



## Can organizational citizenship behavior affect the work performance and work ethics of employees?

Damianus Abun: Professor, Graduate School of Business and Management, Divine Word College of Laoag.

Theogenia Magallanes: President, Saint Benedict College of Northern Luzon, Philippines.

Jecel M. Mansueto: Instructor, Saint Benedict College of Northern Luzon, Philippines.

Mary Micah Sallong: Instructor, Saint Benedict College of Northern Luzon, Philippines.

Abigail Eliot: Instructor, Saint Benedict College of Northern Luzon, Philippines.

### ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received June 01, 2024

Received in rev. form. July 15, 2024

Accepted: August 20, 2024

**Keywords:** *organizational citizenship behavior, work performance, work ethics. OCBO, OCBP.*

JEL Classification: M:12

### ABSTRACT

The study aimed to examine the influence of organizational citizenship on employee work performance and work ethics. To deepen the understanding of the study, the literature was reviewed. The study employed a descriptive assessment and a correlational research design. The population consisted of all employees of the institution where the study was conducted. Data were collected using research questionnaires, and inferential statistics were used for analysis. Specifically, the weighted mean and Analysis of Variance were utilized. The study found that organizational citizenship behavior, work performance, and work ethics among employees were high. Overall, there was no correlation between organizational citizenship behavior and work performance or work ethics. However, when considered individually, there was a correlation between organizational citizenship behavior and work ethics, particularly regarding employees' moral attitudes toward work. In other words, organizational citizenship behavior enhances work ethics, including employees' moral attitudes toward their work.

© 2024 by the authors. Licensee DWIJMH. This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>)

## Introduction

Managing an organization to achieve its vision and mission requires more than just job knowledge and hard skills. While knowledge and hard skills are essential for performing a job, they are not the only factors in achieving organizational objectives; employees' behavior also plays a crucial role. Knowledge and hard skills should be complemented by positive behavior. Studies have shown that improving organizational performance involves not only updating employees' knowledge and hard skills but also enhancing their organizational citizenship behavior

(Lilly, 2016; Notanubun, 2021). Employees are encouraged to engage in activities that benefit the organization and their colleagues, even if these activities are not part of their formal job descriptions (Lilly, 2016). A well-functioning organization will promote behaviors that directly benefit both the organization and the people around them. This should be a key concern for management. Therefore, management must devise policies that promote such behavior and minimize counterproductive

work behavior. Reducing counterproductive work behavior can be achieved by fostering a positive attitude toward work, enhancing work motivation, and improving moral attitudes toward work.

Studies examining the interplay of organizational citizenship behavior, work performance, and work ethics within the school context are relatively rare. While there is research on this topic in other industries, it is limited within educational institutions. The current study aims to explore the role of organizational citizenship behavior in motivating employees to perform their jobs and adhere to work ethics. Work performance encompasses both task performance and contextual performance. Task performance involves the knowledge and skills related to the specific tasks performed, while contextual performance refers to positive behaviors that support overall performance. Work ethics pertain to employees' attitudes toward work, their moral attitudes, and their work motivation.

The results of the study are intended to provide management with scientific evidence on how to improve organizational performance. Addressing organizational citizenship behavior, individual work performance, and work ethics are crucial areas for management to focus on. Training and development should not only update employees' knowledge and hard skills related to current technology but also enhance their positive behavior and work ethics. Ignoring these aspects may hinder efforts to reduce counterproductive work behavior, which can deteriorate organizational performance over time.

The study is divided into several sections, including an introduction, literature review, research methodology, data presentation and analysis, discussion, and conclusion.

## ***Literature review***

### ***Overview of organizational citizenship behavior***

The concept of organizational citizenship behavior originates from political philosophy. The term “citizenship” is derived from political philosophy and related disciplines (Graham, 1991). According to Graham (1991), based on Aristotle (1941), Cary (1977), and Inkeles (1969), citizenship involves organizational equivalents of citizens' responsibilities, which fall into three categories: obedience, loyalty, and political participation. Accordingly, citizenship behavior and citizenship responsibilities are synonymous (Graham, 1991). Obedience requires respect for organizational structures and processes. Loyalty extends beyond mere compliance, requiring attention to others' interests, the organization as a whole, and its values. This behavior includes uncompensated contributions, protecting or enhancing the organization's reputation, and cooperating with others for common interests. Participation refers to engaging in organizational governance. Aristotle argued that a good citizen should both rule and obey. Thus, a good citizen should participate in implementing and changing laws to meet new demands. As a result, citizenship behavior includes dedicating time and effort to governance responsibilities, sharing information, and discussing social issues affecting the organization (Graham, 1991). These three categories are applied in organizational settings, where Inkeles (1969) classifies them as organizational obedience, organizational loyalty, and organizational participation. Organizational obedience involves adhering to structures, job descriptions, and policies, including punctuality, task completion, and stewardship of resources. Organizational loyalty means identifying with leaders and the organization, defending it, contributing to its reputation, and cooperating for common goals. Organizational participation requires showing interest in governance, attending non-required meetings, sharing ideas, and supporting unpopular views to counteract groupthink (Inkeles, 1969).

Researchers have sought to define organizational citizenship behavior based on the political philosophy concept. Early definitions of organizational citizenship behavior, as described by Bateman & Organ (1983) and Smith, Organ, & Near (1983), involve behaviors beyond role requirements that benefit the organization. This aligns with the concepts of obedience, loyalty, and participation. Katz (1964) identified three basic behaviors crucial for organizational functioning: remaining within the system, dependable role performance, and innovative activity beyond job descriptions. Katz (1964), as cited by Smith et al. (1983), argued that organizations rely on cooperation, helpfulness, suggestions, and altruism, which are products of informal organizations and sentiment (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1964).

Since the concept's introduction, efforts have focused on identifying common dimensions of organizational citizenship

behavior. Recent research emphasizes loyalty and participation over obedience (Graham, 1991; Inkeles, 1969). According to Organ and Ryan (1995), these behaviors extend beyond rules and job descriptions. Early research by Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) and Bateman and Organ (1983) identified altruism and general compliance as dimensions. Organ (1988) and Wang et al. (2013), as cited by Abun et al. (2021), identified five dimensions: conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, and altruism. Sportsmanship involves maintaining a positive view despite problems (Wang et al., 2013, cited by Abun et al., 2021). Conscientiousness reflects care for others (Psychologist World, n.d., cited by Abun et al., 2021). Civic virtue includes participation in organizational activities and attention to issues (Organ, 1988; Abun et al., 2021). Courtesy involves politeness and consideration (Organ, 1988). Altruism is about selflessly helping others (Organ, 1988). Podsakoff et al. (2000) identified seven dimensions: helping behaviors, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and self-development. Fox and Spector (2002) summarized these dimensions into one, altruistic behavior, which encompasses behaviors that help both individuals and the organization.

### ***Individual work performance***

Individual work performance is a major concern for management because organizational success depends on it. Therefore, management must regularly monitor and evaluate employee performance to detect deviations from stated objectives as early as possible. Regular or real-time performance evaluations should determine whether employees are fulfilling their tasks and contributing to organizational goals (Armstrong, 2015; Murphy, 2019). However, scholars lack consensus on the dimensions of performance to evaluate due to varying definitions of individual work performance (Dallas, 2005). This lack of consensus leads to confusion about which dimensions should be measured. Different scholars present overlapping elements in their definitions. Motowidlo (2003) defines job performance as “the total expected value to the organization of the discrete behavioral episode that an individual carries out over a specified period.” His definition refers to performance as the output of behavioral activities performed by employees to achieve organizational goals. This view is reinforced by Gulino (2022) and Turanlıgil (2019), who also define work performance as the output of behavioral activities.

Recent scholars agree with the earlier definitions provided by Campbell (1990), who defined individual work performance as behaviors relevant to organizational goals. According to Campbell (1990), work performance focuses on behaviors rather than outcomes. This perspective influenced recent scholars such as Kasemsap (2016), who defined work performance as the execution of work-related activities, and Ahmad (2011), who described it as workers' ability to perform their jobs. Karapinar (2017) defined work performance as "an appraisal report indicating how well an employee fulfills expected job activities." These definitions emphasize that work performance is about behavior rather than outcomes, which are beyond employees' control (Campbell, 2013b). These definitions apply to various occupations and are limited to behavioral dimensions.

From Campbell's (1990) and other definitions, it is clear that work performance dimensions should focus on behavior rather than outcomes. However, the question remains: what constitutes work performance? It needs to be identified for measurement (Viswesvaran, 2002). Campbell's initial effort in the 1980s identified five dimensions of work performance in the military: physical fitness, military bearing, technical performance, peer leadership, supervisory leadership, extra effort/initiative, and personal discipline. While only one dimension is specific to military work, others are applicable across different roles. Later, Campbell et al. (1993) expanded these to eight dimensions: job-specific technical proficiency, non-job-specific technical proficiency, communication, demonstrated effort and initiative, personal discipline, facilitating peer and team performance, supervision/leadership, and management/administration. Inspired by Campbell (1990), Borman and Motowidlo (1993, 1997) simplified these to two dimensions: task performance and contextual performance. Task performance pertains to core job tasks, while contextual performance involves activities that support the organization but are not part of the core job. Organ (1988) suggested adding organizational citizenship behavior as a dimension. To further represent work performance, Bennett & Robinson (2000), Berry et al. (2007), Gruys & Sackett (2003), and Dallas (2005) introduced counterproductive work behavior. Koopmans et al. (2011) summarized work performance into three components: task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior. Koopmans et al. (2014) later added adaptive performance. This paper focuses on the three dimensions proposed by Koopmans et al. (2011), excluding adaptive performance, as these dimensions are deemed relevant for the current

investigation.

Borman & Motowidlo (1993), as cited by Silong et al. (2013), defined task performance as “the effectiveness with which job incumbents carry out activities that contribute to the organization’s ‘technical core,’” either directly through technical processes or indirectly by providing needed materials or services. This definition highlights competency and expertise in performing job functions effectively (Harrison, Newman, & Roth, 2006), also referred to as task proficiency or the technical core (Campbell, 1990). These behaviors directly affect task completion and contribute to the organization’s technical core, requiring basic knowledge and skills.

Doğru (2019) defined contextual performance as “the degree to which an employee behaves positively, including volunteering for extra duties, helping coworkers, and cooperating with them with the expectation of a reward.” Organ (1988) considered these behaviors as organizational citizenship behavior, which goes beyond job descriptions and main duties to enhance the organizational environment and support task performance. While not required, these behaviors are crucial for performing main tasks. Studies show that contextual performance relates to task performance (Diaz-Vilela et al., 2015) and effectiveness (Griffin et al., 2001).

Fox and Spector (2005) defined counterproductive work behavior as negative behaviors that hinder the organization’s objectives and harm others in the organization. These behaviors target both the organization and individuals (Robinson & Bennett, 1995) and include abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal (Spector et al., 2006, as cited by Ispas & Borman, 2015). In workgroups, counterproductive work behavior (CWB) may involve laissez-faire attitudes, violating group norms, damaging relationships, and imposing personal values (Braun & Hentschel, 2015). The main goal of CWB is to prevent the organization from achieving its objectives by consciously undermining performance with hidden motives.

### ***The philosophy of work***

The concept of work ethics is better understood through the philosophy of work, as work ethics relates closely to one’s attitude toward work and how we view it. Thus, this section explores the definition of work and various philosophical perspectives on it. Dictionaries offer a basic understanding of work, which will later be connected to different philosophical views. Dictionary.com, originating from Oxford Languages, defines work as “activity involving mental or physical effort done to achieve a purpose or result.” Similarly, the Free Dictionary defines work as “physical or mental effort or activity directed toward the production or accomplishment of something.” These definitions highlight that work involves both physical and mental activities, including tasks that do not require physical movement but still lead to certain objectives or results. Britannica (2023) also emphasizes physical and mental activity aimed at achieving desired outcomes (Britannica, 2023). However, these definitions do not specify the purposes of work, allowing us to explore various philosophical perspectives on its purpose.

Different authors and philosophers offer varied views on the purpose of work. Plato’s concept provides insights into the significance of work, how people should work, and why they work. Plato classified citizens based on their natural abilities and assigned work according to their capabilities to contribute to the welfare of the city-state (Cholbi, 2022). According to Plato, all citizens must work to support the city-state. His approach suggests that work is essential for both social and personal improvement. Plato’s view implies that work serves as an instrument for social change and personal development, contributing to societal progress and individual fulfillment (Ward & King, 2017). However, this view is challenged by totalitarianism and capitalism. Totalitarianism asserts that work is for the good of the community or state, while capitalism suggests work is for private gain, allowing individuals the choice to work or not (Little, 1948). Under these systems, a person’s worth is measured by their contribution to the state or the wealth they accumulate. In totalitarianism and capitalism, workers are often seen as slaves to their roles or wage slaves, with work viewed merely as a means of survival (Richard, 1998).

Conflicting views on work lead to unnatural working conditions and job dissatisfaction. Viewing work solely as a means of earning a paycheck or accumulating wealth can lead to a misconception about employee motivation. Schwartz (2022)

argues that seeing work merely as a source of income is misleading, as it overlooks why people engage in their work. Management often erroneously assumes that employees are motivated solely by pay, leading to ineffective practices (Nesterak, 2022). Little (1948) offers a more nuanced perspective, defining work in two senses: as manual labor and as deliberate production aimed at changing matter. Manual labor involves direct physical alteration of matter, while deliberate production involves creating goods or experiences valued by others (Cholbi, 2022). This broader view encompasses both physical and mental efforts that lead to valuable outputs.

Little (1948) also argues that work is not only for community or state benefit or to earn a living but for personal fulfillment, as work is part of human nature. According to Little, work perfects one's nature by contributing positively to the material world. This perspective highlights that work is a central life interest and a source of personal satisfaction (Sharma & Rai, 2015). Work is seen as inherently valuable, with the worker finding contentment in performing a good job, regardless of external rewards.

Little's (1948) concept contrasts with the contemporary view of work, which often equates work with employment and financial compensation. The modern focus on work as a means to earn a paycheck undermines other forms of work not directly related to financial gain. Many individuals work not for monetary reasons but for personal satisfaction. The value of work should not be determined solely by its exchange value but by its intrinsic value (Cholbi, 2022). Aristotle, as cited by Clark (2017), argued that the value of work is tied to human rationality. Work is an exercise of rationality, allowing individuals to perfect themselves and develop their rational abilities through their labor (Elster, 1989; Sayers, 2005).

### ***The concept of work ethics***

Understanding the philosophy of work helps in comprehending work ethics. Philosophically, work is not merely an obligation to society or a means to earn a living but a pathway to self-perfection. According to philosophy, work and man are inseparable; work is integral to human nature (Little, 1948). Work should not be associated solely with employment or earning a living but recognized as an essential aspect of human life. Emerging from this philosophical view, work ethics have been defined differently by various researchers with differing emphases. Bazy (2018) defines work ethics as "an individual's attitude toward work and effortful activities." This definition lacks clarity on the nature of attitudes toward work and the purpose of effortful activities. Bouma (1973) and Nelson (1973) define work ethics as a belief in the value and importance of work for its own sake, aligning with the philosophy that work is an inherent part of human nature. In contrast, Lessnoff (1994) describes work ethic as a "complete and relentless devotion to one's economic role on earth," suggesting that work fulfills the "homo economicus" nature of humans (Petrovic, 2008). The theory of homo economicus posits that humans are rational beings who pursue wealth for self-interest (Efeoğlu & Çalışkan, 2018). This view may not necessarily contradict the philosophy of work as a means of self-perfection, as rational power aims to transform matter into valuable goods (Cholbi, 2022). It implies that humans are creative beings who realize their nature through creativity, activity, or work (Petrovic, 2008).

Numerous studies have examined the effects of work ethics on outcomes. Bazy (2016) noted that a strong work ethic, particularly hard work, is associated with success. This finding aligns with Mudrack (1997), who found that individuals with strong work ethics are generally more committed, satisfied, and engaged in their jobs. Marri et al. (2012) also observed that work ethics significantly correlate with organizational commitment and turnover intention. Similar results are reported by Ud Din et al. (2019), Athar et al. (2016), Udin et al. (2022), Aflah et al. (2021), Salahuddin (2011), and Salahudin et al. (2016), indicating that work ethic influences job performance, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

Conflicts between the philosophy of work and work ethics complicate the measurement of work ethics. Researchers disagree on whether work ethics should be viewed as a multidimensional or single-dimensional construct. Miller et al. (2002) argue that work ethics is a multidimensional construct composed of work-related activity, attitudes and beliefs, and motivation, reflecting behavior without specific job contexts or religious values. Bazy (2018) also sees work ethics as a multidimensional construct with two dimensions: hard work and self-reliance. Van Ness et al. (2010) identify seven dimensions: self-reliance, morality/ethics, leisure, hard work, the centrality of work, waste of time, and delay of gratification. However, Sharma and Rai (2015) reject multidimensional measures due to concerns about validity and religious

bias, proposing a single-dimensional construct composed of work centrality, a moral approach to work, and intrinsic work motivation. According to them, these three components are treated as a single dimension called the work ethics dimension. Sharma and Rai (2015) developed a 10-item work ethics scale that has undergone validity testing and is free of religious bias.

In the current study, we adopt the single-dimensional construct proposed by Sharma and Rai (2015) because it aligns with the philosophical view of work focusing on attitudes toward work. We use the 10-item Work Ethics Scale of Sharma and Rai (2015) due to its validated and non-religious nature.

## ***Research questions***

The study examined the interplay between organizational citizenship behavior, work performance and work ethics. It specifically answered the following questions:

1. *What is the organizational citizenship behavior of the employees in terms of:*
  - a. *OCBP*
  - b. *OCBO*
  
2. *What is the individual work performance of employees in terms of:*
  - a. *Task performance*
  - b. *Contextual work performance*
  
3. *What is the work ethics of employees?*
  
4. *Is there a relationship between OCB and work performance*
  
5. *Is there a relationship between OCB and work ethics*

## ***Hypothesis***

Studies have indicated that organizational citizenship behavior can improve organizational and individual work performance (Triani, et al., 2020; Yaakobi & Weisberg, 2020). The current study hypothesizes that organizational citizenship behavior and individual work performance predict employees' work ethics.

## ***Scope and delimitation***

The study focuses specifically on organizational citizenship behavior, individual work performance, and work ethics among employees of the institution. The population for this investigation is restricted to those currently employed by the institution.

## ***Research methodology***

The study employs a quantitative approach, utilizing both descriptive and correlational research designs. It is conducted at Divine Word College of Laoag, focusing on its employees. Data collection is achieved through questionnaires, and analysis involves descriptive and inferential statistics, including weighted mean and ANOVA. To facilitate data gathering, the researcher obtained permission from the President to distribute the questionnaires, which were collected via employee representatives. An ethical review was deemed unnecessary as the research does not address sensitive human issues. The following ranges of values, along with their descriptive interpretations, were used:

<b><i>Statistical Range</i></b>	<b><i>Descriptive Interpretation</i></b>
4.21-5.00	<i>Strongly Agree/Very High</i>
3.41-4.20	<i>Agree/High</i>

2.61-3.40	Somewhat Agree/Moderate
1.81-2.60	Disagree/Low
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree/Very Low

## Data presentation and analysis

The data are presented following the statement of the problems of the study.

**Problem 1. What is the organizational citizenship behavior of the employees in terms of:**

- a. OCBO
- b. OCBP

**Table 1. Organizational citizenship behavior of the employees (n=150)**

Organizational citizenship behavior	Weighted mean	Descriptive interpretation
<b>A. OCBO</b>		
1. Help new employees get oriented to the job	3.66	A/H
2. Offered suggestions to improve how work is done	3.65	A/H
3. Volunteered for extra work assignments	3.60	A/H
4. Said good things about your employer in front of others	3.64	A/H
5. Said good things about your school in the community outside the school	3.65	A/H
6. Give up meals and other breaks to complete the work	3.58	A/H
7. Offered suggestions for improving the work environment	3.66	A/H
8. Came in early or stay late without pay to complete a project or task	3.71	A/H
9. Volunteer to share new job knowledge or skills with other employees	3.63	A/H
Composite Mean	3.64	A/H
<b>B. OCBP</b>		
1. Lent a compassionate ear when someone has a work problem	3.72	A/H
2. Lent a compassionate ear when someone has a personal problem	3.75	A/H
3. Change vacation schedules, workdays, or shifts to accommodate co-workers' needs.	3.67	A/H
4. Help a less capable co-worker lift a heavy box or other objects	3.77	A/H
5. Went out of the way to give co-workers encouragement or express appreciation	3.72	A/H
6. Defended co-worker who was being 'put down' or spoken ill by other co-workers or supervisors	3.68	A/H
7. Help co-workers with personal matters such as sharing food or drinks	3.76	A/H
8. Lent money or personal property to a co-worker	3.66	A/H
Lent a compassionate ear when someone has a work problem	3.72	A/H
<b>OVERALL MEAN</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>A/H</b>

Source: Fox and Spector (2002).

Legend:

Range of Mean Values	Descriptive Interpretation
4.21 - 5.00	Strongly agree
3.41 - 4.20	Agree
2.61 - 3.40	Somewhat agree
1.81 - 2.60	Disagree
1.00 - 1.80	Strongly disagree

The data presented in the table reveals that employees' overall organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) received an

average rating of 3.68, interpreted as "agree/high." This suggests that employees' OCB is considered high, though not exceptionally so. Both dimensions of OCB—OCBO (behavior directed towards the organization) and OCBP (behavior directed towards individuals)—are rated consistently at this high level.

For OCBO, employees affirm their engagement in behaviors such as helping new employees acclimate to their roles, volunteering for additional assignments, dedicating extra time to complete tasks, and promoting the institution positively in the community. Similarly, for OCBP, employees express agreement with behaviors like offering a compassionate ear to coworkers facing work or personal issues, sacrificing their time to assist colleagues, supporting coworkers with personal matters, and defending them when they are criticized or spoken ill of.

Research indicates that strong organizational citizenship behavior can significantly benefit organizations by enhancing their adaptability to environmental changes, boosting morale, and fostering greater cohesion and a sense of belonging among employees, all of which contribute to improved organizational performance (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Maharani & Alwi, 2022; Triani et al., 2020; Allen & Rush, 1998). These findings underscore the importance of prioritizing and fostering organizational citizenship behavior in effective organizational management.

**Problem 2. What is the individual work performance of employees in terms of:**

- a. *Task performance*
- b. *Contextual work performance*

**Table 2. Work performance of the employees (n=150)**

Work performance		Weighted mean	Descriptive interpretation
<b>A. Task Performance</b>			
1.	I managed to plan my work so that it was done on time	4.10	A/H
2.	My planning was optimal	3.92	A/H
3.	I kept in mind the results that I had to achieve in my work	4.02	A/H
4.	I was able to separate main issues from side issues at work	4.09	A/H
5.	I knew how to set the right priorities	4.10	A/H
6.	I was able to perform my work well with minimal time and effort	3.94	A/H
<b>Composite Mean</b>		<b>4.03</b>	<b>A/H</b>
<b>B. Contextual Performance</b>			
1.	I took on extra responsibilities	4.08	A/H
2.	I started a new task myself when my old ones were finished	3.98	A/H
3.	I took on a challenging work task, when available	4.02	A/H
4.	I worked at keeping my job knowledge up-to-date	4.02	A/H
5.	I worked at keeping my job skills up-to-date	4.01	A/H
6.	I came up with creative solutions to new problems	4.04	A/H
7.	I kept looking for new challenges in my job	4.04	A/H
8.	I did more than was expected of me	4.00	A/H
9.	I actively participated in work meetings	4.02	A/H
10.	I actively look for ways to improve my performance at work	4.01	A/H
11.	I grasped opportunities when they presented themselves	3.92	A/H
12.	I knew how to solve difficult situations and setbacks quickly	3.86	A/H
<b>Composite Mean</b>		<b>4.00</b>	<b>A/H</b>
<b>OVERALL MEAN</b>		<b>4.02</b>	<b>A/H</b>

Source: Koopmans, et al. (2011).

The data in the table shows that employees' work performance received an overall mean rating of 4.02, categorized as "agree/high." This rating indicates that employees' work performance is high, though not exceptional or at a lower level. All dimensions of work performance are consistently rated high.

For task performance, employees agreed that they effectively planned and completed tasks on time, maintained focus, and achieved their objectives. Regarding contextual performance, employees affirmed their commitment by taking on additional responsibilities when primary tasks were completed, updating their job knowledge and skills independently, participating in meetings, and developing new solutions to existing problems.

Research supports the significance of both task and contextual performance. Veeraragavan and Arulkumar (2021) and Whiting et al. (2008) highlight that strong task performance enhances job satisfaction and overall employee performance. Additionally, Motowidlo and Schmit (1999) emphasize that contextual performance positively impacts organizational performance and contributes to the organization's culture and climate.

**Problem 3. What is the work ethics of employees?**

**Table 3. Work ethics of the employees (n=150)**

Work ethics	Weighted mean	Descriptive interpretation
<b>A. The ATW</b>		
1. I consider my occupational career to be one of the most important activities in my life	4.11	A/H
2. I believe that a person is known in society by the work he does	3.87	A/H
3. I believe that one's work provides the best source of achieving perfection in life.	4.08	A/H
4. Even if I don't have to work to earn a living, I would still prefer to continue working.	4.22	A/H
5. I believe that work provides a powerful channel to express one's knowledge, ability and creativity.	4.29	A/H
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>A/H</b>
<b>B. The MAW</b>		
1. Even in this fast-changing world, sincerity, hard work and integrity continue to be the golden keys to success in one's work life.	3.80	A/H
2. I feel a moral obligation to give a full day's work for a full day's pay.	4.12	A/H
3. I believe that one should never be last for work unless there is some real emergency	4.20	A/H
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>4.04</b>	<b>A/H</b>
<b>C. The Work Motivation (WM)</b>		
1. I believe that a job well done is a reward in itself	4.37	A/H
2. I welcome jobs that involve greater responsibility and challenge as they contribute to my learning and growth.	4.35	A/H
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>4.36</b>	<b>A/H</b>
<b>OVERALL MEAN</b>	<b>4.17</b>	<b>A/H</b>

Source: Sharma and Rai (2015).

The data in the table indicates that employees' work ethics received an overall mean rating of 4.17, categorized as "agree/high." This rating reflects that employees' work ethics are high, though not at an extreme level, and consistently

rated high across all dimensions.

In terms of attitude toward work, employees agreed that their work is meaningful, serving as a means for achieving life perfection and purpose beyond merely showcasing knowledge and skills. Regarding their moral attitude, employees affirmed that justice, sincerity, honesty, integrity, and hard work are essential for success in their professional lives. On work motivation, they believe that a job well done is its own reward and that taking on greater responsibilities facilitates personal growth and learning.

Research supports the importance of positive work ethics as a key factor in individual and organizational success (Bataineh, 2020; Abun et al., 2022; Aini et al., 2021; Runtu et al., 2019; Osibanjo et al., 2015).

**Problem 4. Is there a relationship between OCB and work performance**

**A. OCB and task performance**

Both OCBO and OCBP when taken together, could not significantly predict the employees’ task performance,  $F(2,147) = 0.221, p > .05$  with a .03 per cent overlap between the predictor variables (OCBO and OCBP) and the employees' task performance.

Therefore, the variations observed in the employees' task performance are not due to the differences in their OCBO and OCBP. The employees' task performance remains similar regardless of the differences in their OCBO and OCBP

**Table 4: OCB and task performance**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.055 <sup>a</sup>	.003	-.011	.64019

a. Predictors: (Constant), OCBO, OCBP

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	.181	2	.090	.221	.802 <sup>b</sup>
1 Residual	60.247	147	.410		
Total	60.428	149			

a. Dependent Variable: Task Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), OCBO, OCBP

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	3.846	.331		11.622	.000
1 OCBP	.077	.155	.073	.496	.621
1 OCBO	-.025	.151	-.025	-.166	.868

a. Dependent Variable: Task Performance

**B. OCB and contextual performance**

The dimensions of organizational citizenship such as OCBO and OCBP when taken together could not significantly predict the contextual performance of the employees,  $F(2, 147) = .335, p > .05$  with .05 percent overlap between the predictor and outcome variables.

Hence, the noted variations in the contextual performance of the employees are not due to the variations in their OCBO and OCBP. The employee’s contextual performance is similar regardless of the differences in their organizational citizenship behavior in terms of OCBO and OCBP.

**Table 5: OCB and contextual performance**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.067 <sup>a</sup>	.005	-.009	.65971

a. Predictors: (Constant), OCBO, OCBP

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	.291	2	.146	.335	.716 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	63.977	147	.435		
Total	64.268	149			

a. Dependent Variable: Contextual Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), OCBO, OCBP

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	3.901	.341		11.438	.000
OCBP	-.101	.159	-.094	-.633	.528
OCBO	.127	.156	.121	.814	.417

a. Dependent Variable: Contextual Performance

**Problem 5. Is there a relationship between OCB and work ethics**

**A. OCB and the ATW (attitude toward work)**

When OCBO and OCBP were taken together, they could not significantly predict the employees’ work ethics in terms of the ATW,  $F(2, 147) = .136, p > .05$  with a .02 per cent overlap between the predictor and the outcome variables.

Thus, the differences noted in the employees' work ethics in terms of ATW are not due to the variations observed in their OCBO and OCBP. Thus, regardless of the levels of their OCBO and OCBP, their work ethics as to ATW remain the same.

**Table 6: OCB and the ATW**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.043 <sup>a</sup>	.002	-.012	.52485

a. Predictors: (Constant), OCBO, OCBP

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.075	2	.037	.136	.873 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	40.493	147	.275		
	Total	40.568	149			

a. Dependent Variable: The ATW

b. Predictors: (Constant), OCBO, OCBP

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.080	.271		15.039	.000
	OCBP	-.055	.127	-.065	-.435	.664
	OCBO	.064	.124	.077	.521	.603

a. Dependent Variable: The ATW

**B. OCB and the MAW (moral attitude toward work)**

The employees' organizational citizenship behavior of OCBO and OCBP taken together significantly predicted their work ethics in terms of MAW,  $F(2,147) = 3.630, p < .05$ , with 4.70 per cent overlap between the OCB factors and work ethics of the MAW. When predicting the work ethics of the MAW the error is approximately .48 rating points.

However, when OCBO and OCBP were taken singly, they could not significantly predict the employees' work ethics in terms of the MAW.

The observed variations, therefore, in the employees' work ethics of the MAW are attributed to the differences in their OCBO and OCBP.

However, when OCBO and OCBP were treated singly, they failed to predict significantly the employees' work ethics in terms of the MAW. Their work ethics in terms of the MAW remain similar regardless of the differences in their levels of OCBO and OCBP.

**Table 7: OCB and MAW**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.217 <sup>a</sup>	.047	.034	.48054

a. Predictors: (Constant), OCBO, OCBP

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	1.676	2	.838	3.630	.029 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	33.945	147	.231		
Total	35.621	149			

- a. Dependent Variable: The MAW
- b. Predictors: (Constant), OCBO, OCBP

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	4.194	.248		16.884	.000
OCBP	-.312	.116	-.389	-2.688	.008
OCBO	.265	.113	.339	2.338	.021

- a. Dependent Variable: The MAW

**B. OCB and The WM (work motivation).**

The employees' organizational citizenship behavior of OCBO and OCBP when considered together could not significantly predict their work ethics in terms of the WM,  $F(2,47) = 1.295, p > .05$  with 0.17 per cent overlap between the predictor variables (OCBO and OCBP) and the outcome variable (The WM).

Hence, the differences recorded in the employees' work ethics in terms of the WM are not attributed to the variations noted in their organizational citizenship behaviors of OCBO and OCBP.

The employees' work ethics in terms of the WM are similar regardless of the varying levels in their organizational citizenship behaviors of OCBO and OCBP.

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.132 <sup>a</sup>	.017	.004	.58360

- a. Predictors: (Constant), OCBO, OCBP

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	.882	2	.441	1.295	.277 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	50.066	147	.341		
Total	50.948	149			

- a. Dependent Variable: The WM
- b. Predictors: (Constant), OCBO, OCBP

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	4.802	.302		15.918	.000
OCBP	-.149	.141	-.155	-1.056	.293
OCBO	.028	.138	.030	.203	.839

a. Dependent Variable: The WM

## Discussion

The study's results reveal that organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), work performance, and work ethics among employees are rated high. However, the analysis shows no correlation between OCB and overall work performance or between OCB and overall work ethics. Nonetheless, a significant correlation exists between OCB and work ethics when considering the moral attitude toward work specifically.

These findings suggest that management should focus on enhancing organizational citizenship behavior to positively impact employees' moral attitudes toward their work. Improving employees' citizenship behaviors, especially their care for the organization and colleagues, can foster stronger moral attitudes, including honesty, integrity, justice, hard work, and sincerity. Sackett and DeVore (2002) noted that high levels of OCB can reduce counterproductive work behaviors. Additionally, Putra et al. (2021) found that caring behaviors can influence fairness and work values, while Cohen and Abdallah (2021) observed that OCB can positively affect procedural justice.

## Conclusion

Based on the study's aims and problem statement, it concludes that employees' organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), work performance, and work ethics are rated high. Overall, no correlation was found between OCB and either work performance or overall work ethics. However, a significant correlation exists between OCB and employees' moral attitudes toward work, indicating that higher levels of OCB are associated with stronger moral attitudes toward work.

The study acknowledges its limitations, particularly its narrow scope. It is recommended to expand the research to include a broader population and other institutions. Future studies should also explore the impact of a caring work environment on employees' work ethics.

**Author's contribution:** D.A., T.M., J.M.M., MM.S., A.E. **Conceptualization:** ... **Methodology:** ... **Data collection:** ... **Formal Analysis:** ... **Writing-Review and Editing:** ...

All authors have read and agreed to the published final version of the manuscript

**Institutional review board statement:** Ethical review and approval were waived for this study, due to the research does not deal with vulnerable groups or sensitive issues.

**Data availability statement:** the data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author. Data are not publicly available due to privacy.

**Conflict of interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest

**Funding:** the study is privately funded.

## References

- Abun, D., Magallanes, T., Acidera, E.B., Encarnacion, M.J. & Domingcil, C.U. (2021). Work environment and work engagement of employees of Catholic Colleges in the Ilocos Region, Philippines. *Technium Social Science Journal*, 19, 439-464
- Abun, D., Julian, F.P., & Ballesteros, J.V.A. (2022). The effect of work ethics of employees on work performance. *Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities*, 1(1), 58-82. <https://doi.org/10.62025/dwijmh.v1i1.7>
- Aflah, K. N., Suharnomo, S., Mas'ud, F., & Mursid, A. (2021). Islamic work ethics and employee performance: The role of Islamic motivation, affective commitment, and job satisfaction. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(1), 997–1007. <https://doi.org/10.13106/JAFEB.2021.VOL8.NO1.997>
- Ahmad, N. (2011). *Research-based insights inform change in IBM's M-learning strategy*. IGI Global Publisher of Timely Knowledge
- Aini, L.N., Nurtjahjani, F., & Dhakirah, S. (2021). The effect of work ethics and motivation on job performance on Ony Comp employees Malang. *Economics and Business Solutions Journal*, 5(2), 64-74.
- Allen, T. D., & Rush, M. C. (1998). The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 247–260. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.2.247>
- Graham, J.W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01385031>
- Aristotle. (1941). *Politics* (B. Jowett, Trans.). In R. McKeon (Ed.). *The Basic Works of Aristotle*. Random House.
- Athar, M.R., Shahzad, K., Amad, J. & Ijaz, M.S. (2016). Impact of Islamic work ethics on organizational commitment: Mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Islamic Business and Management*, 6(1).
- Bataineh, M.T. (2020). The effect of work ethics on job performance in international SMEs in Al-Hassan industrial estate. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 10(5), 154-158. <https://doi.org/10.32479/irmm.10364>
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and 'citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587-595. <https://doi.org/10.2307/255908>
- Bazzy, J. D. (2016a). Work ethic dimensions as predictors of ego depletion. *Current Psychology*, 37, 198-206. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-016-9503-6>
- Bazzy, J.D. (2018b). Work ethic dimensions as predictors of ego depletion. *Current Psychology*, 37, 198–206. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-016-9503-6>
- Bennett, R.J., & Robinson, S.L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 349–60. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349>
- Berry, C.M., Ones, D., & Sackett, P.R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 410–24. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.410>
- Borman, W.C. & Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). *Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance*. In: Schmitt N, Borman WC, eds. *Personnel Selection in Organizations*. Jossey Bass; 71–98.

[https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_3)

- Borman W.C, Motowidlo S.J. (1997). *Task performance and contextual performance: the meaning for personnel selection research*. *Human Performance*, 10, 99–109. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_3)
- Bouma, G.D. (1973). Beyond Lenski: A critical review of recent 'Protestant ethic' research. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 12(2), 141–155.
- Braun, S. & Hentschel, T. (2015). *Group process in an organization*. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (Second Edition). Elsevier
- Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopedia (2023, December 29). Work. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/science/work-physics>
- Campbell, J. (1990). *Modelling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology*. In M. Dunnette & L. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 686–707). Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). *A theory of performance*. In N. Schmitt & W.C. Borman (Eds.). *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 35-70). Jossey-Bass.
- Campbell, J.P., Hanson, M.A. & Oppler, S.H. (2001). *Modeling performance in a population of jobs*. Erlbaum Campbell, J.P. (2013b). Leadership, the old, the new, and the timeless: a commentary. *Oxford Handbook Online.*, 401–22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195398793.013.0024>
- Cary, C. D. (1977). The goals of citizenship training in American and Soviet schools. *Studies in Comparative Communism*, 10(3), 281-297. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0039-3592\(77\)80019-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0039-3592(77)80019-7)
- Cholbi, M. (2022). Philosophical approaches to work and labour. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/work-labor/>
- Clark, S. (2017). Good work. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 34, 61–73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/japp.12137> Dallas, R.S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90,1241–55. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241>
- Diaz-Vilela, L.F. Rodriguez, N.D., Isla-Diaz, R., Diaz-Cebrera, D., Hernandez-Fernaund, E., & Rosales-Sacnchez, C. (2015). Relationships between contextual and task performance and interrater agreement: Are there any? *Plos One*, 10(10), <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0139898>
- Doğru, C. (2019). *The effects of perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange on contextual performance: A study in the banking sector*. In *Handbook of Research on Contemporary approaches in management and organizational strategy*. IGI Global Publisher of Timely Knowledge
- Efeoğlu, I.E. & Çalışkan, Y. (2018). A brief history of homo economicus from the economics discipline perspective. *Adana Alparslan Türkeş Science and Technology University Journal of Social Science*, 2(1), 28-36.
- Elster, J. (1989). *Self-realisation in work and politics*. In J. Elster and K.O. Moene (eds.), *Alternatives to Capitalism*. Cambridge University Press, 127–158. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0265052500000327>
- Fox, S. & Spector, P.E. (2005). The stressor-emotion model of counterproductive work behavior. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.). *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 151–174). *American Psychological Association*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10893-007>

- Fox, S., Spector, P., Goh A., Bruursema K., & Kessler S. (2012). The deviant citizen: Measuring potential positive relations between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85, 199–220.
- Fox, S. & Spector, P.E. (2002). An emotion-centred model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(2), 269–292. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(02\)00049-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00049-9)
- Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4(4), 249–270. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01385031>
- Griffin, M., Neal, A. & Neale, M. (2001). The contribution of task performance and contextual performance to effectiveness: Investigating the role of situational constraints. *Applied Psychology*, 49(3), 517-533. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00029>
- Gruys, M.L., & Sackett, P.R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11,30–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00224>
- Gulino, D. (2022). *Assistive technologies and design for people with autism spectrum disorders: A selective overview*. IGI Global Publisher of Timely Knowledge. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-7430-0.ch003>
- Harrison, D. A., Newman, D. A., & Roth, P. L. (2006). How important are job attitudes? Meta-analytic comparisons of integrative behavioral outcomes and time sequences. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), 305-325. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2006.20786077>
- Inkeles, A. (1969). Participant citizenship in six developing countries. *American Political Science Review*, 63(4), 1120-1141. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1955075>
- Ispas, D. & Borman, W.C. (2015). *Counterproductive work behavior*. Elsevier
- Karapinar, P.B. (2017). *Well-being at work: A comprehensive review about Its predictors and outcomes*. IGI Global Publisher of Timely Knowledge.
- Kasemsap, K. (2016). *A unified framework of organizational perspectives and knowledge management and their impact on job performance*. IGI Global Publisher of Timely Knowledge
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9, 131-133. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830090206>
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C., Hildebrandt, V.H., de Vet, H. C., & van der Beek, A. J. (2011). Conceptual framework of individual work performance. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 53(8), 856-66. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0b013e318226a763>
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., de Vet, H. C., & van der Beek, A. J. (2014). Measuring individual work performance: identifying and selecting indicators. *Work (Reading, Mass.)*, 48(2), 229–238. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-131659>
- Lessnoff, M.H. (1994). *The spirit of capitalism and the Protestant ethic: An enquiry into the Weber thesis*. E. Elgar. Little, A. (1948). The Philosophy of Work. *The Irish Monthly*, 76(896), 56–65. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20515765>
- Lilly, J.D. (2016). *Organizational citizenship behavior*. In: Farazmand, A. (eds) *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816->

- Mahrani, S.W. & Alwi, S. (2022). The effect of organizational citizenship behavior on performance mediated by job satisfaction. *International Journal of Management and Education in Human Development*, 2(4), 769-774.
- Marri, M.Y.K.; Sadozai, A. M.; Zaman, H. M. F. & Ramay, M.I. (2012). The Impact of Islamic work ethics on job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A study of agriculture sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(12) 32-45
- Miller, M.J., Woehr, D.J., & Hudspeth, N. (2002). The meaning and measurement of work ethic: Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional inventory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 60(3), 451-489. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1838>
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Schmit, M. J. (1999). *Performance assessment in unique jobs*. In D. R. Ilgen, & E. D. Pulakos (Eds.). *The changing nature of job performance: Implications for staffing, motivation, and development* (pp. 56-86). Jossey-Bass.
- Motowidlo, S. J. (2003). *Job performance*. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Mudrack, P. E. (1997). Protestant work-ethic dimensions and work orientations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 23(2), 217-225. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(97\)00041-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(97)00041-X)
- Nelson, B. (1973). *Weber's Protestant ethic: Its origins, wanderings, and foreseeable future*. In C. Glock & P. Hammond (Eds), *Beyond the classics* (pp. 71-130). Harper & Row.
- Nesterak, E. (2022). Incorrect ideas about "why we work" warp our organizations...and our views of human nature. *Behavioral Scientist*. <https://behavioralscientist.org/>
- Notanubun, Z. (2021). The effect of organizational citizenship behavior and leadership effectiveness on public sectors organizational performance: Study in the department of education, youth and sports in Maluku Province, Indonesia. *Public Organization Review*, 21, 1-18 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-020-00475-4>
- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books
- Organ D. W. & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 4, 775-803. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x>
- Organ, D.W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's constructed clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85-97.
- Osibanjo, A.O., Akinbode, J.O., Falola, H.O. & Oludayo, A.O. (2015). Work ethics and employees' performance. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 12(1).
- Petrovic, G. (2008). Mas as economic animal and mas as praxis an interpretation of Marx. *An Interdisciplinary of Philosophy*, 6(1-4). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00201746308601366>
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestion for future research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 133-151. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_5)
- 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 and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26, 513-563. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307>

- Psychologist World (n.d). Consciousness: A big five personality trait. *Expand Your Mind*.  
<https://www.psychologistworld.com>
- Putra, K.R., Sutadi, H., Setyowati, S. & Hariyati, T.S. (2021). The impact of nurse manager caring behaviors and work environment on burnout syndrome among nurses. *Journal of Nursing and Social Sciences Related Health and Illnesses*, 23(2). <http://doi.org/10.32725/kont.2021.019>
- Robinson, S.L. & Bennett, R.J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2):555-572. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256693>
- Richard. A. (1998). *Work, philosophy of*. Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Taylor and Francis.  
<https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/thematic/work-philosophy-of/v-1>. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780415249126-S068-1>
- Roethlisberger, F.J, & Dickson, W. J (1964). *Management and the worker*. Wiley
- Runtu, D.Y., Aldrin, L. & Merdiaty, N. (2019). The effect of work ethics on job performance with adversity quotient as a mediator. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 8(5), 98-103.  
<https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v8i5.457>
- Sackett, P. R., & DeVore, C. J. (2002). *Counterproductive behaviors at work*. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.). *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology, Vol. 1. Personnel psychology* (pp. 145–164). Sage Publications Ltd.
- Salahudin, M.M. (2011). Generational difference impact on leadership style and organizational success. *Journal of Diversity Management*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.19030/jdm.v5i2.805>
- Salahudin, S.N., Baharudin, S.S., & Safizal, M. (2016). The effect of Islamic work ethics on organizational commitment. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 35, 582-590. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(16\)00071-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(16)00071-X)
- Sayers, A. (2005). Class, moral worth and recognition. *Sociology*, 39(5), 947–963.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038505058376>
- Sharma, B. R., & Rai, S. (2015). A study to develop an instrument to measure work ethic. *Global Business Review*, 16(2), 244–257. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150914564417>
- Silong, A.D., Daryoush, Y., Omar, Z., & Othman, J. (2013). Improving job performance: Workplace learning is the first step. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 1(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.1n.1p.100>
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653-663. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653>
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centred model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(2), 269–292. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(02\)00049-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00049-9)
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68 (3), 446-460. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.10.005>
- Schwartz, B. (2022). *Why We Work*. Simon & Schuster, Inc
- Triani, F., Halin, H., & Wadud, M. (2020). Effect of organizational citizenship behavior on employee performance at PT

Surya Dermato Medica Palembang. *International Journal of Community Service & Engagement*, 1(1).

- Turanlgil, F.G. (2019). *Work-life balance in the tourism industry*. IGI Global Publisher of Timely Knowledge. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-5760-9.ch010>
- Ud Din, M., Khan, F., Khan, U., Kadarningsih, A., & Darmi, S. (2019). The effect of Islamic work ethics on the job performance: Mediating role of intrinsic motivation. *International Journal of Islamic Business Ethics* 4(2), 676. <https://doi.org/10.30659/ijibe.4.2.676-688>
- Udin, U., Dananjoyo, R., Shaikh, M., & Vio Linarta, D. (2022). *Islamic work ethics, affective commitment, and employee's performance in family business: testing their relationships*. SAGE Open. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221085263>
- Van Ness, R.K., Melinsky, K., Buff, C. & Seifert, C.F. (2010). Work ethic: do new employees mean new work values? *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 22 (1), 10-34.
- Veeraragavan, P. & Arulkumar, S. (2021). Impact of task performance on job satisfaction of employees. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 27(4). <https://doi.org/10.47750/cibg.2021.27.08.049>
- Viswesvaran, C. (2002). *Assessment of individual job performance: a review of the past century and a look ahead*. In: Anderson N, Ones DS, Sinangil HK, Viswesvaran C, eds. *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology. Vol 1: Personnel Psychology*. Sage Publications Ltd; 110–126
- Wang, L., Hinrichs, K.T. & Prieto, L (2013). Five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior: Comparing antecedents and levels of engagement in China and the US. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 30, 115-147.
- Ward S. J., & King L. A. (2017). *Making sense: Meaning in life in a cognitive context*. In Robinson M. D., Eid M. (Eds.), *The happy mind: Cognitive contributions to well-being* (pp.409–425). Springer.
- Whiting, S.W., Podsakoff, P.M. & Pierce, J.R. (2008). Effects of task performance, helping, voice, and organizational loyalty on performance appraisal ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 125-139.
- Yaakobi, E. & Weisberg, J. (2020). Organizational citizenship behavior predicts quality, creativity, and efficiency performance: the role of occupational and collective efficacies. *Frontier in Psychology*, 11, 758. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00758>

**Publisher's Note:** DWIJMH stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



© 2024 by the authors. Licensee DWIJMH. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>)

Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities. DWIJMH is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.