

ACADEMIC CITIZENSHIP AND WELLBEING: AN EXPLORATORY CROSS-CULTURAL STUDY OF SOUTH AFRICAN AND SWEDISH ACADEMIC PERCEPTIONS

D. Coldwell*

School of Economic and Business Sciences
e-mail: David.Coldwell@wits.ac.za

E. Papageorgiou*

School of Accountancy
e-mail: Elmarie.Papageorgiou@wits.ac.za

C. Callaghan*

School of Economic and Business Sciences
e-mail: Chris.Callaghan@wits.ac.za

A. Fried

Department of Management and Engineering, Business Administration
Linköping University, Sweden
Otto Schott Institute of Materials Research
Department of Metallic Materials
Friedrich-Schiller-University of Jena, Germany
e-mail: andrea.fried@liu.se

*University of the Witwatersrand
Johannesburg, South Africa

ABSTRACT

Academic citizenship is, conceptually speaking, closely related to organisational citizenship behaviour, as both concepts can be regarded as consisting essentially of personal co-worker and organisational support behaviours. Academics across the world operate in widely divergent settings in different socioeconomic and political situations and higher education environments. Such differing circumstances might be expected to have a bearing on the priorities that academics face in different countries and the ways academic citizenship is understood. This article uses a mixed methods approach to analyse perceptions of academic citizenship and employee well-being in one Swedish and one South African university which operate in starkly different socioeconomic circumstances. The findings of the exploratory study suggest that despite wide-ranging differences in socioeconomic environments between the two countries,

there is a high degree of common understanding of the form and substance of academic citizenship and its bearing on well-being.

Key words: academic citizenship, organisational citizenship behaviour, South African and Swedish universities, well-being

INTRODUCTION

Sweden and South Africa are countries with large differences in terms of economic development, demographic profile and physical infrastructure. South Africa is regarded as a middle-income developing country. It has one of the most unequal distributions of wealth in the world with a Gini coefficient of 65.0 in 2011 (World Bank 2013). The Gini coefficient measures the area between the Lorenz curve and a hypothetical line of absolute equality; a Gini coefficient of 0 represents perfect equality, while an index of 100 implies perfect inequality (World Bank 2013). This inequality in income distribution has its origins in its recent past, that is, in its apartheid history. Its newly formed democracy has been subject to recent turbulence in the face of the continued high unemployment rate (currently estimated to be 24%) (International Labor Organization 2015) and continuing record of poor government service delivery. Sweden, on the other hand, is an established and developed first-world country with an enviable standard of living and an equitable distribution of wealth (Gini coefficient = 26.1) (World Bank 2013).

Universities and academics in Sweden and South Africa operate in widely different socio-political and economic environments. Research universities in South Africa, such as the University of Cape Town, the University of the Witwatersrand and the University of KwaZulu-Natal, are confronted with enormous pressure to admit increasing numbers of disadvantaged students, a significant portion of which struggle to pay university fees and may be excluded from higher education because they have insufficient funds. Many students are also underprepared for higher education as the result of a partly malfunctioning secondary education system. Nevertheless, such universities attempt to maintain high profiles in terms of international rankings; rankings which are based largely on international research publication productivity. The pressure to increase research output and, at the same time, increase student throughput by helping disadvantaged students who would have been excluded from higher education in the past, places enormous strain on academia's financial and personnel resources. Student-to-staff ratios in South African universities tend to be high, currently about 24 students per staff member at the University of the Witwatersrand, although in certain schools such as Mining Engineering, it can be as high as 39 students per staff member (University of the Witwatersrand 2015).

In Sweden, on the other hand, higher education is free; although the amount of student debt is growing (the average size of this debt at the beginning of 2013 was roughly 124 000 Swedish krona, i.e. \$19 000). Students are generally socioeconomically better off than those in South Africa and have experienced a higher standard of secondary education. Sweden was ranked 17th above Germany, France and the UK in a 2010 study by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), in which around 470 000 15-year-olds across the world sat for a numeracy, literacy and science test (Guardian 2010). The quality of South Africa's education system and its education in Mathematics and Science was ranked 148th out of the 148 countries surveyed by the World Economic Forum's (2014) report.

Sweden's homogenous egalitarian cultural milieu and single official language profile contrasts with South Africa's heterogeneous multicultural multilingual society (South Africa has 11 official languages), and its first world-third world socioeconomic scenario. Also, student-staff ratio averages at Swedish universities are estimated to be around nine students per staff member (Linköping University 2013). Such figures compare favourably with EU estimates of 15.9 students per staff member (Linköping University 2013) and with South African universities, which lag far behind with an estimated average of 27 students per staff member across the country (Council on Higher Education 2011).

In South Africa the participation rate in higher education is less than 20 per cent (Macfarlane 2011), whereas in Sweden around 80 per cent of Swedish young people attend university (Brint 2006, 53). Similarly, there are wide differences in health of the young people in the two countries. For example, the percentage prevalence of HIV among the population of 15 to 49 year olds in South Africa and Sweden was 17.3 per cent and 0.2 per cent respectively in 2011 (World Bank 2013).

Clearly, the causal effects of such factors on academic citizenship perceptions in Sweden and South Africa are difficult to measure, but it can be expected that the more direct factors that impinge on academic functions, such as the staff-student ratios and the secondary educational standards in terms of the preparedness of students entering university may have a bearing on perceptions of academic citizenship. Accordingly, differences between the academic preparedness role and the staff-to-student ratios between Sweden and South Africa may affect academic citizenship perceptions in the two countries. For example, in South Africa the fact that many students are underprepared may accentuate the helping aspect of academic citizenship, while staff-student ratios may militate against this, thus affecting academic staff well-being.

The central question this article aims to analyse is: What are the effects that such diverse

socio-politico-economic environmental differences have on perceptions of academic citizenship at Swedish and South African universities? More specifically, the article seeks to answer the question: Can academic citizenship be regarded as a homogenous concept with a similar association with academic well-being in these different cross-cultural contexts? Or, do wide dissimilarities in both the concept of academic citizenship and its effect on academic feelings of well-being at work emanate from such cross-national contextual differences? In spite of similar western-oriented traditions of scholarship, Sweden and South Africa have quite different academic traditions. In Sweden the educational system is in line with an independent Nordic educational ethos conducted in the Swedish language; while the South African educational system is more in line with an Anglo-American ethos and conducted (largely) in English. The Swedish system of education therefore should not be regarded as largely indistinguishable from the 'colonial' imported system of South Africa.

The article aims to make a contribution to the extant literature in two main ways. First, it aims to compare perceptions of academic citizenship in widely disparate socio-politico and economic contexts. Second, it aims to explore the relationship between academic citizenship and feelings of academic well-being at work. Most studies have not considered the meaning of the concept of academic citizenship in highly contrasting world contexts, nor have they explored the relationship of academic citizenship with academic well-being.

The article takes the following form. Firstly, a literature review of the concept of academic citizenship and its association with organisational citizenship is described. Secondly, the concept of employee well-being is discussed. The third section concentrates on methodological aspects of the study. Section four describes the findings of the study, which are followed in section five by a brief discussion. Section six presents a conclusion with an outline of the limitations of the study and recommendations for further research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organisational citizenship behaviour

Before considering academic citizenship behaviour (ACB), which is the focus of the current article, it is necessary to briefly describe the concept of organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) on which ACB is based. Organ (1988) and other researchers regard the extra-role behaviour that contributes to organisational effectiveness by improving individual and work group performance and organisational morale to be organisational citizenship or 'good soldier' behaviour (Organ 1988; Smith, Organ and Near 1983). The term 'good soldier' was

incorporated into the concept of OCB and is regarded as transferable to organisations designed for specific purposes, such as political organisations (Graham 1991), the military from which the concept is derived, and business organisations (Borman, Motowidlo, Rose, and Hanser 1983; Coldwell and Callaghan 2014).

Organ (1988) regards OCB as consisting of conscientiousness, civic virtue, sportsmanship and courtesy dimensions. However, Borman (2004) developed a three-dimensional model of OCB, consisting of personal, organisational support and conscientious initiative aspects. *Personal supportive behaviour* includes teaching employees useful in-house knowledge and skills, giving emotional support and showing courtesy and tact in interpersonal behaviour. *Organisational support behaviour*, which comprises the second main aspect of OCB, is regarded as showing loyalty and supporting, promoting and defending organisational missions and objectives. The conscientious initiative aspect of Borman's (2004) model is seen as 'going the extra mile' type behaviour, showing persistence at work and initiative in accomplishing company objectives beyond formal job roles and responsibilities.

Borman's (2004) model, consisting essentially of the two main dimensions of personal and organisational support behaviour (including conscientious initiative as it pertains to both aspects), provides the basis for the development of the quantitative and qualitative instruments used in the study. Conscientious initiative through its duality of relevance to both personal and organisational aspects of OCB can be regarded as its core underlying dimension. The *Collins English Dictionary* (2009) defines conscientiousness as 'involving or taking great care; painstaking; diligent and as governed by or done according to conscience'. Thus, in the context of the current article, conscientiousness refers to individuals' painstaking diligence in their organisational duties *and* in their personal support of co-workers.

Sevi's (2010) model also considers OCB as helping behaviour, in line with Borman's (2004) notion of 'personal support', and his concept of 'work effort' is similar to Borman's (2004) concept of 'organisational support'. Closely allied concepts of OCB, such as organisational misbehaviour (OMB) (Vardi and Weitz 2003) and organisational deviance (Heckert and Heckert 2004), are considered outside the focus of the current article because they constitute non-conscientious type behaviour. Similarly, compulsory conscientious behaviour (CCB), consisting of *compulsory* conscientious type behaviour (Vigoda-Gadot 2007), is considered outside the domain of OCB.

Academic citizenship behaviour

Academic citizenship, or as we have conceptualised it for purposes of this article, ACB, has not been researched in any depth either as a concept in its own right or in terms of its form and incidence in cross-cultural environments. Shils (1997, 76) regards academic citizenship as a duty in line with teaching and research; an academic should 'do his duty to the university and the academic world as a loyal and responsible academic citizen'.

A study by Macfarlane (2007) on academic citizenship used a mixed methods approach that incorporated face-to-face interviews and a questionnaire. In a sample of 30 university staff drawn from institutions in the UK, North America, Australia, Canada and southern Europe, Macfarlane (2007) found a fundamental commonality in perception in the essential meaning of academic citizenship. Respondents in his study regarded academic citizenship as membership of a community consisting of both academic colleagues and students. Respondents also regarded academic citizenship in terms of broader criteria, such as the meaning and contribution of their work to society. However, some respondents saw academic citizenship as being strictly defined as a contractual obligation.

Macfarlane (2007) maintains that academic citizenship can be conceptualised in the form of a service pyramid with a distinct status attached to each segment. At the apex of the pyramid is *public service* followed, in declining order of scholarly and reward status, by *discipline based or professional service*, *institutional service*, *collegial service* and finally, *student service*. However, while Macfarlane's (2007) study gives important insights into the nature of academic citizenship in cross-cultural situations, his focus is restricted to higher learning institutions in the *developed world* where one might expect a high degree of consensus in the perceptions of its constituents. Macfarlane's (2007) analysis also points to the basic underlying conceptual dichotomy of personal supporting behaviour (student and collegial service) and organisational supporting behaviour (institutional, professional and generalised public service).

In a recent article in the *Times Higher Education*, Morgan and Havergal (2015) point to the fact that, with the recent emphasis on research output in the academic role, the invisible and often unpaid tasks of academic citizenship are being progressively squeezed out. As a specific cause of this they point to the changing nature of the employment contract at universities. Certainly, the increasing adoption of a managerial-type ethos in higher educational institutions has had the effect of making academics themselves more aware of the unpaid and often invisible work they perform as part of their academic citizenship role. Morgan and Havergal (2015) consider academic citizenship as consisting of 11 aspects:

organising conferences, external examining, evaluating for funding bodies, peer review of journal articles and scholarly monographs or serving on the editorial board of a journal, participation in committee meetings and appointment panels, board membership of academic organisations, writing references, curriculum and qualification design, public engagement and outreach, supporting junior academics and researchers, and pastoral care. Most of the eleven specific aspects listed by Morgan and Havergal (2015) as part of the academic citizenship role can be classified into personal or organisational supporting behaviours motivated by a spirit of conscientiousness.

Employee well-being

There is vast and burgeoning literature on employee well-being, although only a brief outline of the more pertinent issues in this article is warranted here. In any human being's life, the workplace and the work environment are major measures that could affect their life and well-being as employees (Harter, Schmidt and Keyes 2002; Thompson and Prottas 2006). Warr (1999) investigated the job and life satisfaction of employees by using a proposed framework to distinguish between feelings that are context-specific and those that are context-free. Employers are also interested in the well-being of their employees; happy employees evidently link well-being with job satisfaction. Warr's (1999) study confirmed that better employee well-being is significantly associated with better job performance. In addition, Warr (1999) indicated that better employee well-being is positively related to lower absenteeism, reduced probability of leaving an employer and increased social work behaviours towards co-workers and employers. The findings of De Jonge, Bosma, Peter and Siegrist (2000) further indicate the risks of poor well-being in terms of overcommitted employees suffering from high cost and low gain conditions in the workplace.

Judge, Thoreson, Bono and Patton (2001) found that the well-being of employees is in the interests of business and generates higher profits, better customer relationships, better quality products and higher productivity. In addition, Spector (1997) suggests that employees with a greater sense of wellbeing are more helpful to co-workers, more punctual and time-efficient, have longer employment tenure and are longer at work and attend work more often than employees that are dissatisfied.

On the other side of the scale, a study by Schaufeli, Taris and Van Rhenen (2008) investigated three concepts, workaholism, burnout, and engagement, and concluded unique patterns of relationships with five variables, namely, long working hours, job characteristics, work outcomes, quality of social relationships, and perceived health. The study by De Jonge

et al. (2000) investigated effort–reward imbalances and confirmed that monitoring employees’ educational level, managerial position, high job demands (psychological and physical) and low job control had elevated risks in terms of emotional exhaustion, mental health and physical health complaints and job dissatisfaction.

Wright and Cropanzano (2000) studied psychological well-being and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance and reported that employees with higher performance ratings from their superiors have a greater balance of positive emotional symptoms than employees with negative emotional symptoms. The study by Harter et al. (2002) concluded that workplaces with engaged employees on average do better in retaining employees longer, satisfying customers and being profitable and productive than workplaces in which employees are detached. In addition, Harter et al. (2002) confirmed that workplace well-being and performance are complementary and dependent elements of a healthy workplace.

Little research between the service orientations of academic citizenship and its effects on an academic sense of well-being has been conducted. However, many people who join the academic profession are drawn to it because of the opportunity it presents to contribute to the development of learners in a ‘helping profession’ and the opportunity academic citizenship offers to ‘give service’ tends to enhance academics’ feelings of well-being. For example, Davila and Finkelstein (2013) found that citizenship behaviour among educationists was associated with greater job engagement and a sense of psychological wellness.

METHODOLOGY

A brief contextual outline of the universities from which the sample was obtained

Of 23 universities existing in South Africa, 11 are research-intensive, six are technology based, and six are traditional ‘comprehensive’ universities (Pitso 2013). The University of the Witwatersrand (Wits) is a research intensive university and is ranked among the top 115 universities in the world, (Wits 2014). Student numbers have grown from 23 752 in 2005 to 30 833 in 2013 (Wits Facts 2014). Data for the study were collected from the CLM faculty which consists of five schools.

Linköping University in Sweden is a state university which was granted full university status in 1975 and is now one of Sweden’s larger academic institutions. Education, research and PhD training are the mission of the four faculties, Arts and Sciences, Educational Sciences, Health Sciences and the Institute of Technology. Linköping University has 27 000

registered students and 4 000 employees (Linköping 2014). Data for the study was collected from the Department of Management and Engineering.

The research design and sample

The research study used a cross-sectional mixed method design with both quantitative and qualitative aspects incorporating correlational and open-ended techniques respectively (Leedy and Ormrod 2012; Ryan, Scapens and Theobald 2002). Mixed methods were adopted to reduce the probability of 'common method' errors by allowing corroboration between the quantitative and qualitative findings. The research focused on the perceptions/attitudes/feelings of academic staff towards their academic citizenship role and their sense of well-being at work. Participants in the study included lecturers, senior lecturers, associate professors and full professors at two academic institutions, a large South African university and a large Swedish University. The non-random sample consisted of 22 South African and 26 Swedish academics, of which 23 were female and 25 were male. Although the sample was small and restricted to commerce staff, it provided a degree of control over other, potentially obfuscating, exogenous cross-cultural variables emerging from analysis of academic citizenship at the two universities.

The process of obtaining a sample for comparison between two specific universities with a similar international ranking, with Linköping (which is under fifty years old) obtaining a 350 to 400 group rank compared with the University of the Witwatersrand's 251 to 275 group rank (Times Higher Education 2015), was elaborate and constrained. Prior permission at both institutions to conduct the study was required and trust between administrators, respondents and researchers was necessary. This proved possible only through the fact that the lead researchers at both universities had a long history of international co-research work collaboration. The mixed methods approach aimed at counteracting problems of small sample size by providing qualitative analysis detail.

The measuring instruments

Data were collected using an electronic self-completion questionnaire as this was considered the most effective method for eliciting responses from individuals in different countries. An e-mail was sent to the heads of schools/departments to request participation in the questionnaire. It also contained a brief introduction of the research and sought permission from the heads to forward the link to the questionnaire to lecturers, senior lecturers, and associate and full professors. The questionnaire dealt with academics' perceptions of,

attitudes to and feelings towards the academic citizenship role. Respondents were not asked to give their names and the information supplied was treated with the utmost confidentiality. There were no right or wrong answers and respondents were requested to indicate how they really felt on a 7-point scale.

The questionnaire comprised five sections. The first section dealt with biographical data and the second section with attitudes towards the role of an academic citizen. In some cases items for academic citizenship organisational/civic (ACAC) and academic citizenship personal/helping (ACAH) were adapted in a minor way to show that they referred to academic school, from Podsakoff et al.'s (1997) measuring instrument, and consisted of organisational/civic aspects of citizenship behaviour (e.g. 'I provide constructive suggestions about how the school can improve its effectiveness') and personal/helping citizenship behaviour (e.g. 'I am often willingly to give of my time to help members who have work-related problems'). The third section concerned perceptions of the effects of academic citizenship in the work situation. Items for this EACTOT section refer to the effects of academic citizenship behaviour on work output (e.g. 'Being a good academic citizen in the work I do helping others makes work colleagues feel upstaged' and 'My work colleagues admire what I do as an academic citizen in helping others').

In both sections 2 and 3, respondents were required to select the most appropriate option to adequately describe their attitudes or perceptions. Section 4 dealt with feelings of well-being at work and respondents selected the most appropriate option describing their feelings of well-being. There are two aspects to the well-being instrument; one dealing with negative well-being feelings which comprises the EMPLOYEEWELLNEGOT scale, such as 'I generally feel stressed at work'. The second part of the well-being scale EMPLOYEEWELLPOSTOT consists of items such as 'My current job fits well with my career plans'.

The scale for the questions in sections 2, 3 and 4 consists of the following seven options: strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, neutral, somewhat disagree, disagree and strongly disagree. The final section consisted of open-ended questions relating to academic citizenship. In this section respondents were given the opportunity to present their personal views on academic citizenship. This aspect was crucial to the mixed methodological approach adopted as it gave respondents the opportunity to indicate their subjective perceptions of academic citizenship without the constraints of responding to a pre-formulated Likert-type scale. This allowed the researchers to check the substance of the quantitative findings on academic citizenship against their subjective feelings towards the role uncovered in the analysis of the

qualitative data.

Ethics clearance was obtained from the University of the Witwatersrand's Ethics Committee. Anonymity and confidentiality were assured as the results were only reported at the grouped level of analysis, not at the individual level.

FINDINGS

Quantitative

Frequency distributions revealed the sample consisted of 22 (46%) South African and 26 (54%) Swedish academics, of which 23 (48%) were female and 25 (52%) male. The mean age of the sample as a whole was 44 years with a median of 42 years and a mode of 39 years. There were six (12.5 %) professors in total, 17 (35.4%) associate professors, 11 (23%), senior lecturers and 14 (29%) lecturers. Fifty-eight per cent (58%) of academics had served ten years or less, while eight (17%) had served twenty years or more. About a third of the academics (19 persons or 39%) had served five years or less at university.

Reliability was assessed by using internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) tests of the four quantitative measuring instruments included in the analysis. These revealed the following outcomes: academic citizenship organisational/civic (ACAC) $C = .725$; academic citizenship personal/helping (ACAH) $C = .835$; positive employee wellbeing positive (EMPLOYWELLPOSTOT) $C = .567$; and negative employee wellbeing negative (EMPLOYEEWELLNEGOTOT) $C = .605$. The expectations of academic citizenship (EACTOT), $C = .437$, measuring instrument was eliminated from the analysis since Nunnally (1967, 226) indicates a *minimum* internal consistency score of .5 for exploratory studies.

The validity of the measuring instruments was assessed by principal components factor analyses with varimax factor rotations for the academic citizenship (civic and helping) and employee wellbeing (positive and negative) measuring instruments. The construct validity of the measuring instruments was investigated by subjecting the variables to a principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation in an attempt to obtain a simple structure. Although the sample is small ($N = 48$) and the subjects-to-variables (STV) ratio of the current study is around 1:5, a wide variety of sample sizes and STVs have been reported in the literature pertaining to factor analytic studies (Costello and Osborne 2005; Fabrigar et al. 1999; Henson and Roberts 2006) and these reports indicate that the sample size and STV ratio of the current study fall within some of the listed parameters. Very briefly, the academic citizenship (civic and helping) Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin $MSA = .740$, while Bartlett's test of

sphericity = 0.000 indicated that the data were middling factor analytical material. Two components achieved eigenvalues of >1 , and explained 62.1 per cent of the variance. A clear interpretable pattern emerged from the analysis in both the principal components analysis and the varimax rotation, with strong variable loadings under the 'civic' and 'helping' components respectively. Factor 1 was considered an academic citizenship helping component and consisted of all six of the original helping item loadings: i.e. 0.620, 0.714, 0.708, 0.727, 0.799 and 0.664 respectively. Factor 1 explained 44.8 per cent of the variance and obtained an initial eigenvalue of 4.04. The underlying dimension of this factor was suggested by the items with the largest factor loadings, i.e. items 4 and 5 (after varimax rotation of the principal components analysis with Kaiser normalisation): 'I generally take steps to try to prevent problems with other members'; 'I am often willing to give of my time to help members who have work-related problems'.

Factor 2 consisted of the three original civic components of academic citizenship. Factor 2 explained 17.3 per cent of the variance and obtained an initial eigenvalue of 1.55. After varimax rotation of the principal components analysis with Kaiser normalisation, the loadings on the three items were 0.891, 0.849, and 0.588 respectively. Items 1 and 2 were: 'I provide constructive suggestions about how the School can improve its effectiveness' and, 'I am willing to risk disapproval to express my beliefs about what is best for the School'. Both these items clearly suggest a civic/organisational dimension of academic citizenship.

Positive and negative employee well-being measuring instruments were also subjected to principal components factor analyses with varimax rotations. Employee well-being positive obtained a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin $MSA=.619$, with Bartlett's test of sphericity = 0.002, which indicated that the data were middling factor analytical material. One component achieved eigenvalues of >1 , and explained 45 per cent of the variance. The one factor that emerged from the principal components analysis obtained the following item loadings: 0.796, 0.302, 0.642 and 0.816 for the four items included in the analysis. Items one and four which obtained the largest loadings under this factor expressed positive employee well-being dimensions: 'When I go to work I generally feel healthy and energetic' and, 'My job generally does not encroach on my domestic life'.

Employee well-being negative obtained a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin $MSA=.635$ with Bartlett's test of sphericity = 0.000, which indicated that the data were middling factor analytical material. Two components achieved eigenvalues of >1 , and explained 63.9 per cent of the variance. Four of the five items entered into the principal components with varimax rotation emerged under one factor that consisted of four employee well-being negative items

with 0.828, 0.788, 0.427, and 0.701 factor loadings respectively. The two items with the largest factor loadings were: 'I generally feel stressed at work' and, 'I do not feel in control over my day-to-day interpersonal activities at work'. Both these items indicate a clear negative aspect of employee wellness in the work situation.

The quantitative data were subjected to a number of statistical tests. ANOVA revealed no differences between the two universities as regards biographical data, including age, length of service, gender and rank, and personal (helping) and organisational (civic) aspects of academic citizenship, or feelings of well-being. Since the samples were not selected randomly and normal distributions for the dependent variables and homogeneity of variances were not obtained in some instances, the analysis was followed up using the Kruskal Wallis non-parametric test; accordingly, no significant differences were found between the two universities for any of the above variables. Table 1 presents the findings of Spearman rank correlations between the variables.

Table 1: Spearman rank correlations between scores on the measuring instruments

Spearman rank correlations		ACAC	ACAH	EMPLOYWELLPOSTOT	EMPLOYWELLNEGOT
ACAC	Correlation coefficient	1.000	.471**	.091	.070
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.001	.540	.635
	N	48	48	48	48
ACAH	Correlation coefficient	.471**	1.000	.338*	.153
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.	.019	.299
	N	48	48	48	48
EMPLOYWELLPOSTOT	Correlation coefficient	.091	.338*	1.000	-.296*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.540	.019	.	.041
	N	48	48	48	48
EMPLOYWELLNEGOT	Correlation coefficient	.070	.153	-.296*	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.635	.299	.041	.
	N	48	48	48	48

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Non-parametric Spearman correlation analyses revealed a significant association between EMPLOYWELLPOSTOT and ACAH (0.338, $p = .019$). However, no significant correlation was found for ACAC and EMPLOYWELLPOSTOT ($R = .091$, $p = .540$).

Qualitative

Tables 1, 2 and 3 present actual responses to the open-ended questions on academic citizenship made by South African and Swedish academics at the two universities. Table 1 indicates academics' views of what constitutes the essential aspects of academic citizenship. Table 1 uses Macfarlane's (2007) pyramid model as a classification system for particular responses. Classification is made in terms of professional (i.e. the part of academic citizenship in the perceived professional role of an academic), collegial (i.e. the part of academic citizenship in academic collegiality) and institutional (i.e. the place of academic citizenship in institutional effectiveness). Furthermore, the collegial, professional and institutional classifications were subdivided where appropriate into 'helping' and 'civic' orientations.

Table 2: South African and Swedish academics' descriptions of the essence of academic citizenship: response classification

South African (SA) and Swedish (S) academics' individual responses	Response classification: Professional (P), Collegial (C), Institutional (I), Unclassified (U) Subcategories: Helping (HE), Civic (CI)
SA 1. Being able to debate with colleagues openly and finding a framework that accommodates diversity and also providing a common approach to what we do	P, C
SA 2. Building colleagues, the school and the institutions by supporting and doing what is expected	P, C, I (CI)
SA 3. Not helping other academic colleagues as questionnaire seems to suggest. I imagined academic citizenship to be a much broader concept	U
SA 4. Seeing yourself as part of a larger whole, and being committed to achieving communal goals	P, C, I
SA 5. More or less as implied in the questions above. Except that it may also require persons to step forward for academic leadership, which entails risks	C, I
SA 6. Active memberships in areas of interest, peer review articles/work, organise conferences, editing work, network, etc.	P, C, I
SA 7. Academic citizenship is a give and take responsibility. One cannot expect the assistance of others if you are not prepared to give such assistance yourself	C
SA 8. Production of knowledge and sharing knowledge / educating	P, C (CI)
SA 9. Being a member of committees in the University, the Faculty and the School	P, I
SA 10. Academic citizenship is a give and take - you give some of your time so that you feel free to ask others to give some of theirs when the time comes	C
SA 11. It is being the best you can be for your department / school and university	P, I
SA 12. Being a part of a community that supports its members by sharing the load and expertise	P, C
SA 13. Service to internal and external community	P, C (HE) (CI)
SA 14. Helping others	C (HE)
SA 15. Conducting rigorous research that contributes to knowledge	P (CI)
SA 16. Being involved in at least the basics of student research process, school meetings, and one or two university committees	P, C, I
SA 17. Being able to enjoy the particular field you have chosen and helping others to achieve their dreams	P, (HE) C
S 1. It is performing efforts of one's strictly-defined duties 'going the extra mile'	P (CI)

South African (SA) and Swedish (S) academics' individual responses	Response classification: Professional (P), Collegial (C), Institutional (I), Unclassified (U) Subcategories: Helping (HE), Civic (CI)
S 2. Being collegial	C
S 3. Helping out others in the school and students	C (HE)
S 4. To be rational and careful in all reasoning and arguing	P
S 5. I don't know if I have a strong opinion or idea about it. Perhaps trying to make an effort for the gains of the division / research project in general, regardless of the benefits (or lack of benefits) for oneself	P, C (CI)
S 6. Trying to act as a team player, i.e. helping each other out, facilitating each other's work (in a broad interpretation of what that means, so not doing the work of others but also not intentionally making it more difficult for colleagues)	P, C (HE)
S 7. Professionalism, freedom, responsibility, openness	P
S 8. Being a good colleague and a constructive organisational / faculty member	C, I
S 9. Believe and support the belief in each other's individual competence and capacity to get the work done	P, C
S 10. Being sensitive to the three pillars of higher education; research, teaching, and administrative duties	P
S 11. Being included and respected can lead to a positive citizenship	P, C
S 12. Freedom and stress	U
S 13. Participating in academic discussions and seminars in an active and constructive way, read the work of others and give feedback, participate in pedagogic / research / organisational development processes that are not directly linked to exactly my own activities, but are for the good on a higher ground	P, C
S 14. The essence is to identify areas that could be improved and take action for change	P, I
S 15. Collegiality, privilege, flexibility, responsibility and a critical mind	P, C
S 16. Being a good researcher and teacher. Being interested in the students' development, learning and well-being, helping to develop the competence and well-being of colleagues. Building a strong international position for the school, extending the international network of our faculty	P (HE), (CI), C I
S 17. It's important that you listen to what other persons have to say and respect their thoughts	P, C
S 18. A certain collective responsibility. Sense of common mission	P, C, I
S 19. Just helping others get published	C (HE)
S 20. Respecting faculty, staff, students, guests, taking responsibility, reflecting on inappropriate actions, professional / transparent communicating and decision making	P, C
S 21. Help out in making the University a more effective organisation	I (CI)
S 22. Being an active participant in all aspects of the academic project	P, C

Table 1 indicates that South African and Swedish academics, in spite of differences in age gender, tenure and seniority, hold surprisingly similar views concerning what they consider the 'essence of academic citizenship' to be. In terms of Macfarlane's (2007) pyramid most Swedish and South African academics seem to regard academic citizenship as focused on discipline-based professional, institutional and collegial services. In terms of the classification frequencies, 11 (64%) South African academics and 15 (67%) Swedish academics indicate that they regard academic citizenship as part of their academic role. Academic citizenship is also seen as part of collegiality by 13 (76%) and 15 (71%), South African and Swedish

academics respectively. Helping academic citizenship professional and collegial orientations are evident in three (18%) South African and four (19%) Swedish comments. Such helping orientations are evident in responses such as: ‘Helping others’, ‘Just helping others get published’, and, ‘Helping out others in the school and student’.

Also, civic professional and institutional orientations are apparent in four (23%) of South African academic responses and four (19%) of Swedish academic comments. One Swedish academic noted both the personal (helping) and organisational (civic) dimensions in the academic citizenship role which comes out clearly in his/her response to this question.

Being a good researcher and teacher. Being interested in the students’ development, learning and well-being, helping to develop the competence and well-being of colleagues. Building a strong international position for the school, extending the international network of our faculty.

Table 2 shows the feelings of Swedish and South African academic staff towards the helping role in academic citizenship specifically. Responses are classified as positive or negative and conditional (i.e. perceived factors that are regarded as having a bearing on individual positive or negative views of this role) or unconditional (i.e. without other factors affecting the interpretation of this role).

Table 3: South African and Swedish academics’ feelings towards the personal (helping) role of academic citizenship: response classification

South African(SA) and Swedish (S) academics’ individual responses	Response classification: Positive (P), Negative (N) Subcategories: Conditional (CON) Unconditional (UNCON)
SA 1. Always happy to help - but structure and approach not conducive to peer support and collegiality	P (CON)
SA 2. I like helping others but resent it when I have to fill in gaps created by others not doing their work. There are no consequences for non-performance and no rewards for those who pick up the slack. This is demotivating	P (CON)
SA 3. Of course. What a naf (silly) question	P (UNCON)
SA 4. I do not. People must do their own jobs. I am tired of doing other people's jobs	N (UNCON)
SA 5. Mostly. However not if the other party has not put in any effort on their own part. Such assistance should be temporary only - at some point other party should take responsibility for themselves	P (CON)
SA 6. To a limited extent. The frustration is when (a) that need could be met by a well-functioning institution but is not being met and (b) when the institution is so not-well-functioning that it is the cause of the need	P (CON)
SA 7. Of course	P (UNCON)
SA 8 Assistance is a reasonable requirement provided that these individuals make a full effort to fulfil their own duties	P (CON)
SA 9. Yes, very much so	P (UNCON)
SA 10. Sometimes	P (CON)
SA 11. I believe that there is at least a moral duty that full professors should take a prominent role in academic citizenship. I have had the privilege over many years of working with senior colleagues who gave freely of themselves to assist their juniors	P (CON)

South African(SA) and Swedish (S) academics' individual responses	Response classification: Positive (P), Negative (N) Subcategories: Conditional (CON) Unconditional (UNCON)
<p>and to support the efforts of others. I have also found that the most successful people (not only academics) realize the value of supporting admin staff - admin staff at universities appreciate it immensely when they know that their academic colleagues understand their value and support their efforts too. I live by these examples, although I realize that I probably contribute somewhat more than most of my colleagues. I also pick up from your response that you are working from the premise that academic citizenship is grudge function. I think this is probably correct for many if not most people. The reason is the skewed incentives at universities. There is very little acknowledgment of academic citizenship as part of the job. You mentioned promotion - you know as well as I do that one's research outputs is mainly the measure by which promotion is awarded. Teaching and admin come second; academic citizenship often does not even feature in interviews. I have tried before (in vain) to have some sort of workload acknowledgement attached to academic citizenship, as well as community engagement. The standard response is that it is too vague to attach a time value to and therefore open to abuse. I spend literally weeks of my working year on peer reviews, external examinations, NRF work, reading of colleagues' manuscripts, attendance of public lectures, school functions etc. None of it gets any recognition. This is why it is a grudge function</p>	
SA 12. Yes, within reason	P (CON)
SA 13. Very reasonable and expected requirements by me	P (UNCON)
SA 14. I think it is important; we need to work as a team	P (UNCON)
SA 15. I am happy to assist students and colleagues where I can - one is generally more keen to help those who are contributors to the community themselves	P (CON)
SA 16. There's a difference between mentorship/guiding and having to actually take on the work because of others' incompetence or lack of willingness to learn	N (UNCON)
SA 17. I do it anyway	P (UNCON)
SA 18. Helping out with anything they need help with. Of course - I depend on them for the same	P (UNCON)
S 1. They are completely reasonable requirements	P (UNCON)
S 2. I think these are reasonable expectations of colleagues, to make a pleasant workplace	P (CON)
S 3. Yes, I do as this builds relationships and knowledge of the university and the school processes	P (CON)
S 4. Yes, I do, especially having reached a certain age and having more room in my Schedule for such help and assistance	P (CON)
S 5. It depends on who is asking and to what purpose. If it is someone who I like or not. Also, if it regards teaching I am more likely to provide assistance, as there are more common grounds in teaching (I have the ability/competence to help in more cases)	P (CON)
S 6. Yes, I regard them as reasonable and acceptable requirements and I generally get upset when I see how other colleagues are not willing to help out, provide information or advice and the like (linked to our position/work)	P (UNCON)
S 7. Very reasonable requirements	P (UNCON)
S 8. For those working closest to me I regard it as my responsibility as a colleague and friend to help out, as I wish to be able to count on them when I need their support. It's a give-and-take thing. At the same time it is frustrating that this effort is not really regarded as important when it comes to salary or merits. There should generally be more time for interacting with others in the faculty	P (CON)
S 9. Give help only when asked for help, don't be intrusively helpful	P (CON)
S 10. I see no difference in doing this in my role as an academic as I would being in any other job role. It's part of the job and part of creating a 'healthy' work environment	P (UNCON)
S 11. Difficult to have the time	N (UNCON)
S 12. Definitely yes. Academic work is not done by single disconnected islands - the work of all of us become better and more fun if we support and give input to each other	P (UNCON)
S 13. Helping others e.g. newcomers is a fundamental responsibility	P (UNCON)
S 14. Yes, yet it is difficult as we do not work in the same projects that often. The work is very individualized	P (CON)

South African(SA) and Swedish (S) academics' individual responses	Response classification: Positive (P), Negative (N) Subcategories: Conditional (CON) Unconditional (UNCON)
S 15. It is important that all colleagues take their responsibility of doing a good job. People who ask for too many services from their colleagues are sometimes troublesome for the faculty team. People who initiate conflicts or thrive on conflicts are really not what we need	N (UNCON)
S 16. By helping other colleagues, students and administrative staff you improve the work climate	P (CON)
S 17. Of course, it is a responsibility for us all, not only in academia but in all work places. But it must be recognized	P (CON)
S 18. Very reasonable, and expected, if not materially rewarded	P (UNCON)
S 19. Somehow	N (UNCON)
S 20. From the beginning I felt recognized at the division. However, due to a lack of understanding what does it mean 'to be not grown within the division' made my start at the division fairly difficult. After one year, this has turned into good	P (UNCON)
S 21. Yes, it is reasonable	P (UNCON)
S 22. Yes, I do, and I go out of way to assist colleagues	P (UNCON)

Table 3 indicates that the large majority of both South African (16, 89%) and Swedish (19, 86%) academics have positive views towards the helping role of academic citizenship. Responses range from those who regard it as an integral part of the academic role, such as 'Helping others e.g. newcomers are a fundamental responsibility', to those who regard it as something that enhances their well-being, evidenced in the comment: 'Definitely yes. Academic work is not done by single disconnected islands – the work of all of us becomes better and more fun if we support and give input to each other.' Table 3 presents academics' feelings towards the organisational role of academic citizenship with responses being classified as either positive or negative.

Table 4: South African and Swedish academics' responses towards the organisational role (civic) of academic citizenship: response classification

South African(SA) and Swedish (S) academics' individual responses	Response classification: Positive (P), Negative (N)
SA 1. Yes. Have to put more pressure and force people to research and publish. Peer pressure helps - but equity in delivering core outputs important	P
SA 2. Yes, they are reasonable but difficult to achieve given other crises that need to be managed	P
SA 3. Certainly. Why else are we paid?	P
SA 4. They are neither here nor there to me. I have my own very rigorous goals in this regard that exceed those of my School and which I strive to achieve	P
SA 6. Due to increased teaching goals, it is becoming more difficult to achieve research goals	N
SA 7. Yes	P
SA 8. Yes	P
SA 9. Research and teaching are core responsibilities of our School	P
SA 10. The goals are more than reasonable but they are overshadowed completely by often improper admin responsibilities. I suspect this will be a common concern	P
SA 11. They are not reasonable	P

South African(SA) and Swedish (S) academics' individual responses	Response classification: Positive (P), Negative (N)
SA 12. Research and teaching are core requirements of an academic	P
SA 13. They are reasonable; at times it is harder than other times. But that is the nature of an academic	P
SA 14. I think that some people take advantage of others in terms of how work is shared and are quick to appropriate easier teaching loads which help to free up time for research. I also believe that very different measures for research activity should be put in place for different levels of academic staff	N
SA 15. I'm not sure that the department's goals can be seen as anything more than an aggregate of individuals' goals. There is nothing more important than the research agenda as it is the basis on which we distinguish ourselves and earn our reputation. Research and teaching are usually in tension and it's important to establish priorities. Departments that develop goals that prioritize teaching will marginalize researchers, and vice-versa. The requirement to both teach and research is entirely reasonable but one must be prioritized over the other	P
SA 16. They clash- when teaching I can do no research	N
SA 17. The bar is set too low. Unfortunately, the incentives for research, as they are currently structured, only promote mediocrity (at best). The Economics department at Wits is poor by South African standards and much work is required to turn the situation around. It would help if we had more senior Professors who are publishing in top journals (and who actually play a role in the department) to lead the way. As it stands we are, for the most part, in a race to the bottom in terms of the quality of our publications. We are not contributing meaningfully to the academic discourse in this country. This is the central issue that management should focus on. In all other respects we are doing better than most	P
SA 18. Yes, but it is difficult and the university is unreasonable to expect publications in every year as well as quality	P
SA 19. Very reasonable and expected requirements by me	P
S 1. Yes, joint research and teaching goals require one's involvement	P
S 2. I like research, I'd be happy not to teach at this point in my career	P
S 3. I think that people are required to do research outside of their time at work and this can be very hard for people with families	N
S 4. Yes	P
S 5. Yes, I would say so	P
S 6. I honestly do not know what our goals are more precisely. However, in a very general sense of providing high quality education and the like, I think that's not only a reasonable, but a necessary, requirement	
S 7. Regarding content, it is reasonable, regarding the amount of work (hours) it is not reasonable	N
S 8. The hours provided for teaching in the social sciences in Sweden are by far too poor. Today, teaching often take time (and thus resources) from research. We need more resources to provide that extra quality we always strive for	N
S 9. It's up to each individual to find his own balance between teaching and research to get both done properly	P
S 10. These are reasonable over a time period, say 3-5 years. Sometimes it becomes difficult to deal with the high investment costs (time, effort) in setting up new teaching or new research projects	P
S 11. The problem is that teaching is under-financed and you have to apply for research grants on your spare time	N
S 12. Conflict of aims between places students and teaching on a high level	N
S 13. Fine - I work in a context where there is no guaranteed research time, which means that the 'hunt' for external funding is very real and affects us both positively and negatively. At times, it might feel unreasonable to make employees fund their own work (i.e. research) by attracting external funding - and if they do not succeed, 100% teaching is the only option. But, as long as you manage to maintain a reasonable balance with external funding/research time and teaching time, it's fine	P
S 14. To a large extent I set the goals myself	P
S 15. I think they are reasonable, but you always have to work more hours than what is calculated (teaching)	P
S 16. Some people are high achievers and performers when it comes to	P

South African(SA) and Swedish (S) academics' individual responses	Response classification: Positive (P), Negative (N)
research, others are low performers. However, it is important that all faculties have the chance to excel in at least one area, be that research, teaching, administration. The division has a responsibility in letting all faculties develop their skills and capabilities and thus also assume roles that they can handle	
S 17. I work as hard as I can and hope that it is enough	P
S 18. When trying to be a good teacher and academic citizen, there is just not enough time even for the paid research tasks. External research funding (and leisure time) ends up subsidizing teaching and academic citizenship	N
S 19. Requirements yes, but a serious mismatch with resources	N
S 20. No	N
S 21. Working at the best school of BA for teaching in Sweden makes me proud; to reach recognition value in terms of research as well in a collaborative way is a satisfying task	P
S 22. Hard to combine	N
S 23. Yes, they are reasonable, but hard to balance with administrative requirements	N

Table 4 indicates a general consensus of opinion that research teaching and administration form the basics of the academic role; however, what is not clear to many South African and Swedish academics is how they should be balanced and, indeed, whether they can be fully achieved without going the extra mile in one, other or all three domains if organisational (civic) goals are to be attained successfully. In this regard the aspect of teaching load and how it is to be successfully balanced with research productivity is particularly apparent in both South African and Swedish samples despite the vast difference in staff–student ratios existing in the two countries.

Similarly, there is a clear undercurrent of negativism and dissent among certain Swedish and South African academics regarding University (particularly research) goals and administrative requirements that are seen, as a matter of course, by the university to be part of the academic role and yet require largely unrewarded ‘extra mile’ type academic to be achievable. For example:

Yes, they are reasonable, but hard to balance with administrative requirements.

The goals are more than reasonable but they are overshadowed completely by often improper admin responsibilities. I suspect this will be a common concern.

I think that people are required to do research outside of their time at work and this can be very hard for people with families.

DISCUSSION

Quantitative and qualitative analyses indicate that Swedish and South African academics hold very similar views towards the academic citizenship role. The correlation analysis reveals a significant Spearman correlation between academic helping behaviour and positive feelings of

wellbeing at work. However, no significant association was discovered between the organisational/civic aspects of academic citizenship and academic citizenship behaviour.

Broadly speaking, these quantitative findings are further corroborated by the qualitative data which show positive feelings towards the helping role and negative feelings towards the organisational/civic role in academic citizenship behaviour. It might be argued that the homogeneity in academic citizenship at both universities arose because the profile of South African academics is similar to that in Sweden, representing in the main relatively well-paid individuals embracing Westernised culture. And that had the South African sample been more representative of the actual demographics prevailing there and been made up more of the indigenous black population and cultural orientation in particular, the results might have been different. This is an important aspect that needs further analysis.

However, four factors have to be borne in mind. First, although there is little doubt that the profile of academics (particularly senior academics) at South African universities is not representative of the demographics of the country and that more blacks, females and people with disabilities are needed to redress this problem, the South African sample reflects quite accurately the current situation. Second, South African universities are generally English-medium universities which means their intellectual focus is firmly situated in the Western cultural tradition (although there have been recent calls to radically Africanise the curricula at these universities). Third, the speculative nature of this aspect in its possible effects on the similarity of perceptions of academic citizenship in the two countries found in the current study make it difficult to articulate in the current research design. Finally, it was a deliberate part of the existing research design to ensure as far as possible that the demographic, departmental and university ranking variables of the two universities were similar so as to allow for the effects of 'endogenous' (i.e. more academically pertinent) variables, such as staff-student ratios, secondary educational standards, university preparedness and university access – all of which are very real differences known to exist in the two countries and ones expected to potentially affect perceptions of academic citizenship. Also, more 'exogenous' (i.e. less academically pertinent) general socioeconomic and country-specific effects, such as student wealth and health, known to exist between the two countries may also generate a need for more specific types of academic citizenship behaviour in the two countries. For example, that of the student-oriented helping type in the South African context.

However, as indicated earlier, despite wide contextual differences, the findings suggest a general consensus among academics in both countries concerning the essential form and substance of academic citizenship and its effects on feelings of well-being.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The quantitative and qualitative analyses reveal that academic citizenship is a relatively homogenous concept, even among academics operating in widely divergent socio-political and economic contexts, which have a direct bearing on factors impinging on institutions of higher learning such as staff–student ratios, student preparedness for university and level of poverty. These divergent factors operating in a Swedish and a South African university might be expected to influence the ways in which academic citizenship is perceived and implemented. For example, academic citizenship in South Africa might be expected to be more ‘helping’ oriented than in Sweden. On the other hand, Swedish academics might be expected to be more ‘civic’ in orientation since Swedish students are generally ‘better off’ in the widest sense of the term than their South African counterparts and thus require less helping behaviour; allowing Swedish academics to go the extra mile in terms of attaining institutional goals. Nevertheless, the findings suggest that this is not the case as Swedish and South African academics have very similar views of academic citizenship in their professional roles. For example, it was found that both Swedish and South African academics obtain an overriding positive sense of wellness from the helping role of academic citizenship. This may be on account of the fact that the academic profession worldwide attracts professionals who want and have selected a career that offers them the opportunity to make a positive contribution in a helping-type role. However, the findings also reveal that both groups have ambivalent feelings towards the ‘civic’ aspects of academic citizenship and some academics clearly regard this as having a negative bearing on their sense of well-being at work. We believe that the sharing of views on academic citizenship between Swedish is instructive in showing how different academics in different countries perceive and experience academic citizenship. It provides evidence of the communality of that experience and the importance and generality of the helping aspect of academic citizenship in particular, and its contribution to feelings of well-being among academics generally.

Limitations to the study include the smallness of the sample and the fact that it was not randomly selected. However, it is believed that the mixed methods approach has compensated for this by generating a wealth of qualitative material which has corroborated and substantively elaborated on the quantitative findings.

Recommendations for future research include investigating the distinction and intercommunication between academic citizenship, on the one hand and the lived experience of academics on the other. Lived experience might be expected to inform perceptions of

academic citizenship in specific ways offering fruitful scope for further in-depth qualitative research. Also, future research can investigate academic citizenship in other countries throughout the world with a view to uncovering how the concept is understood by academics globally, the degree of commonality in the way it is perceived, and ways it can be most favourably implemented to enhance academics' wellbeing at work.

REFERENCES

- Bilbao-Osorio, B., S. Dutta and B. Lanvin. 2014. *The Global Information Technology Report: Rewards and Risks of Big Data*. World Economic Forum: Insead. http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GlobalInformationTechnology_Report_2014.pdf (accessed 8 May 2015).
- Borman, W. 2004. The concept of organizational citizenship. *Current Reflections in Psychological Science* 13: 238–241.
- Borman, W., S. Motowidlo, S. Rose and L. M. Hanser. 1983. *Development of a Model of Soldier Effectiveness* (Institute Report No.95). Minneapolis: Personnel Decisions Research Institute.
- Brint, S. 2006. *Schools and societies*. 2nd Ed. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Coldwell, D. A. L. and C. Callaghan. 2014. Specific organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational effectiveness: The development of a conceptual heuristic device. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 44(3): 347–367.
- Collins. 2009. *Collins English Dictionary*. 10 Ed. Glasgow. Harper Collins.
- Council on Higher Education South Africa. 2011. *Higher Education: Staffing*. http://www.che.ac.za/focus_areas/higher_education_data/2011/staffing#ratio (accessed 7 May 2015).
- Costello, A. B. and J. W. Osborne. 2005. Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment Research and Evaluation*. <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=10&n=7> (accessed 10 May 2015).
- Davila, M. C. and M. A. Finkelstein. 2013. Organizational citizenship behavior and well-being: Preliminary results. *International Journal of Applied Psychology* 3(3): 45–51.
- De Jonge, J., H. Bosma, R. Peter and J. Siegrist. 2000. Job strain, effort-reward imbalance and employee well-being: A large-scale cross-sectional study. *Social* 50(9): 1317–1327.
- Fabrigar, L. R., D. T. Wegener, R. C. MacCallum and E. J. Strahan. 1999. Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods* 4: 272–299.
- Graham, J. 1991. An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 4: 249–70.
- Guardian. 2010. UK schools slip down world rankings. <http://www.theguardian.com/education/2010/dec/07/uk-schools-slip-world-rankings> (accessed 7 May 2015).
- Harter, K. J., F. L. Schmidt and C. L. M. Keyes. 2002. Well-being in the workplace and its relationships to business outcomes. In *Flourishing: The positive person and the good life*, ed. C. L. Keyes and J. Haidt, 205–244. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Heckert, A. and D. Heckert. 2004. Using an integrated typology of deviance to analyse ten common norms of the US middle class. *The Sociological Quarterly* 45: 209–228.
- Henson, R. K. and J. K. Roberts. 2006. Use of exploratory factor analysis in published research: Common errors and some comments on improved practice. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 66: 393–416.
- International Labor Organization. 2015. *World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2015*. http://www.ilo.org/global/research/global-reports/weso/2015/WCMS_337069/lang-en/index.htm
- Judge, T. A., C. J. Thoresen, J. E. Bono and G. K. Patton. 2001. The job satisfaction–job performance

- relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin* 17: 376–407.
- Leedy, P. D. and J. E. Ormrod. 2010. *Practical research*. Boston: Pearson.
- Linköping University. 2014. <http://www.liu.se/> (accessed 9 October 2014).
- Macfarlane, B. 2007. Defining and rewarding academic citizenship: The implications for University Promotions Policy. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 29(3): 261–273.
- Morgan, J. and C. Havergal. 2015. Is ‘academic citizenship’ under strain? *Times Higher Education*. <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/> (accessed 29 January 2015).
- Nunnally, T. 1967. *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Organ, D. 1988. *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Pitso, T. 2013. Status of scholarship of teaching and learning in South Africa. *South African Journal of Higher Education* 27(1): 196–209.
- Podsakoff, P. M., M. Ahearne and S. B. MacKenzie. 1997. Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82(2): 262–270.
- Ryan, B., R. W. Scapens and M. Theobald. 2002. *Research method and methodology in finance and accounting*. 2nd Ed. London: South-Western.
- Schaufeli, W. B., T. W. Taris and W. Van Rhenen. 2008. Workaholism, burnout, and work engagement: Three of a kind or three different kinds of employee well-being? *Applied Psychology* 57(2): 173–203.
- Sevi, E. 2010. Effects of organizational citizenship behaviour on group performance: Results from an agent-based simulation model. *Journal of Modeling in Management* 5: 25–37.
- Shils, E. 1997. *The calling of education: The academic ethic and other essays on higher education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, C., D. Ogan and J. Near. 1983. Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 68: 653–63.
- Spector, P. E. 1997. *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Thompson, C. A. and D. J. Prottas. 2006. Relationships among organizational family support, job autonomy, perceived control, and employee well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 11(1): 100–118.
- Times Higher Education*. 2015. World University Rankings: 2014–2015 Supplement. <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/2014-15/world-ranking/range/251-275> (accessed 8 May 2015).
- University of the Witwatersrand. 2013. *Average staff to student ratio*. <http://www.wits.ac.za/academic/ebe/miningeng/4813/overview.html> (accessed 6 February 2015).
- University of the Witwatersrand Ranked. 2014. *Wits Ranked Top University in Africa*. http://www.wits.ac.za/newsroom/newsitems/201407/24117/news_item_24117.html (accessed 9 October 2014).
- University of the Witwatersrand Facts (Wits). 2014. *Wits Facts* http://www.wits.ac.za/prospective/undergraduate/11637/what_parents_need_to_know.html (accessed 9 October 2014).
- Vardi, Y. and E. Weitz. 2003. *Misbehavior in organizations: Theory, research, and management*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. 2007. Redrawing the boundaries of OCB? An empirical examination of compulsory extra-role behavior in the workplace. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 21: 377–405.
- Warr, P. 1999. Well-being. In *The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology*, ed. D. Kahneman, E. Diener and N. Schwarz, 392–412. New York: US Russell Sage Foundation.

- World Bank. 2013. World Bank Development Indicators: Prevalence of HIV Total Percentage of Population, 15–49. <http://www.indexmundi.com/facts/indicators/SH.DYN.AIDS.ZS/compare?country=se#country=za:se> (accessed 8 May 2015).
- Wright, T. A. and R. Cropanzano. 2000. Psychological well-being and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 5: 84–94.