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Psychological Empowerment as a Mediator Between Teachers’ Perceptions of Authentic Leadership and Their Withdrawal and Citizenship Behaviors

Orly Shapira-Lishchinsky¹ and Sigalit Tsemach¹

Abstract
Purpose: This study explores the mediating role of psychological empowerment on authentic leadership, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB), and a variety of withdrawal behaviors among teachers, using the psychological model of perceptions-attitudes-behaviors. Research Design: A total of 366 teachers from 23 randomly selected Israeli schools participated in the study. The research combined self-reports and school records taken at regular time intervals regarding three withdrawal behaviors: lateness, absenteeism, and intent to leave. The model for the hierarchical data (teachers within schools) that included latent as well as manifest variables was analyzed using the Mplus statistical package applying to multilevel analysis. Findings: “Impact,” a dimension of psychological empowerment, was found to mediate the relationship between authentic leadership and OCB, whereas “self-determination, meaning, and competence,” the other
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dimension of psychological empowerment, was found to mediate the relationship between authentic leadership and absence frequency. No mediating relationship was found for psychological empowerment on authentic leadership and the other withdrawal behaviors of lateness and intent to leave. **Research Implications:** The present study improves the Ajzen and Fishbein model. While most previous withdrawal behavior studies focused on a single dimension of withdrawal behaviors and did not consider OCB, the present study presents an integrative framework, focusing on the mediating role of psychological empowerment as a consistent link between authentic leadership and a spectrum of teachers’ withdrawal behaviors and OCB. **Practical Implications:** These findings should encourage principals to promote high standards of authentic leadership to empower their teachers, increase OCB, and reduce absenteeism among teachers.
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During the past decade, organizational behavior research has focused on positive behaviors, such as “organizational citizenship behaviors” (OCB), on negative behaviors, commonly labeled as “withdrawal behaviors,” and on the relationship between them (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Bennett & Stamper, 2001; Sackett, Berry, Wiemann, & Laczo, 2006; Shapira-Lishchinsky, 2012). Recent studies have conveyed the importance of value-based leadership through the construct of authentic leadership. These studies define authentic leadership as promoting a positive internalized moral perspective and show that authentic leadership is positively related to key organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction and work performance (Bird, Wang, Watson, & Murray, 2009, 2012; Leroy, Palanski, & Simons, 2011; Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008).

Ajzen and Fishbein (2005) developed the “perceptions–attitudes–behavior” theory, which argues that there is a strong link between perception, attitude, and behavior. We will relate the “perceptions–attitudes–behavior” theory specifically to the educational system and examine the following three primary research questions:

1. Can a model be formulated to test the linear relationships among the teachers’ perceptions of the principals’ authentic leadership, the teachers’ psychological empowerment, and organizational citizenship behavior and withdrawal behaviors?
2. Does psychological empowerment mediate the relationship between perceived authentic leadership and both OCB and withdrawal behaviors among teachers?

3. Based on the suggested mediating model, what are the relationships between the different withdrawal behaviors and OCB?

The following study examines the teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ authentic leadership (independent variable), their sense of psychological empowerment (mediating variable), and their resulting OCB and withdrawal behaviors (dependent variables). Currently, educational systems invest considerable resources in developing leadership programs and to empower teachers to improve school effectiveness (Ben-David, 2010; Hairon & Dimmock, 2012; Starratt, 2007). The purpose of the present study is to explore the relationship between OCB and withdrawal behaviors through a psychological model among teachers in order to optimize these school effectiveness programs.

**Authentic Leadership in Education**

Authentic leadership in education is defined as ethical leadership practices and moral literacy in a manner relevant to school leaders (Begley & Stefkovich, 2007). Authentic leadership is the outcome of self-knowledge and sensitivity to the orientations of others (Begley, 2001, 2003) and is usually understood as being true to oneself (Wang & Bird, 2011). Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, and May (2004) describe authentic leaders as follows: “They know who they are, what they believe and value and they act upon those values and beliefs while transparently interacting with others” (p. 801). George, Sims, McLean, and Mayer (2007) reported that authentic leaders “develop self-awareness from their experiences; act on that awareness by practicing their values, sometimes at substantial risk; balance their motivations with both internal and external drives; keep a strong support team around themselves; and, live integrated, grounded lives” (pp. 131-132).

Preliminary efforts to implement authentic leadership (Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005; Kermis, 2003; Walumbwa et al., 2008) have revealed certain characteristics required of authentic leaders: (a) self-awareness—a heightened awareness of the world they live in, awareness of their strengths and weaknesses and awareness of their impact on other people, and how other perceive them; (b) relational transparency—exercising behaviors that promote trust, such as openly sharing information, true thoughts and feelings while minimizing displays of inappropriate emotions; (c) balanced processing—being able to objectively analyze all relevant data.
and solicit sufficient opinions and viewpoints of others before making a decision; and (d) internal moral perspective—having internal moral standards and values when facing group, organizational, and societal pressures, reflecting the extent to which they are willing to fight for high standards of moral and ethical conduct.

Authentic leadership reflects aspects of the leader’s inner self. The leaders retain their distinctiveness as individuals, yet they are accepted in strong corporate and social cultures and know how to use those cultures’ elements as a basis for radical change (Bird et al., 2009; 2012; Goffee & Jones, 2005). Many authentic leaders reported that overcoming difficult experiences and solving conflicts gives meaning to their leadership and brings long-term results (George et al., 2007; Leroy et al., 2011).

**Psychological Empowerment**

The term *empowerment* can be defined as either an outward process or an internal process. It can be defined as the act of empowering others (Burke, 1986; Menon, 2001) or as the internal process of individuals who are empowered (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Thus, the term *psychological empowerment* has been given several definitions. Conger and Kanungo (2000) perceived psychological empowerment as motivational and defined it as a process of enhancing feelings of self-efficacy among organizational members by both formal practices and informal techniques of promoting efficacy. Short, Greer, and Melvin (1994) focused on psychological empowerment in education and defined it as “a process whereby school participants develop the competence to take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems” (p. 38). In this study, we will use Mishra and Spreitzer’s (1998) definition of psychological empowerment, which is the sense of control that employees perceive at the workplace. According to this approach, the sense of control is manifested in four different dimensions: meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact.

*Meaning* is defined as the employees’ perception of their work as being valued. In teaching, it refers to the professional respect and appreciation that teachers believe they receive from colleagues for their knowledge and expertise. *Competence* is defined as the employees’ belief that they possess the necessary skills to successfully perform skill-related tasks. In teaching, it refers to the teachers’ perception that they are equipped with the skills to develop curricula for students and help them advance in their studies. *Self-determination* is defined as the employees’ sense of freedom in working in the manner they choose. In teaching, it refers to the feeling of control that teachers have at work, such as scheduling, curriculum development, selection
of textbooks, and lesson planning. In addition, self-determination also refers to the teachers’ participation in critical decisions that directly affect their work, for example, budgeting, scheduling, and the curriculum. Impact is defined as the degree to which employees feel that their achievements make a difference. In teaching, it refers to teachers’ perception that they have influence on what happens at school.

The Relationship Between Authentic Leadership and Psychological Empowerment

Authentic leadership is closely linked to psychological empowerment (Zue, May, & Avolio, 2004). Authentic leaders are likely to treat their employees with respect rather than treating them as a means to an end. As a result, employees are likely to experience a stronger sense of meaning at work, which is one of the dominant factors in psychological empowerment (Bandura, 1986; May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004). In addition, employees of authentic leaders perceive themselves as autonomous in their decision making (Conger & Kanungo, 2000; Meyerson & Kline, 2008), which is also an important factor in the employees’ psychological empowerment.

The relationship between authentic leadership and psychological empowerment has been previously studied. Wong and Cummings (2009) sampled two types of health care employees, clinical care providers ($N = 147$) and nonclinical care providers ($N = 188$). They suggested that authentic leadership in management is necessary for the staff to be psychologically empowered. Weichun (2008) collected data from 335 employees in 13 different industries and found that psychological empowerment in terms of competence, impact, meaning, and self-determination was related to authentic leadership, especially in the aspect of internalized moral perspective. In a school setting, we would also expect authentic leaders to facilitate the teachers’ growth and confidence in their job-related skills. Therefore, our first hypothesis is as follows:

**Hypothesis 1:** Perceptions of the principals’ authentic leadership among teachers is positively related to their psychological empowerment attitudes.

Withdrawal Behaviors

Withdrawal behaviors usually refer to a set of attitudes and behaviors seen in employees whose job performance has deteriorated (Kaplan, Bradley, Lachman, & Hayness, 2009). In a school setting, teachers who engage in
withdrawal behaviors are likely to directly or indirectly reduce their effort at work (Shaw, Gupta, & Delery, 2005), leading to lower school standards. Withdrawal behaviors also increase pressure on other teachers, resulting in a decrease in school morale (Borda & Norman, 1997; Shapira-Lishchinsky & Rosenblatt, 2009; Shaw et al., 2005). In this study, we will examine three withdrawal behaviors common among teachers: voluntary lateness, voluntary absenteeism, and intent to leave.

*Lateness* refers to arriving late to work and has been recognized as having motivational antecedents (Koslowsky, 2000; Sagie, Birati, & Tziner, 2002). Lateness is subclassified in the literature as chronic lateness, avoidable lateness, and unavoidable lateness. *Chronic lateness* occurs as a response to a poor work environment. Relevant antecedents of chronic lateness are lack of organizational commitment and lack of job satisfaction. *Avoidable lateness* occurs when employees have better or more important activities to do than arriving on time. Leisure–income trade-offs and work–family conflicts may be antecedents to this type of lateness. *Unavoidable lateness* occurs when factors beyond the employee’s control are involved, such as transportation and commuting problems, inclement weather, illness, and accidents (Blau, Tatum, & Ward-Cook, 2004).

*Work absenteeism* is “the lack of physical presence at a behavior setting when and where one is expected to be” (Harrison & Price, 2003, p. 204). Sagie (1998) distinguished between two basic types of absenteeism: voluntary and involuntary. Voluntary absenteeism is normally under the direct control of the employee and is frequently exploited for personal issues such as testing the market for alternative employment prospects. Involuntary absenteeism is usually beyond the employee’s immediate control such as mourning periods and maternity leave.

*Intent to leave* is the degree to which a worker is interested in switching to a different workplace (Hanisch & Hulin, 1991). Intent to leave has been described as either contemplating to leave the workplace, a desire to leave the workplace, and the likelihood of leaving the workplace (Blau, 1998). Employees with intentions to leave are likely to be less productive and negatively affect their colleagues’ motivation and efforts (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Previous studies indicate that intent to leave is normally viewed as a proxy for actual voluntary turnover (Ladebo, 2005; Price & Mueller, 1986; Tett & Meyer, 1993). In the Israeli educational system, it is difficult to follow teacher turnover because it is usually first expressed as long unpaid leaves of absence. Hence, it may be more useful to study intent to leave rather than turnover.

Four major models have been suggested for describing the relationships between the different withdrawal behaviors. According to the *independent* model, withdrawal behaviors have different causes and functions and are,
therefore, unrelated to each other. The spillover model posits that withdrawal behaviors are positively related, without specifying any sequential relationship. The compensatory model proposes that similar functionality causes specific forms of withdrawal to be negatively correlated. The most common model is the progressive model, which posits that withdrawal manifestations occur in progression, starting with relatively mild forms of psychological withdrawal such as occasional lateness, moving to more severe forms such as absence and intent to leave (Johns, 2003; Koslowsky, Sagie, Krausz, & Singer, 1997).

However, the literature does not seem to offer a clear single model that describes the relations between the different withdrawal behaviors. A few researchers reported that no relationship exists (e.g., Ross, 1988), others reported negative relationships (e.g., Nicolson & Goodge, 1976), some reported positive relationships (e.g., Iverson & Deery, 2001), while still others claim that there is no sequential relationship between them and they can occur concurrently (e.g., Benson & Pond, 1987). These ambiguous findings have led us in the present study to seek out the differences between withdrawal behaviors through predictors such as authentic leadership and psychological empowerment.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCB is the contribution of employees to the organization beyond their formal obligations (Organ, 1988; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000). OCB focuses on behaviors that go beyond expectations but are important and even crucial for an organization’s survival, namely, extra-role behavior (Vigoda-Gadot, Beeri, Birman, & Somech, 2007). These extra-role behaviors are not just those that occur within an organization but those that are directed toward or seen as beneficial to the organization (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998).

OCB was initially conceptualized by Organ (1988) as an “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate, promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (p. 4). Thus, we may conceptualize OCB as helpful behaviors that support the social fabric of an organization but are not included in the job’s core tasks (Organ, 1997).

In a school setting, OCB consists of contributions that teachers freely choose to make or withhold, knowing that their actions are neither sanctioned nor incentivized (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Organ & Konovsky, 1989). Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2000) presented three dimensions of OCB: (a) extra-role behavior toward the students (e.g., staying in class during breaks in order to listen to students); (b) extra-role behavior toward the team
(e.g., sharing and cooperative behaviors); (c) extra-role behavior toward the school as a unit (e.g., organizing social activities for the school). Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2000) found that while extra-role behavior toward the team is exhibited primarily in helping behaviors toward team members, extra-role behavior toward the organization is mainly expressed in initiative behaviors for the benefit of the school as a unit.

OCB are important to organizations because formal job descriptions cannot encompass the whole range of behaviors needed for organizations to achieve their goals (Vanyperen, van den Berg, & Willering, 1999). Today, as schools move into a new era of reorganization (e.g., Lavine, 2011; Malaklolunthu & Shamsudin, 2011; Priestley, Miller, Barrett, & Wallace, 2011), performing the job description’s defined roles is necessary but not sufficient in optimizing school effectiveness. Therefore, schools are becoming more dependent on teachers who are willing to exert considerable effort beyond formal job requirements, namely, engaging in OCB (Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000).

The Relationship Between OCB and Withdrawal Behaviors

The notion that withdrawal behaviors are uniformly harmful and OCB are uniformly helpful (e.g., Dineen, Lewicki, & Tomlinson, 2006; Lee & Allen, 2002; Sackett, 2002; Sackett et al., 2006) has promoted the idea that these forms of behaviors present distinct performance domains, and therefore, individuals who frequently engage in one type tend to avoid engaging in the other. For example, the OCB of consistently coming to work early without missing a day has an opposite withdrawal behavior, lateness or absenteeism. Furthermore, empirical and theoretical work on the antecedents of withdrawal behaviors and OCB tend to show opposite relationships. For example, studies have concluded that satisfied employees are more likely to engage in OCB and are less likely to engage in withdrawal behaviors (Dalal, 2005; Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001).

However, there is reason to suspect that such a view is an oversimplification of the underlying processes that lead individuals to practice such behaviors. Studies have shown that one antecedent, such as stress, may lead to both voluntary absenteeism and OCB (e.g., Miles, Borman, Spector, & Fox, 2002) and there are instances in which highly productive people engage in activities that fall within withdrawal behaviors (Sackett, 2002). For example, in a school setting, it may be a teacher who often organizes social activities for the school but tends to take days off.

Studies also indicate that withdrawal behaviors do not necessarily arise from negative attitudes (Hackett & Bycio, 1996; Staw & Oldham, 1978). For
example, the conservation of resources theory suggests that people strive to obtain, protect, and foster their resources and minimize any threats of resource loss (Hobfoll, 2001). Thus, withdrawal behaviors may actually give employees a needed break from their workload, meaning that it is not necessarily a negative attitude that leads to withdrawal. In teaching, withdrawing for a limited amount of time may enable teachers to return to work with newly found energy and higher motivation, consequently increasing school effectiveness. Therefore, OCB and withdrawal behaviors do not present distinct performance domains. Rather, OCB and withdrawal behaviors are different points on a single continuum (e.g., Bennett & Stamper, 2001; Sackett et al., 2006). Under such a perspective, performances may be broadly located on the same scale between withdrawal behaviors, which are traditionally considered negative behaviors, and OCB, which is traditionally considered a positive behavior.

The Relationship Between Psychological Empowerment and OCB

Based on the logical assumption that empowered employees will be motivated to improve job performance (Organ, 1988), we can expect to find a positive relationship between psychological empowerment and OCB. Bogler and Somech (2004) conducted a study of 983 teachers in Israeli middle and high schools and showed that teachers’ perceptions of their level of empowerment were significantly related to their OCB. Therefore, our second hypothesis is as follows:

Hypothesis 2: Psychological empowerment will be positively related to OCB among teachers.

The Relationship Between Psychological Empowerment and Withdrawal Behaviors

Different dimensions of withdrawal behaviors such as voluntary lateness, voluntary absenteeism, and intent to leave are all indications of negative attitudes toward work and point to a desire to distance oneself from work (Johns, 1997; Shapira-Lishchinsky & Rosenblatt, 2010). However, when teachers, for example, see their jobs as meaningful (the meaning dimension of psychological empowerment), or feel that they are autonomous in their decision making (the self-determination dimension of psychological empowerment) or that they have influence on what happens at school (the impact dimension of psychological empowerment), it is likely that they will be motivated to
care more deeply about what they do in their workplace. Such teachers will be less inclined to be absent, late, or leave to teach at different schools than teachers who exhibit a low sense of psychological empowerment (Meyerson & Kline, 2008).

Previous studies support the negative relationship between psychological empowerment and intent to leave and turnover. For example, a meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of psychological empowerment has indicated that psychological empowerment is negatively associated with employee turnover intentions (Seibert, Wang, & Courtright, 2011). An additional study of 244 sales associates working in 25 stores of a Turkish retail chain showed that psychological empowerment was negatively related to intention to leave and to voluntary turnover (Berrin & Bauer, 2009).

In the school setting, a study of 101 school principals in Malaysia showed that when the levels of the four dimensions of psychological empowerment increased, withdrawal intentions decreased correspondingly ($r = -0.253, p < 0.05$; Fook, Brinten, Sidhu, & Fooi, 2011). Based on previous studies that indicate that lateness, absenteeism, intent to leave, and turnover belong to the same withdrawal syndrome (Author, 2012; Biron & Bamberger, 2012; Koslowsky, 2009), we formed our third hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 3:** Psychological empowerment among teachers will be negatively related to the following dimensions of withdrawal behaviors: (a) voluntary lateness, (b) voluntary absenteeism, and (c) intent to leave.

**Psychological Empowerment as a Mediator Between Authentic Leadership Withdrawal Behaviors and OCB**

Based on studies that showed a positive relationship between authentic leadership and psychological empowerment (e.g., Zue et al., 2004), a positive relationship between psychological empowerment and OCB (e.g., Bogler & Somech, 2004), and a negative relationship between psychological empowerment and withdrawal behaviors (e.g., Fook et al., 2011), we may assume that when the perception of authentic leadership increases, psychological empowerment increases as well. This leads to higher OCB and lower rates of lateness, absenteeism, and intent to leave. Therefore, our fourth hypothesis is as follows:

**Hypothesis 4:** Psychological empowerment among teachers will mediate the relationship between the perception of authentic leadership and OCB and a variety of withdrawal behaviors.
Gender and seniority were used as control variables. The choice of these variables was based on studies that indicate that gender and teaching seniority are more likely to be related to withdrawal behaviors and OCB than other sociodemographic factors (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Borkowski, Amann, Songand, & Weiss, 2007; Cohen, 1993; Wright & Bonett, 2002). Figure 1 summarizes the study model.

**Method**

**Study Sample and Population**

The present study was conducted in secondary Israeli public schools (7th-9th grade levels) in two rural districts in central Israel, which included secular and religious public schools under the supervision of the Israeli Ministry of Education. To obtain statistically significant numbers, we initially applied *cluster sampling*, a sampling technique used when “natural” groupings are evident (in our case two rural districts). Then, within each district we used *stratified sampling* (since each district includes two strata: secular and
Combining both cluster sampling and stratified sampling methods often improves the representativeness of the sample by reducing sampling error (Saifuddin, 2009). These sampling methods yielded 392 teachers.

The 392 teachers were from 17 secular public schools and 6 religious public schools in the two rural districts in central Israel. Three teachers were excluded from the first phase of the study because the criteria for participating in the study included a minimum seniority of 1 year to ensure that all respondents had sufficient time to develop perceptions and attitudes about their schools. Teachers who did not complete the second phase questionnaires, or teachers whose school attendance records were not available, were omitted from the study. Roughly 93% of the teachers from the first phase were included in the second phase. Of the 366 teachers who participated in the study, 75.4% were female and 24.6% were male. The average number of females in each school was 12.39 (SD = 5.76). The average number of responding teachers in each school was 16.24 (SD = 7.19, 75% average response rate for each school). Our results may be generalized beyond the selected group of schools, since the mean values of the study variables obtained from the school teachers were in the midscale range and not in the extreme parts of the scale, which would be expected were there a sampling bias (Table 1).

The average teaching seniority was 16.49 years (SD = 10.04). The majority of the teachers (82.3%) were tenured and the rest were employed by temporary contracts. The majority of teachers worked full-time (62%), 14.7% worked more than full-time, and the rest (23.3%) worked part-time. 63.3% of the teachers had a bachelor’s degree, 24% held a master’s degree, and the rest (12.7%) had nonacademic degrees. Approximately 14% of the students in the sampled schools were not born in Israel (61.6% of them came from the former U.S.S.R., 16.3% came from Ethiopia, 10.5% were from the United States, and the remainder came from different countries such as France, the United Kingdom, and Argentina). The students in these schools represented different socioeconomic levels, with a mean pretax family monthly income of the equivalent of $3,375. These characteristics are typical of the teacher population and the student population in the two sampled districts, and are also typical of Israeli secondary schools in general (Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics, 2010).

Data Collection

Ethical guidelines were taken from the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (2002). We initially obtained permission from our
university’s institutional review board and the Israeli Ministry of Education to distribute questionnaires and to collect the attendance records from each school. We then sent letters explaining the objectives and methods of the study to all the inspectors in the two districts to encourage the principals to participate in the study.

Data collection was in two phases. In the first phase, the teachers anonymously answered a questionnaire during their free hours at school. The questionnaire related to the teachers’ perceptions about their principals’ authentic leadership, their attitudes relating to psychological empowerment, and personal background. Response options in the questionnaire ranged from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The questionnaire also included a cover page describing the study goals and the researchers’ obligation to maintain anonymity according to the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (2002).

Anonymity was a contributing factor in obtaining the teachers’ consent to participate and may explain the fact that the response rate was as high as 75%. Each teacher put the questionnaire in an envelope, wrote a code number on the envelope, and gave the envelope to the secretary of the participating school. In the second phase, which was carried out 6 months later, the

Table 1. Summary of Means, Standard Deviations, and Minimum and Maximum Values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seniority in teaching</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence duration</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence frequency</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateness</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to leave</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership (general)</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership: Self-awareness</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership: Relational</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership: Internalized</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership: Balanced</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment: Impact</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment: Self-determination, meaning, and impact</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-School</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-Team</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-Student</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. OCB = organizational citizenship behaviors.
participating teachers attached copies of their absence records from the
school secretary, and wrote reports about lateness, intent to leave, and OCB. They put this information in an envelope with only the code number they had been given in the first phase written on the envelope and gave it to the school secretary. The codes helped the researchers link the questionnaires from the first phase to relevant data from the second phase.

**Variables and Measures**

*LateXeness.* Lateness was measured by a single item adapted from a measure of withdrawal behaviors developed by Blau (1994) and by Neal, Chapman, Ingersoll-Dayton, and Emlen (1993). We based our data on self-reports because in Israel the majority of schools (as in most schools in the United States, Canada, Australia, Sweden) do not keep records of teachers’ lateness. Therefore, the teachers were asked to report their lateness frequency in the past 30 days and the reasons for their lateness. Lateness was defined as arriving 6 or more minutes after the bell rang, as studies have shown that arriving 6 minutes late is unacceptable in many organizations (Blau, 1994). The choice of a 30-day period over which to report lateness was based on a pilot study in which teachers were asked about a reasonable time span in which lateness could be remembered. Following Johns’ (1994) discussion of self-reported absence measures, the 30-day period seems to be long enough to afford reliability, yet still short enough to minimize memory loss, thus offering a valid picture of lateness in schools. In addition, the teachers were provided with calendars to help refresh their memory. The use of a frequency measure to assess avoidable lateness is based on studies of absenteeism, which found frequency to be a pertinent indicator of voluntary absences (Dalton & Mesch, 1991; Sagie, 1998).

*Absenteeism.* Absenteeism was mainly measured by frequency of absences as found in the school records over a period of 6 months. It is generally believed that absence frequency is the best measure of voluntary absence in comparison to absence duration (Blau et al., 2004; Sagie, 1998). People do not usually take long absence leaves unless it is involuntary (e.g., mourning period). Therefore, absence duration is not a good measure for voluntary absences. On the other hand, frequent absences over the same period of time are usually voluntary (e.g., looking for another job). Thus, the present study focused mainly on absence frequency as a measure based on the assumption that perceptions and attitudes significantly affect measures of voluntary absence. We omitted all definite involuntary absences (i.e., maternity leave, mourning) and examined all other absences that may be considered voluntary (including sickness, since in Israel, in most cases, to get paid for an absence day,
teachers must supply a doctor’s note or a declaration of illness). A 6-month period of absence frequency reports was determined to present a valid picture of teachers’ absenteeism (Author, 2010) and to be a reasonable time-span for which schools normally retain such records (Johns, 1994).

Intent to Leave. This measure was adopted from Walsh, Ashford, and Hill (1985) and tapped into teachers’ tendency to leave their workplace. One sample item is, “I often think about leaving my school” (5 items, α = .94).

Authentic Leadership. To determine the teachers’ perspectives regarding authentic leadership, we used Walumbwa et al.’s (2008) original authentic leadership 16-item questionnaire. Based on confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), we omitted two items “My principal encourages everyone to speak their mind” and “My principal solicits views that challenge his deeply held positions.” These items are not suitable for the principal–teacher relationship in the Israeli educational system, which is characterized by respectful but distant relationships. Tenure and promotion for teachers depend on the approval of the principal. Therefore, teachers do not feel free to say what they really think to their principals, and the principals know that it will be difficult to encourage teachers to espouse opposing opinions. The CFA consists of four subscales: (a) Self-awareness reflects the extent to which leaders are aware of their strengths and limitations and how others perceive them. One sample item is, “My principal knows when it is time to reevaluate his or her positions on important issues” (four items, α = .83). (b) Relational transparency reflects the extent to which leaders reinforce a level of openness with others. One sample item is, “My principal says exactly what he or she means” (four items, α = .81). (c) Internalized moral reasoning reflects the extent to which leaders set high standards for moral and ethical conduct. One sample item is, “My principal makes decisions based on his/her core values” (four items, α = .84). (d) Balanced processing reflects the extent to which leaders solicit sufficient opinions and viewpoints of others prior to making important decisions. One sample item is, “My principal listens carefully to different points of view before coming to conclusions” (two items, α = .84).

Psychological Empowerment. To determine whether the participants believed that they were empowered, we used Spreitzer’s (1995) original 12-item psychological empowerment questionnaire. Based on CFA, we omitted four items (one item from each original dimension) that were not suitable to Israeli teachers. Items such as “I have mastered the skills necessary for my job” and “I am confident about my ability to do my work” were taken out. Teachers in Israel are given ample training in the pedagogical and subject aspects of
teaching. Continuous education courses are given to teachers in a myriad of subjects. However, recently it has been the policy of the Israeli Ministry of Education to mainstream many students with discipline problems who were previously put in special education classes. Most teachers in Israel do not have adequate training on how to deal with these students’ discipline problems. The growing number of “problematic” students in the classroom and the lack of tools available to the teachers to deal with them may be the cause of perceptions of professional inability revealed by the questionnaire.

This questionnaire measures psychological empowerment as an intrinsic motivation that is reflected in a personal sense of control in the workplace. The CFA yielded two factors: (a) “Impact” reflects the teachers’ sense of freedom regarding their work and their belief in having an impact on their schools. A sample item is, “I have a strong impact on what happens at school” (three items, $\alpha = .83$). (b) “Self-determination, meaning, and competence” assessed the teachers’ sense of freedom regarding their work, their sense of purpose, and personal connection to the job and assessed the degree of confidence that teachers have as to their ability to do their job well. Sample items are the following: “The work I do is very important to me” and “I have considerable independence in doing my job” (five items, $\alpha = .88$).

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviors.** To determine whether teachers believe that they exhibit citizenship behaviors, we used Somech and Drach-Zahavy’s (2000) OCB 23-item scale. Using CFA, we omitted nine items (three items from each original dimension), which after considerable considerations were not relevant to the Israeli system such as “stay after school hours to help students with class materials” or “stay in class during breaks in order to listen to my students.” This is because of a new program implemented by the Ministry of Education called “New Horizons” in which there are scheduled hours beyond the classroom hours dedicated to helping students with class materials or other matters. Therefore, the teachers prefer to help the students during these hours and not during the short periods during breaks or after school when both the teachers and the students are in rush to do other things. CFA revealed three dimensions: (a) extra-role behavior toward the student; sample item: “I go to school on my days off to prevent problems in my class” (three items, $\alpha = .70$); (b) extra-role behavior toward the school; sample item: “I organize social activities for the school” (seven items, $\alpha = .88$); (c) extra-role behavior toward the team; sample item: “I offer my colleagues work sheets that I have prepared for my class” (four items, $\alpha = .71$).

Response options for all the items, that is, intent to leave, authentic leadership, psychological empowerment, and organizational citizenship behaviors ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).
Control Variables. Gender: 1 (men), 2 (women), and teaching seniority.

Sample items, number of items, and reliability coefficients are presented in the appendix.

Figure 2 illustrates the fitted factor analyses models, which were either first or second order. These models were fitted in order to estimate the extent to which a constrained a priori factor structure is consistent with the sample data (Byrne, 2005). Using the available option in Mplus 7.0 (Muthén & Muthén, 2006), the standard errors and the chi-square test of the model fit were computed by taking into account the nonindependence of observations due to the cluster sampling.

In the SEM literature, several “rules of thumb” cutoff criteria have been suggested to evaluate model fit. None of these criteria have been universally accepted, due to the lack of compelling theoretical rationale and empirical evidence (Hu & Bentler, 1999). In addressing these issues, Hu and Bentler (1999) have suggested several alternatives for cutoff criteria. They argue that cutoff values close to .90 for Tucker–Lewis index (TLI) and comparative fit index (CFI), close to .06 for root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and close to .05 for standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) would justify the conclusion of a relatively good fit between the hypothesized model and the data. As shown in Table 2, the indexes indicate a good model fit of the study measures. Although nonsignificant chi-square outcomes are preferred, in large models, based on a large sample size such as in this study, the observed chi square will always be statistically significant, even when there is a good fit of the data (Schumacker & Lomax, 2004).

Data Analysis

The proposed model describes the mediating effect of psychological empowerment on the relationship between authentic leadership and withdrawal behaviors (lateness, absence frequency, and intent to leave work) and OCB. Because the statistical tools in this study are based on the assumption that the dependent variables are of normal distribution, we first tested their distributions. When lateness and absenteeism did not meet this assumption, we applied the Box–Cox power transformations to select their optimal transformation. We found that for absence duration it is the fourth power, for absence frequency it is the second power, while for lateness it is the log (late + 1).

Table 3 presents the interclass correlation coefficient (ICC) values of the study variables, showing that members of a single school provide correlated proportional ratings. High reliability indicates ratings that consistently differ across schools in that the variance is smaller within a single school unit than
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Figure 2. CFA findings for the study variables based on MPLus multilevel analysis.

Note. f_ld_14 = Authentic leadership; f_ld_1 = Self-awareness; f_ld_2 = Relational; f_ld_3 = Internalized; f_ld_4 = Balanced. f_emp_1 = Impact; f_emp_2 = Self-determination, meaning, and competence. f_e_ocb1 = OCB-School; f_e_ocb2 = OCB-team; f_e_ocb3 = OCB-student.
between schools. Both ICC(1) and ICC(2) are based on ratios involving variances within schools and variances between schools. ICC(1) calculates the proportion of variance in a school unit, and directly indicates the extent to which variability within the school is relatively smaller or larger to the variability between schools. ICC(2) indicates whether individual school means can be used to reliably differentiate between schools (Bliese, 2000). In the present study, the magnitude and significance of ICC(1) and ICC(2) support the use of a multilevel model (Bliese, 2000; LeBreton & Senter, 2008).

### Table 2. Goodness-of-Fit Indicators for the Study Measures Based on MPlus Multilevel Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership</td>
<td>144.652*</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment</td>
<td>819.135</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>201.884*</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to leave</td>
<td>20.448*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. OCB = organizational citizenship behaviors; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index.

* $p < .05$.

### Table 3. Estimates of ICC(1) and ICC(2) for the Study Items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ICC(1)</th>
<th>ICC(2)</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>$1.42 \times 10^{-26}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>$1.68 \times 10^{-18}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>$2.86 \times 10^{-23}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>$2.32 \times 10^{-17}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>$3.86 \times 10^{-15}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>$3.47 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination, meaning, and impact</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>$3.56 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB—Toward the school</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>$3.97 \times 10^{-21}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB—Toward the team</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>$1.65 \times 10^{-16}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB—Toward the student</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>$1.23 \times 10^{-12}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to leave</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.0008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Typical values: ICC(1) = .01 to .45; ICC(2) = .45 to .90 (Bliese, 2000; LeBreton & Senter, 2008). $p$ = Significance of ICC $F$ test.
Structural equation modeling (SEM) with Mplus 7.0 (Muthén & Muthén, 2006) was used to fit the hypothesized path models to the data and address the research questions. A multilevel model was fitted to account for the nested nature of the data (teachers nested within 23 schools). The multilevel aspect is reflected by including random intercepts in the model. These random components of the model were also part of the factor expressions in the structural equation model, when items or first order latent variables (factors) were expressed as linear functions of the second respective factor. The intercepts were always considered as random (varying by schools). To overcome the problem of missing data that could lead to biased conclusions, the correlations used for the input were estimated based on the pairwise available data (Byrne, 2005).

Results

The correlations for the study variables are presented in Table 4. Considering the relationships between perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors, moderate and positive relationships were found between all four dimensions of authentic leadership and psychological empowerment (.29 < r < .42). Also, most of the relationships between the two dimensions of psychological empowerment and the different dimensions of OCB were found moderate (.26 < r < .50). Only the relationships between psychological empowerment (impact) and OCB (school), and psychological empowerment (self-determination, competence, and meaning) and OCB (team) exhibited small correlations (.13 < r < .21). No significant relationships were found between the two factors of psychological empowerment and absence frequency, absence duration, or lateness. Only one dimension of psychological empowerment (self-determination, competence, and meaning) was found related to intent to leave (r = .22, p < .001). In addition, no significant relationships were found between the different withdrawal behaviors.

Consider the study control variables. The results showed that the relationships between gender and the study variables were found ranging from no to small correlations (e.g., the relationship between gender and lateness, r = −.13; the relationship between gender and the different dimensions of absenteeism, .18 < r < .22). Also the relationships between teaching seniority and the other study variables were found not correlated or exhibited small correlations (.15 < r < .22).

All in all, the above correlations indicate that there is a real justification to investigate the study model. However, these are pairwise simple correlations based only on the pairwise data without accounting for other related variables. Therefore, inferences based on their significance tests may differ from the inferences based on the full SEM model. The latter analyses are more relevant.
Table 4. Correlations of the Study Variables (n = 366).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: OCB = organizational citizenship behaviors. men = 1, women = 2.

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.
SEM was used to examine the mediating effect of psychological empowerment and its different dimensions on the relationship between authentic leadership and the teachers’ behaviors. The model with its standardized path coefficients is presented in Figure 3. In the case of latent variables (factors), the model included the items or the first order factors so that the respective scores were derived by fitting the structural equation model.

According to the goodness of fit criteria, the model can be considered acceptable ($\chi^2 = 179.253, p < .001$, $df = 92, p < .0001$; RMSEA = .051; CFI = .921; TLI = .900; SRMR = .057; Byrne, 2001; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2005).

**Figure 3.** The mediating effect of psychological empowerment between authentic leadership, withdrawal behaviors, and OCB based on MPlus multilevel analysis.

Note. OCB = organizational citizenship behaviors; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index. $\chi^2 = 179.253$, $df = 92$, RMSEA = .051; CFI = .921; TLI = .900; SRMR = .057. men = 1, women = 2.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Figure 3 illustrates the positive and significant relationships between authentic leadership and the two dimensions of psychological empowerment: (a) “self-determination, meaning, and competence” ($\beta = .431, p < .001$) and (b) “impact” ($\beta = .729, p < .001$). We found that only “impact” was positively related to OCB ($\beta = .396, p < .001$) whereas “self-determination, meaning, and competence” was negatively related to absence frequency ($\beta = -.214, p < .01$). The two dimensions of psychological empowerment were unrelated to intent to leave and lateness.

We found that authentic leadership was positively correlated with the “impact” dimension of psychological empowerment, which in turn was positively correlated with OCB. An increase in authentic leadership led to higher psychological empowerment (“impact”), and as a result to higher OCB levels. We also found a relationship among “self-determination, meaning, and competence,” authentic leadership and absence frequency. As authentic leadership increased, “self-determination, meaning, and competence” increased as well, and as a result, the teachers’ absence frequency decreased. In addition, authentic leadership was found to be positively directly related to intent to leave ($\beta = .285, p < .01$). We also found weak significant relationships between absence frequency and intent to leave ($r = .05, p < .05$) and between intent to leave and OCB ($r = .06, p < .01$). The other relationships between the different withdrawal behaviors were insignificant.

Table 5 summarizes the results of the mediation test based on the Mplus applying to multilevel analysis. “Self-determination, meaning, and competence” mediated the relationship between authentic leadership and absence frequency and “impact” mediated the relationship between authentic leadership and OCB.

We tested another alternative model, which was similar to the suggested model, but included absenteeism duration instead of absenteeism frequency. The fit of this alternative model was not as good as the fit of our proposed model. The fit indexes of the alternative model are as follows: $\chi^2 = 195.45, df = 96, p < .001$; RMSEA = .0542; TLI = .850; CFI = .832; and SRMR = .065, whereas the suggested model fit indexes are as follows: $\chi^2 = 179.253, df = 92$, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .0462; TLI = .863; CFI = .843; and SRMR = .063.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediated Pathway (Significant)</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership $\rightarrow$ Impact $\rightarrow$ OCB</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership $\rightarrow$ Self-determination, meaning, and competence $\rightarrow$ Absence frequency</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. OCB = Organizational citizenship behaviors.
The suggested model is the better fit based on the following useful rules of thumb: (a) The smaller the chi-square, the better the model’s fit (Timothy, 1995); (b) an indication of a good fit for RMSEA is a value of .05 or less (=0.0 indicates an exact fit); (c) a TLI of ≥0.9 indicates an acceptable model fit; (d) a CFI > .9 indicates a good fit; and (e) an SRMR value of less than .08 is considered good fit, with a smaller value being a better fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Therefore, the proposed model provides a better depiction of mediation as compared with the alternative model.

Our findings fully confirm Hypothesis 1. Perceptions of authentic leadership among teachers positively relates to their psychological empowerment attitudes. Hypothesis 2 was partially supported. Only the “impact” dimension of psychological empowerment and not “self-determination, meaning, and competence” was found to be positively related to OCB among teachers. Hypothesis 3 was also only partially supported. Only the “self-determination, meaning, and competence” dimension of psychological empowerment among teachers and not the “impact” dimension was negatively related to voluntary absenteeism. No relation was found for the “lateness” and “intent to leave” withdrawal behaviors. Our fourth hypothesis was also partially confirmed. Although “impact” mediates the relationship between authentic leadership and OCB, “self-determination, meaning, and competence” only mediates the relationship between authentic leadership and absence frequency but not the relationship between authentic leadership and lateness or intent to leave.

Discussion

The goal of this study is to develop an integrative approach to better understand the psychological model of authentic leadership, psychological empowerment, OCB, and withdrawal behaviors in education. The study findings indicate that the “impact” dimension of psychological empowerment mediates the relationship between the teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ authentic leadership and OCB while the other dimension of psychological empowerment (“self-determination, meaning, and competence”) mediates the relationship between the teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ authentic leadership and absence frequency. A possible explanation for these findings is that when teachers perceive their principal as an authentic leader who empowers them in making meaningful changes (“impact”), they feel that they have influence on what happens at school. Therefore, they are motivated to improve job performance, and go beyond expectations (OCB).

In addition, when the school principal is perceived as an authentic leader who empowers teachers toward “self-determination, meaning, and competence,”
they feel in control at work, receiving respect from other colleagues. Gaining this self-respect induces the teachers to act as role models, thus reducing their absenteeism. Since the findings indicate that different dimensions of psychological empowerment can predict OCB versus absenteeism in that high levels of “impact” predict high levels of OCB, and high levels of “self-determination, meaning, and competence” predict low levels of absenteeism, we can conclude that OCB and absenteeism frequency are two domains located at different points on a single continuum of teacher behaviors. Another finding that supports our argument of a single continuum is that we found a direct positive relationship between authentic leadership and intent to leave while for absenteeism and OCB we found mediating relationships. This indicates that different relationships reveal different behaviors outcomes of withdrawal behaviors and OCB.

While the study findings show that authentic leadership and/or psychological empowerment could be both positively and negatively related to absence frequency, OCB, and intent to leave, this was not the case for lateness. This can be explained by the fact that many educational systems in the world (e.g., the United States, Canada, Sweden, Australia) have clear absenteeism rules and control over teachers’ absence records, which emphasized the importance they perceive in this severe phenomenon, unlike lateness, which is not sufficiently defined (e.g., whether being 5 minutes late to class is considered lateness) and is usually not reported. This reflects the minor importance lateness is perceived in the school system. Thus, it seems that according to the educational systems policy, the teachers also do not give great importance to this phenomenon.

The finding regarding lateness also supports our argument regarding the different points being located on a single continuum. Although lateness belongs to withdrawal behaviors, it is not predicted by the same predictors as the other withdrawal behaviors such as absence frequency and intent to leave. An additional finding that may support the argument that the tested withdrawal behaviors and OCB are located on a single continuum is that most of the relationships between the different withdrawal behaviors and OCB are nonsignificant or of very low significance.

Thus, regarding our primary research questions, a mediating model can be formulated to present the relationships between teachers’ perceptions regarding their principals’ authentic leadership, their own psychological empowerment, OCB, and different withdrawal behaviors. The relationships between the different withdrawal behaviors and OCB and between these factors and their predictors are not necessarily progressively linear in nature but that withdrawal behaviors and OCB are rather different points located on a single continuum from traditionally positive behaviors, such as OCB, through traditionally negative withdrawal behaviors such as lateness, absenteeism, and intent to leave.
There were also gender based discrepancies. We found that female teachers tend to be absent more often than male teachers whereas male teachers tend to be late more often than female teachers. The increased female teacher absenteeism may be ascribed to the tendency of women to experience work–family conflicts more often than men. The societal expectations from women is that they should give higher priority to family concerns (e.g., a child’s illness) than their career (Boyar, Maertz, & Pearson, 2005). The discrepancy between male and female teachers with regard to lateness may be because of the fact that principals are more tolerant of male teachers’ lateness than of female teachers’ lateness. Men tend to be more autonomous in their decision making (Eagly, Beall, & Sternberg, 2004). Therefore, compared with female teachers, principals are less inclined to take male teachers to talk on their tardiness. Principles assume that male teachers are surer in their actions than female teachers and will be less likely to change their behavior. Therefore, principals try to avoid confrontations with male teachers regarding their lateness and in essence, are more tolerant of male teacher lateness.

Conclusions and Implications

A closer analysis revealed that both OCB and withdrawal behaviors can be considered as different performance points on a single continuum since they may result from different relationships and antecedents, and in addition, the interrelationships between them is either insignificant or very low. The present study contributes to the knowledge of the psychological model of perceptions–attitudes–behaviors (Ajzen & Fishbein, 2005) of authentic leadership, psychological empowerment, withdrawal behaviors, and OCB in a school context. Although previous studies focused on OCB as an end result of teacher empowerment or on single dimensions of withdrawal behaviors, the present study presents an integrative framework, focusing on the mediating role of psychological empowerment as a consistent link between authentic leadership and a spectrum of teachers’ withdrawal behaviors and OCB.

In practice, educational leaders (e.g., school principals, coordinators, mentors) should promote high standards of authentic leadership. This will empower teachers, increase their OCB, and reduce their voluntary absenteeism and may even encourage them to become future leaders in the long run (e.g., being promoted to administrative positions). The findings of the study should also be acknowledged by policy makers outside the school and encourage participation of teachers in seminars and programs that emphasize the importance of teachers’ psychological empowerment.
Strengths, Limitations, and Future Research

Strengths

This article attempted to present an integrative approach for variables and constructs that have typically been presented separately in the literature (OCB, lateness, absenteeism, intent to leave). Methodologically, this study was based on various sources of data (teachers’ self-reports, school records) to minimize errors.

Limitations

First, because the majority of schools do not keep records of teachers’ lateness, lateness data were based on self-report data, which may be biased by memory problems or unwillingness to report about lateness behaviors. Based on the fact that the questionnaires were anonymous and were based on a 30-day period, we believe that we minimized this limitation. The other limitation of the study is that the sample was drawn from only two districts in Israel. This is a limited sample, which may classify our study as exploratory. Thus, the findings should be tested in other districts in Israel as well. In addition, research based on a framework developed in one country must be assessed elsewhere as it may not be applicable in other countries. A further limitation of the study is that the relationships flow in the model is unidirectional, that is, authentic leadership associates to psychological empowerment, which may lead to withdrawal behaviors or OCB. However, a relationship in the opposite direction is also a reasonable expectation (Clegg, 1983).

Future Research

Future studies should further examine how and in which cases do teachers choose to engage in withdrawal behaviors, since withdrawal behaviors are generally undesirable (e.g., Blau et al., 2004; Carraher & Buckley, 2008; Johns, 2003; Koslowsky, 2009; Lambert & Hogan, 2009). In addition, future studies should examine other types of withdrawal behaviors, such as not engaging in sponsorship or supervision of student extracurricular activities or other behaviors that might suggest teachers’ withdrawal.

We believe that the study’s general model could be used as a basis for future theory building. The significance of the antecedents in determining various withdrawal behaviors suggests that the theory is incomplete and that future research should consider other models such as the conservation of resources model and additional variables such as burnout, challenges, and hindrance stressors.
## Appendix

### Summary of Study Measures, Sample Items and Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational transparency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal says exactly what he or she means.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal admits to mistakes when they are made</td>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal tells me the hard truth</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal outwardly displays how she/he feels.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized moral reasoning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal demonstrates beliefs that are consistent with his or her actions</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal makes decisions based on his or her core values.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal asks you to take positions that support your core values</td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal makes difficult decisions based on high standards of ethical conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced processing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal analyzes relevant data before coming to a decision</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal listens carefully to different points of view before coming to conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal seeks feedback to improve interactions with others</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal accurately describes how others view his or her capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal knows when it is time to reevaluate his or her positions on important issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal shows that he or she understands how specific actions impact others</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a strong impact on what happens at school</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### Appendix (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a great deal of control over what happens in my school</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My impact on what happens in my school is great</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-determination, meaning, and competence</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work I do is very important to me</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to carry out work related activities</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have considerable independence in doing my job</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can decide on my own how to go about doing my work</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have considerable opportunities for independence and freedom in how I do my job</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent to leave</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to get in touch with other schools to check out other job opportunities</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently I’ve been looking for a job in other places</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to leave school</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have started to ask friends/acquaintances about other job opportunities</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often think about leaving my school</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCB</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra-role behavior toward the student</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go to school on my free days to prevent problems in my class</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participate in private celebrations of my students (e.g., birthdays)</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I invite students to my home</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra-role behavior toward the school</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I organize social activities for school</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I decorate the school</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I volunteer for tasks that I am not required to do</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take responsibility above and beyond to what I am required</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I make innovative suggestions to improve the school</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I assist the principal in my free hours</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend functions that are not mandatory which help the school’s image</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extra-role behavior toward the team 4 .79

| I orient new teachers even though it is not required of me | .46 |
| I offer my colleagues work sheets that I have prepared for my class | .76 |
| I work collaboratively with others (planning assignments, joint projects, etc.) | .64 |
| I prepare learning programs for substitute teachers | .68 |

Note. OCB = organizational citizenship behaviors.
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