported reliabilities (Cronbach alpha) of the UWES across 10 different countries varied between .85 and .92, with a median of .92, which is satisfactory. However, as a result from pilot testing group, the reliability for this study was .79. Responses ranged from 1 (never) to 7 (always). Examples for subscales are at my class, I feel bursting with energy, at my class, I feel strong and vigorous, and I am enthusiastic about my class.

**Control variables.**

In assessing the relationship of teachers' transformational leadership on students' OCBs with the mediating role of students' work engagement, I controlled age, gender, faculties, and students' work experiences. As these four variables may derive the relational variable sources. The effect of the simple demographic measures should be controlled (Avery, McKay & Wilson, 2008).

**Data Analysis**

Hierarchical regression analysis is a statistical methodology for predicting values of one or more dependent variables from a collection of independent variable values (Cook, Kress, & Seiford, 1996). It examines whether there exists a linear relationship or not between one or more independent variables and a dependent variable, including linear regression analysis and nonlinear regression analysis, etc. Therefore, hierarchical regression analysis was used in this study.

This study also aims to see the mediating role of variable. According to Kenny and Baron (1986) and Mathieu and Taylor (2007), mediation is supported, H2, if three criteria are
met: (1) the independent variable significantly relates to the dependent variables (transformational leadership and OCBs), which will be tested of H1; (2) the independent variable (transformational leadership) significantly relates to the mediator (students’ work engagement), and (3) the mediator significantly relates to the dependent variables when controlling for the independent variable (students’ experienced work meaningfulness and students’ work engagement, and students’ work engagement and OCBs which is going to be tested of H2)

**Results**

The reliability cronbach alpha coefficient of the measurement tools in this study, which are transformational leadership, work engagement, and OCBs are .93, .94, and .92 respectively. Means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations for each of the variables in the study are presented in Table 1. It revealed a significant positive correlation between transformational leadership and work engagement, $r = .78, p < .01$. The correlation between transformational leadership and OCBs is also found positively significant, $r = .68, p < .01$. Work engagement is also positively significant correlated with OCBs, $r = .73, p < .01$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Transformational leadership</td>
<td>47.74</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work engagement</td>
<td>43.19</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. OCBs</td>
<td>33.42</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 463$

** p < .01

To further analyze the data, the regression equation as suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986) was used to test the regression path coefficients for independent links between variables. Using regression analysis for transformational leadership and OCBs, which was tested the first hypothesis, H1. The regression of transformational leadership and OCBs was
significant, $\beta = .68$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .47$. Transformational leadership accounted for 47% of the variance in OCBs.

To test H2, the regression analysis was conducted between work engagement and OCBs. The finding showed that there was a significant relationship between work engagement and OCBs, $\beta = .73$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .54$. According to Baron and Kenny (1986), both transformational leadership and work engagement were entered into the equation. Both transformational leadership and work engagement accounted for 57% of the variance in OCBs. Interestingly, the result showed that transformational leadership was lower ($\beta = .28$), but it was still at significant level ($p < .01$).

These concluded that both transformational leadership and OCBs have significant relationship with work engagement and work engagement was partially mediated between the relationship of transformational leadership and OCBs.

**Discussion**

The present study adds to the transformational leadership literature by documenting empirical support of mediation relations among transformational leadership, work engagement, and OCBs. All hypothesized relations were supported by the data. As expected, transformational leadership was significantly positively related to OCBs. These findings were also demonstrated and supported the several studies of the mediating role of work engagement between the relationship of transformational leadership and OCBs (Aryee, Walumbwa, Zhou, & Hartnell, 2012; Babcock-Roberson, & Strickland, 2010; Salanova, Lorente, Chambel, & Martinez, 2011).

There was an interesting finding in which add-on to the previous studies of the mediating role of work engagement. According to the several studies, work engagement was a full mediator between those two variables (Aryee, Walumbwa, Zhou, & Hartnell, 2012; Babcock-Roberson, & Strickland, 2010; Salanova, Lorente, Chambel, & Martinez, 2011), but this study showed that work engagement was a partial mediator. In conclusion, the transformational leadership in classroom was positively significant to students’ OCBs with partially mediator role of students’ work engagement. It indicated that there is a strong role of faculty members as transformational leadership in classroom, in which influences the students’ OCBs.

**Implication to practice**

According to Northhouse (2013), “leadership is a process whereby an individual influence a group of individual to achieve a common goal” (p. 5). To increase students’ work engagement and OCBs, the faculty member as transformational leadership in classroom plays
an important role. Therefore, faculty member’s quality improvement needs to be considered to response to students’ perception, their interactive teaching style, challenging students, and encouraging independent thought.

**Limitations of Study and Future Research**

There are several limitations of this study. First, the common method variance with data collected from a single source. This study collected data from graduate students, which may create artifact covariance. The artifact covariance will be happened when rating of several constructs are generated by a single source (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). This limitation may lead to future research by collecting data from multilevel such as from the perception of faculty members etc. Second, as the current study is a cross sectional study and data for analysis was taken at a particular time period so, the analysis of the data is confined to that particular time. Last, as recommended by Bristin (1980), the measurement tools were originally produced in English and have been used back and forth translation into Thai. However, more evidence is needed to support this procedure. Adaptation and validation of a questionnaire are two different processes that should be distinguished and undertaken with care (Epstein, Santo & Guillemin, 2015).
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