Original Researcher Article

A Conceptual Framework on OCB as a Driver of POS, Work Engagement, and Job Performance among Women Faculty in Higher Education.

Shwetha BV [1], Dr. Sharmila Ashraf [2]

[1]Assistant professor, Research scholar, Jain (deemed-to-be University) Bengaluru, India
Email ID : shwethabv2709@gmail.com
[2]Associate professor, JAIN (deemed-to-be University) Bengaluru, India
Email ID : a.sharmila@jainuniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) significantly contributes to positive outcomes in higher education, yet remains under-researched. This paper explores OCB as a predictor of Perceived Organizational Support (POS), Work Engagement (WE), and Job Performance (JP) among women faculty. Using theories like Social Exchange Theory, Organizational Support Theory, and Job Demands–Resources Theory, it proposes a framework where women faculty's discretionary behaviours foster support perceptions, boost engagement, and enhance performance. Often performing invisible, emotionally demanding roles, recognizing these behaviours improves perceptions of support, leading to greater engagement in terms of vigor, dedication, and absorption which in turn heightens teaching, research, and institutional contributions. Contextualized in Indian, specifically Karnataka, higher education, the study addresses gaps in gender and context overlooked in Western or corporate research. By positioning OCB as a direct predictor rather than just an outcome, it advances theory. Practically, the framework suggests gender-sensitive policies, inclusive evaluations, and supportive cultures to enhance well-being and performance. This provides a foundation for future research and guidance to improve faculty effectiveness and sustainability...

Keywords: *Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Perceived Organizational Support, Work Engagement, Job Performance, Women Faculty in Higher Education.*
.

1. INTRODUCTION:

The Higher Education Sector (HES) in India, especially in Karnataka, is undergoing major changes driven by societal expectations, technological progress, and demands for academic excellence (Altbach, 2015). Faculty contributions go beyond official roles, requiring voluntary, collaborative behaviors to support institutional competitiveness and student success (Organ, 1988). The discussion on human resource development emphasizes promoting positive organizational behaviours to enhance productivity and faculty well- being (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). In Karnataka, where women form a large part of the academic workforce, their professional experiences and performance merit closer study (Aithal & Aithal, 2019). Women faculty often manage complex roles without sufficient recognition or support (Misra et al., 2012). This highlights the need to explore behaviours like Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and their effects on workplace outcomes (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Although extensively studied in corporate settings, OCB's role in academia, especially among women faculty, remains limited (Paillé, 2009). Faculty often voluntarily support departmental initiatives, mentoring, and committees, impacting institutional culture (Somech & Drach- Zahavy, 2004; Oplatka, 2009). For women faculty, OCB can also help address workplace challenges and build professional identities (Settles et al., 2019). Understanding OCB, Perceived Organizational Support (POS), Work Engagement (WE), and Job Performance

(JP) is crucial, as women in Karnataka face socio- cultural and organizational challenges that affect their engagement and productivity (Rao, 1986). High POS encourages women faculty to reciprocate with OCB and increased work engagement (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). WE, characterized by vigor and absorption, predicts faculty effectiveness (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Despite extensive research, little attention has been paid to these constructs' interplay among women faculty in Indian higher education (Agarwal & Gupta, 2018). This paper proposes a model where OCB influences POS, WE, and JP, providing insights into how extra- role behaviours foster institutional climate and excellence, guiding future research and policies.

2. BACKGROUND OF WOMEN FACULTY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Recent decades have seen notable shifts in India's higher education, especially in gender representation, faculty recruitment, and goals (Gupta & Sharma, 2021). Women faculty are growing in number but face systemic inequalities and entrenched gender norms (O'Connor, 2020). Despite progress, they encounter structural, cultural, and professional challenges affecting their roles, visibility, and experiences (Morley, 2013). Understanding their background is vital for insights into behaviours like Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB), Perceived Organizational Support (POS), Work Engagement (WE), and Job Performance (JP). Academia remains male-dominated, especially in STEM and leadership, limiting

women's power access (Bagilhole & White, 2011). Women pursuing postgraduate and doctoral studies still face biases, hierarchical hurdles, and slow career advancement (Bhopal, 2020). In Karnataka, a hub of education, women are active in teaching but underrepresented in research and top roles (Nagasundari & Rao, 2018). Women perform various responsibilities beyond teaching, including curriculum design, accreditation, mentoring, and administrative tasks, often without formal recognition (Thomas & Davies, 2002). Balancing academic and family duties impacts their work-life balance, influenced by cultural caregiving expectations (Hochschild & Machung, 2012). Different institutions—government, private aided, private autonomous—have varying cultures. Private colleges in Karnataka emphasize performance and quality, creating workload and engagement challenges for women. Disparities exist in research output, grants, and conference participation, with women often lacking access to mentorship and networks, affecting visibility and promotion (Shaw & Stanton, 2012). Cultural issues like stereotyping worsen these challenges, despite support initiatives like mentoring, leadership training, and gender policies. Formal channels for harassment exist, but fear and norms suppress reporting (Pereira, 2018). Supportive leadership and recognition are crucial, but many women experience exclusion from informal networks. Women bring relational, pedagogical, and collaborative strengths, with high empathy and mentoring dedication, linked to OCB (Sprague & Massoni, 2005). Their contributions shape the academic atmosphere but often go unrecognized. Digital shifts post-pandemic have added opportunities and challenges, especially for women managing domestic duties (Htun & Weldon, 2021). Overall, women in Karnataka's higher education face progress amid ongoing hurdles, making this environment ideal for studying how OCB influences perceptions of support, engagement, and performance, informing policies for inclusive, high-achieving institutions.

3. ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR (OCB): CONCEPT AND RELEVANCE IN ACADEMIA

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) involves voluntary actions by employees beyond their formal duties, significantly impacting organizational effectiveness and cohesion (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2000). In higher education, OCB is crucial as faculty often perform unnoticed, beneficial tasks, especially women, driven by gendered expectations and institutional culture emphasizing nurturing and collaboration (Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2004; Eagly & Heilman, 2016). Originating from Organ's work, OCB includes altruism, conscientiousness, civic virtue, sportsmanship, and courtesy, manifesting in activities like mentoring, assisting colleagues, and participating in institutional development, which influence climate and quality (Oplatka, 2009). Academic environments rely on shared governance, collaboration, and voluntary participation. Unlike corporate hierarchies, higher education depends on faculty commitment to standards, student needs, and quality. Faculty undertake tasks like curriculum revision, exam coordination, student advising, and community

outreach as part of their roles. Societal norms influence women faculty's engagement in OCB, viewing them as caregivers and emotional leaders—roles that extend into academic duties and often lead to heavier mentoring and support (Guarino & Borden, 2017). In Karnataka, an educational hub in India, OCB's importance is heightened by institutional pressures for accreditation, quality assurance, and rankings. These activities require faculty participation beyond teaching. Women faculty, seen as dependable, are often assigned documentation, coordination, and committee roles supporting accreditation that may not advance their careers (Bhopal, 2020).

Women in academia perform high levels of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), such as committee participation and mentoring, but face limited recognition and underrepresentation in leadership roles. While their service boosts student engagement and atmosphere, it often goes unmeasured and can lead to role overload and burnout. OCB increases when faculty feel supported but can diminish if efforts are undervalued. Recognizing OCB's importance is key to fostering engagement, performance, and organizational support for women faculty.

4. PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT (POS) AND FACULTY WELL-BEING

Perceived Organizational Support (POS) is crucial for faculty well-being, especially women in higher education (Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011). It acts as a key psychological resource, helping manage pressures, stay motivated, and maintain health (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Women face additional barriers, making POS even more vital (Settles et al., 2019). It improves well-being by reducing anxiety and fostering resilience through recognition, fairness, and leadership. Lack of support can lead to burnout and disengagement (Kinman & Wray, 2018). POS influences performance, offering support via fair workload, acknowledgment, flexibility, and transparency, creating safe, valued environments. Emotional support reduces isolation and stress, critical for women balancing work and family. Instrumental support like resources and mentorship enhances performance and reduces burnout (Bhopal, 2020). POS fosters psychological well-being by boosting autonomy, self-efficacy, and growth. Recognized faculty gain confidence, while undervalued faculty suffer stress. POS supports work–life balance through policies like flexible schedules and childcare, reducing guilt and conflicts (Htun & Weldon, 2021). It fosters social bonds, preventing burnout and aiding in emotional and professional support, especially in male-dominated fields (O'Connor, 2020). POS lowers job stress by clarifying expectations and promoting fairness, encouraging coping strategies. Without support, faculty may withdraw. Long-term, POS improves career satisfaction, retention, and reduces burnout, especially for women, by providing growth opportunities. It boosts optimism and institutional growth (Kinman & Wray, 2018). Lack of support increases attrition among women, mainly mid-career with higher workloads. POS enhances academic quality, student satisfaction, and fosters engagement and collaboration,

promoting institutional excellence. It reduces gender stressors and promotes autonomy, recognition, and belonging, creating healthier, resilient faculty environments supporting long-term success.

5. WORK ENGAGEMENT (WE) AND JOB PERFORMANCE (JP) OF WOMEN FACULTY IN THE HIGHER EDUCATION SECTOR

Work engagement (WE) and job performance (JP) are vital in organizational and higher education contexts, especially for women faculty due to unique duties and gendered expectations (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012). WE, a positive state of energy, dedication, and absorption, reflects enthusiasm for academic activities (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). JP involves core duties and extra roles like mentoring and service (Campbell & Wiernik, 2015). Women face emotional labor, biases, and workload disparities, affecting engagement. Supportive environments, equitable policies, and transparency foster high WE and JP (Airini et al., 2011). Autonomy, meaningful work, and institutional climate impact engagement; toxic cultures diminish it. Vigor, critical for long hours and societal demands, needs policies like flexible schedules and leadership support (Sabharwal & Corley, 2009). Dedication can lead to burnout if unrewarded; fair recognition is key (Kinman & Wray, 2018). Absorption enhances research, especially with protected time and resources (Aiston & Jung, 2015). Engagement improves teaching and mentoring but risks burnout if duties are unbalanced. Overemphasis on publications can disadvantage women with service roles; inclusive evaluations that recognize mentoring and service are needed (Ceci et al., 2014). Fair leadership and supportive policies improve engagement and JP, with engagement mediating these outcomes (Saks, 2006). Overall, fostering positive, gender-sensitive environments promotes women's success, balance, and creativity in academia.

6. INTERRELATIONSHIPS AMONG OCB, POS, WE, AND JP

Understanding links among Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Perceived Organizational Support (POS), Work Engagement (WE), and Job Performance (JP) explains how women faculty in higher education function, excel, and contribute. These four constructs—each important—form a dynamic system influencing motivation, well-being, and behavior (Organ, 1988; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Schaufeli et al., 2002). For women in Karnataka's institutions, supportive environments and positive behaviors promote success. OCB involves voluntary actions beyond duties that improve organizational functioning (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2000). In academia, these include mentoring, committee work, supporting accreditation, and community engagement, often driven by dedication, ethics, and gendered expectations (Kidder, 2002; Heilman & Chen, 2005). Though unrecognized formally, these efforts impact institutional climate and success. Perceived Organizational Support (POS) is faculty's belief that their institution values their work (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), influenced by leadership, fairness, recognition, workload, and professional development. For women faculty, POS helps mitigate gender bias, service loads, and work–life pressures (Caesens et al., 2017). High POS fosters positive attitudes, emotional bonds, and extra effort. Work engagement is a positive mental state of energy, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Bakker et al., 2008), with engaged faculty showing enthusiasm and involvement in teaching, research, and service. Engagement helps women manage challenges, stay resilient, and find meaning. In higher education, engagement links to performance and commitment (Saks, 2006). Job performance includes in-role tasks like teaching and research, plus extra-role activities such as mentoring (Campbell & Wiernik, 2015). Women with heavier loads succeed when supported. The relationships among OCB, POS, WE, and JP are cyclical, driven by reciprocity norms (Blau, 1964). Strong organizational support fosters OCB, reinforcing POS, which mediates between OCB and engagement, promoting fulfillment, vigor, and absorption (Caesens & Stinglhamber, 2014). Supportive, fair environments allow women to excel despite hurdles. Engagement enhances job performance, fostering identity and resilience. OCB promotes cooperation, stability, and student satisfaction without formal rewards (Podsakoff et al., 2009). Engagement mediates support's impact on performance (Saks, 2006). Overall, these elements form a dynamic system where support boosts engagement, leading to better performance and sustained effort, emphasizing the importance of supportive leadership, fair policies, and recognition for an inclusive, high-performing academia.

7. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This framework views Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) as a key driver causing three outcomes—Perceived Organizational Support (POS), Work Engagement (WE), and Job Performance (JP)—for women faculty. Unlike chain models, it treats OCB as a resource that directly influences perceptions, motivation, and performance, supported by evidence that discretionary behaviours can produce multiple organizational effects in relational environments like academia.

Rationale for positioning OCB as the primary driver

OCB includes voluntary behaviours like altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy, and sportsmanship, demonstrating dedication to institutional goals and colleagues. In academia, these are seen in mentoring students, volunteering for accreditation, supporting peers, and contributing to initiatives. For women faculty, who often take on more relational and service roles, OCB is more than behaviour, it's a resource shaping how others view their intentions, skills, and alignment with the institution. As both enacted and observed, OCB can influence perceptions (POS), boost psychological well-being (WE), and impact role outcomes (JP).

OCB → POS: Behaviour shaping perception of support

The OCB→POS pathway depends on reciprocity and visibility. When women faculty engage in citizenship behaviours, they promote social exchanges and foster cooperation. Observers—like department heads, peers,

and committees—may respond with recognition, invitations, or resource sharing. Even before formal reciprocation, contributing signals an unspoken expectation of support: colleagues and leaders view OCB as a sign of commitment and are more likely to support. Being recognized as a contributor often leads to feedback or gestures—such as affirmation, mentoring, or inclusion—that boost perceived organizational support (POS). In academic settings, where relational recognition matters, OCB acts as a catalyst for increased POS.

OCB → WE: Behaviour fuelling psychological engagement

The link from OCB to WE highlights that engaging in citizenship behaviours is fulfilling and meaningful. For women faculty, activities like mentoring and committee work affirm their identity and effectiveness. This creates a positive feedback loop: prosocial acts lead to feelings of meaning and competence, boosting energy, vigor, dedication, and absorption—elements of work engagement. Unlike models where POS mediates, this shows that citizenship behaviours can directly increase intrinsic motivation and engagement, even without organizational support.

OCB → JP: Behaviour translating into performance

OCB often improves job performance through activities such as mentoring students and participating on committees, thereby enhancing teaching, administration, and research collaboration. For women faculty, whose tasks include student development and departmental duties, OCB is particularly vital: it boosts social environment and yields tangible benefits.

Theoretical Foundations Supporting the Model

Several theoretical perspectives support conceptualizing direct paths from OCB to distinct outcomes:

Social Exchange Theory (SET) explains how OCB fosters workplace relationships through reciprocal acts that boost support, trust, and performance. It emphasizes that positive actions, like women faculty volunteering, lead to recognition, increased Perceived Organizational Support (POS), and deeper connections, enhancing Work Engagement (WE). Such exchanges improve collaboration, information flow, and job outcomes, especially for marginalized faculty. SET thus links OCB with improved support, engagement, and performance.

Organizational Support Theory:

This theory states prosocial actions boost motivation by enhancing autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Organizational Support Theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986) suggests employees develop beliefs about how much their organization values them and cares for their well-being. POS impacts motivation, commitment, and performance. While OST sees POS as leading to OCB, OCB can also influence POS, supported by theory. Female faculty often get positive feedback, recognition, mentorship, trust, or involvement, reflecting organizational care that boosts POS. OCB's visibility attracts supervisory support. OST indicates POS fosters engagement by increasing safety and reducing burnout. Faculty perceiving support through OCB feel more connected. OCB influences engagement directly and via support. OST states support improves performance; higher POS from OCB motivates effort in teaching, research, and service, and provides resources like roles and leadership opportunities, enhancing performance. Women often do invisible labour; recognition and support from OCB reinforce well-being, address gendered workloads, and improve performance.

Self-Determination Theory (SDT)

These frameworks show how prosocial actions boost intrinsic motivation and engagement by supporting autonomy, competence, and relatedness. According to Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), motivation results from fulfilling these needs. When met, people feel more motivated and engaged. Fulfilled needs promote intrinsic motivation, which enhances work engagement. Female faculty, who often prioritize relational and mentoring roles, may experience even stronger engagement through SDT when participating in OCB. SDT associates intrinsic motivation with increased persistence, creativity, and performance. When OCB boosts autonomy, competence, and relatedness—elements closely linked to perceived support—it leads to improved job performance in teaching, mentoring, research, and service. Although POS is not a traditional SDT term, relatedness, a key psychological need, connects to perceived support. Strengthening relationships via OCB with colleagues and administrators enhances perceived organizational care, thereby increasing POS.

8. GAPS IN EXISTING LITERATURE

Despite extensive research on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB), Perceived Organizational Support (POS), Work Engagement (WE), and Job Performance (JP), gaps exist, especially regarding women faculty in higher education. A key gap is the limited focus on OCB as a predictor of multiple outcomes. Most studies analyze these constructs separately or with POS or WE as mediators—often overlooking that OCB can influence POS, WE, and JP simultaneously. This fragmented view hampers understanding of how discretionary behaviors impact outcomes, especially in academia where relational and citizenship behaviors are vital (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2009). Another gap is the lack of gender-specific research. Most studies use gender-neutral frameworks ignoring women's unique experiences (Kidder, 2002; Heilman & Chen, 2005). Women faculty often perform more service, mentoring, and emotional labor—forms of OCB that are essential yet undervalued (Misra et al., 2011). Few studies disaggregate data by gender, limiting insights into how OCB affects POS, engagement, and performance for women, despite evidence that their citizenship behaviors are assessed less favorably (Heilman & Chen, 2005). Most research also focuses on Western or corporate contexts, with limited studies on higher education in developing countries like India (Bakker et al., 2008; Saks, 2006). Indian academic institutions face unique cultural and institutional influences, and few region-specific studies hinder model applicability. Lastly, recognition of OCB is underexplored. Although voluntary and often

unrewarded, little is known about how acknowledgment affects POS, engagement, and performance (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Caesens & Stinglhamber, 2014). For women faculty, efforts may go unrecognized, weakening the social exchange cycle. This highlights the need for research on how institutional recognition impacts OCB's effects on perceptions and engagement. In summary, current research lacks integrated approaches that treat OCB as a predictor of multiple outcomes, consider gender and regional contexts, and address visibility and recognition. Addressing these gaps is essential for understanding how OCB influences POS, WE, and JP among women faculty in higher education.

9. PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

The model has key implications for higher education institutions seeking to leverage OCB to improve faculty outcomes and institutional performance. Recognizing and rewarding OCB is vital, especially since women faculty often undertake additional tasks like service, mentoring, and administrative work that are rarely formally acknowledged. Institutions should create mechanisms such as service credits, adjusted workloads, or awards to encourage these efforts, which boosts support and motivation. Transparent workload management and fair distribution are crucial to prevent overburdening, with policies promoting fairness and reducing burnout. Providing feedback and fostering a culture of appreciation can enhance OCB's positive effects by making faculty efforts valued. Leadership development should focus on supporting discretionary contributions and making informal acts visible and recognized in decisions and promotions. Establishing mentoring, flexible schedules, and wellness programs can maintain OCB benefits, increase job satisfaction, and improve retention. Systematically integrating OCB into policies helps foster environments that support, recognize, and utilize discretionary behaviours to boost effectiveness, benefiting women faculty, academic performance, student success, and institutional resilience.

10. DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The proposed framework suggests future research. First, studies should explore how Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) affects Perceived Organizational Support (POS), Work Engagement (WE), and Job Performance (JP) using longitudinal and multi-level designs. Longitudinal studies assess if effects last or change over time, and multi-level analysis clarifies departmental or organizational influences. Second, research should identify moderating factors like institutional type, disciplinary differences, employment status, and leadership support. Gender-specific moderators are also vital, as women faculty may face different recognition and workload, impacting the benefits of citizenship behaviours. Qualitative and mixed methods offer deeper insights into women's experiences, such as invisible labour, mentorship, and emotional impacts of discretionary behaviour. These methods complement quantitative research, explaining how OCB influences perceptions, engagement, and performance. Examining institutional recognition systems can inform policy.

Cross-cultural studies in emerging economies like India are key to understanding how local contexts shape these dynamics. Comparing higher education systems reveals if norms, governance, or culture influence OCB practices. These paths aim to refine theories, improve measurement tools, and develop strategies to support women faculty.

11. CONCLUSION

This paper presents a framework positioning Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) as a key predictor directly influencing Perceived Organizational Support (POS), Work Engagement (WE), and Job Performance (JP) among women faculty. Drawing from Social Exchange Theory, Organizational Support Theory, Self-Determination Theory, and Role Theory, it explains how discretionary behaviours impact perceptions, motivation, and performance. The paper highlights research gaps, including limited focus on women faculty, effects of OCB across dimensions, regional contexts like Karnataka, and visibility of extra-role behaviours. Theoretical implications show the link between faculty actions and organizational responses, while practical suggestions include recognition, equitable workload, mentorship, and supportive policies. This framework guides future research and offers actionable insights to create a supportive, engaging, and high-performing environment for women faculty, ultimately enhancing well-being, engagement, and organizational effectiveness in higher education.

.. REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, U. A., & Gupta, V. (2018). Examining the nature and consequences of work engagement: A review of literature. International Journal of Commerce and Management Research, 4(2), 7–13.
2. Airini, C., Conner, L., McPherson, K., Midson, B., & Wilson, C. (2011). Learning to be leaders in higher education: What helps or hinders women's advancement as leaders in universities. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 39(1), 44–62.
3. Aiston, S. J., & Jung, J. (2015). Women academics and research productivity: An international comparison. Gender and Education, 27(3), 205–220.
4. Aithal, A., & Aithal, P. S. (2019). Academic performance and role of faculty in higher education institutions: A review. International Journal of Applied Engineering and Management Letters, 3(2), 1–19.
5. Altbach, P. G. (2015). Global perspectives on higher education. Johns Hopkins University Press.
6. Bagilhole, B., & White, K. (2011). Gender, power and management: A cross-cultural analysis of higher education. Palgrave Macmillan.
7. Bakker, A. B., & Bal, P. M. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83(1), 189–206.
8. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3), 309–328.

9. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. Career Development International, 13(3), 209–223.

10. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. Career Development International, 13(3), 209–223. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430810870476

11. Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. Work & Stress, 22(3), 187–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802393649

12. Barkhuizen, N., & Rothmann, S. (2008). Occupational stress of academic staff in South African higher education institutions. South African Journal of Psychology, 38(2), 321–336.

13. Bhopal, K. (2020). White privilege: The myth of a post-racial society. Policy Press.

14. Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. John Wiley & Sons.

15. Bolino, M. C., Hsiung, H. H., Harvey, J., & LePine, J. A. (2013). "Well, I'm tired of tryin'!" Organizational citizenship behavior and citizenship fatigue. Journal of Applied Psychology, 100(1), 56–74.

16. Brough, P., & Pears, J. (2004). Evaluating the influence of the type of social support on job satisfaction and work-related psychological well-being. International Journal of Organizational Behavior, 7(2), 54–64.

17. Caesens, G., & Stinglhamber, F. (2014). The relationship between perceived organizational support and work engagement: The role of self-efficacy and its outcomes. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 23(6), 889–903. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2013.800570

18. Caesens, G., Stinglhamber, F., Demoulin, S., De Wilde, M., & Mierop, A. (2017). Perceived organizational support and well-being: A review of literature and directions for future research. Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science, 18(2), 134–148. https://doi.org/10.1080/1463922X.2016.1178134

19. Campbell, J. P., & Wiernik, B. M. (2015). The modeling and assessment of work performance. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 2, 47–74. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111427

20. Ceci, S. J., Ginther, D. K., Kahn, S., & Williams, W. M. (2014). Women in academic science: A changing landscape. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 15(3), 75–141.

21. Eagly, A. H., & Heilman, M. E. (2016). Gender and leadership: Introduction to the special issue. Leadership Quarterly, 27(3), 349–353.

22. Eisenberger, R., & Stinglhamber, F. (2011). Perceived organizational support: Fostering enthusiastic and productive employees. American Psychological Association.

23. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(3), 500–507. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500

24. Guarino, C. M., & Borden, V. M. H. (2017). Faculty service loads and gender: Are women taking care of the academic family? Research in Higher Education, 58(6), 672–694.

25. Gupta, N., & Sharma, A. (2021). Women in Indian higher education: Prospects and challenges. Journal of Educational Planning and Administration, 35(2), 123–139.

26. Heilman, M. E., & Chen, J. J. (2005). Same behavior, different consequences: Reactions to men's and women's altruistic citizenship behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 90(3), 431–441. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.431

27. Hochschild, A. R., & Machung, A. (2012). The second shift: Working families and the revolution at home. Penguin Books.

28. Htun, M., & Weldon, S. L. (2021). The effect of COVID-19 on women's academic productivity. Gender & Society, 35(4), 583–597.

29. Kidder, D. L. (2002). The influence of gender on the performance of organizational citizenship behaviors. Journal of Management, 28(5), 629–648. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630202800504

30. Kinman, G., & Wray, S. (2018). Work-related well-being in UK higher education: A scoping study. University and College Union.

31. https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/9706/Work-related-well-being-in-HE/pdf/ucu_hewellbeing_jul18.pdf

32. Macfarlane, B. (2007). The academic citizen: The virtue of service in university life. Routledge.

33. Mathew, A., & Prakash, A. (2017). Academic work culture in private higher education institutions in India: Workload, expectations, and challenges. Higher Education Review, 49(3), 55–70.

34. Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., Holmes, E., & Agiomavritis, S. (2011). The ivory ceiling of service work. Academe, 97(1), 22–26.

35. Morley, L. (2013). The rules of the game: Women and the academic profession. Routledge.

36. Nagasundari, R., & Rao, M. (2018). Women in higher education leadership in Karnataka: An institutional analysis. Indian Journal of Gender Studies, 25(1), 87–104.

37. O'Connor, P. (2020). Why is it so difficult to reduce gender inequality in male-dominated higher education? Gender and Education, 32(4), 509–527.

38. Oplatka, I. (2009). Organizational citizenship behavior in teaching: The consequences for teachers, students, and the school. International Journal of Educational Management, 23(5), 375–389.

39. Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington Books.

40. Paillé, P. (2009). Assessing organizational citizenship behavior in the French context: Evidence for the four-dimensional model. Journal of Psychology, 143(2), 133–146.

41. Pereira, M. (2018). Power, knowledge and feminist scholarship: An ethnography of academia. Routledge.

42. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J.

B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature. Journal of Management, 26(3), 513–563.

43. Podsakoff, P. M., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, N. P., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(1), 122–141. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013079

44. Rao, S. (2020). Women in Indian academia: Challenges and opportunities. Journal of Higher Education Research, 43(2), 55–70.

45. Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(4), 698–714.

46. Sabharwal, M., & Corley, E. A. (2009). Faculty job satisfaction across gender and discipline. Social Science Journal, 46(3), 539–556.

47. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21(7), 600–619.

48. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25(3), 293–315.

49. Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. Journal of Happiness Studies, 3, 71–92. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326

50. Settles, I. H., Rodgers, A. J., & Montgomery, G. M. (2019). Overcoming the ivory ceiling: Identity work and justice in academia. Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 12(3), 251–264.

51. Shaw, A., & Stanton, S. (2012). Leaks in the academic pipeline: Gender differences in research productivity and career advancement. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 34(3), 233–245.

52. Somech, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2004). Exploring organizational citizenship behavior from an organizational perspective: The relationship between organizational learning and OCB. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77(3), 281–298.

53. Sprague, J., & Massoni, K. (2005). Student evaluations and gendered expectations: What we can't count can hurt us. Sex Roles, 53(11–12), 779–793.

54. Ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). A resource perspective on the work–home interface: The work–home resources model. American Psychologist, 67(7), 545–556.

55. Thomas, R., & Davies, A. (2002). Gender and new public management: Reconstituting academic subjectivities. Gender, Work & Organization, 9(4), 372–397.

56. Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2012). Academic motherhood: How faculty manage work and family. Rutgers University Press.

57. Winefield, A. H., Gillespie, N., Stough, C., Dua, J., Hapuarachchi, J., & Boyd, C. (2003). Occupational stress in Australian university staff: Results from a national survey. International Journal of Stress Management, 10(1), 51–63