Employees' Performance Paradigm: A Review Envisions for Behavioral Perspectives

Madan Kumar Luitel[1], Rajesh Kumar Poudel[2]

[1] Nepal Commerce Campus
    Tribhuvan University, Nepal
    Email: madan.luitel@ncc.tu.edu.np
[2] Nepal Commerce Campus
    Tribhuvan University, Nepal
    Email: rajesh.poudel@ncc.tu.edu.np

Corresponding Author
Madan Kumar Luitel
Email: madan.luitel@ncc.tu.edu.np

Abstract

The main purpose of the study is to analyze and synthesize existing academic literature on employee performance through a behavioral lens. Systematic review and qualitative method have been adopted by this study. This study focusses on the assessment of peer-reviewed journal articles published in the last 10-35 years. The academic databases such as PubMed, JSTOR, Scopus, google Scholar and Web of social science are included. It includes studies on behavioral issues such as contextual performance, employees' behavioral performance, organizational citizenship behavior, adoptive and helping behavior, extra role performance and non-routine job. The study also reviews the practical aspect of behavioral performance in the service sectors and the internal linkages of behavioral factor. The study excludes articles that focus solely on non-behavioral factors like task performance, routine job, technical performance and external economic conditions. This study found that the major components of employee's behavioral performance are organizational citizenship behavior, adoptive behavior, team work, counterproductivity work behavior, emotional intelligence and proactive performance. In the future the employee's behavioral performance is important due to present dynamism in technological advancement and job in remote and diversified working climate.

Keywords: *Employee performance, Employees' behavioral performance, Task and Contextual performance, Organizational citizenship behavior and Counterproductivity work behavior.*

JEL Classification: *D23, J24, J29, M12, M19, M54*

Introduction

Employee performance refers to how effectively an individual fulfills their job responsibilities and contributes to organizational goals. Over time, its definition has expanded to encompass not just task execution but also behaviors that benefit the organization and its culture. Campbell (1990) defined employee performance as observable behaviors that people do in their jobs that are relevant to organizational goals. Visweswaran and Ones (2000)

defined as scalable actions, behaviors, and outcomes. Performance includes both task performance and contextual performance (Sonnentag and Frese 2002). Rotundo and Sackett (2002) categorized performance into three dimensions; task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behaviors. Aguinis (2013) refers to the observable behaviors and actions which align with organizational objectives, either contributing to or detracting from their achievement. The concept of employee performance has evolved significantly, reflecting changes in organizational structures, workplace dynamics and societal trends.

Early 1900s scientific management of Taylor (1911) focused on task performance, emphasizing efficiency and productivity, and Performance was measured through efficiency, standardization, and time-motion. Mayo (1933s) discovered that social factors like relationships, morale and employee satisfaction as well as highlighted the importance of human factors like morale, motivation, and social interactions on performance. They recognized that social and psychological factors contribute to performance. Performance began to be studied through individual and group behavior. Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs suggested that human behavior is motivated by a hierarchy of needs. Herzberg's two-factor theory (1959) distinguishes between hygiene factors and motivators. McGregor (1960) developed theory X and Theory Y, emphasizing how management styles affect employee motivation and performance as well as highlighted the importance of employee motivation and management styles in influencing performance. They Focus behavioral contributions like initiative and teamwork were acknowledged. Vroom's expectancy theory (1964) posits that employees will behave in ways that they believe will lead to the best possible outcome. In 1970s Scholars began distinguishing between task performance and extra-role behaviors. Katz & Kahn (1978) identified extra-role behaviors. Performance was viewed as a combination of in-role and discretionary actions. Bateman & Organ (1983) introduced OCB, focusing on behaviors, while not required, positively impact organizational functioning. Rotundo and Sackett (1990s) classified task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behaviors actions that harm the organization. Campbell's et al. (1990) identified multiple dimensions of performance, including task-specific behaviors, effort, and discipline. They stressed the importance of distinguishing between performance behavior and outcomes. Borman and Motowidlo (1993) expanded the performance paradigm by introducing the concept of contextual performance, which includes behaviors such as helping others, showing initiative, and maintaining a positive attitude at work. Contextual performance became linked to organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), which refers to discretionary behaviors that are not formally recognized by the organization but that contribute to its effectiveness. They also defined task performance is the job-specific technical tasks. Van Dyne, Cummings, and Mclean Parks (1995) emphasized how extra-role behaviors, such as helping others and engaging in proactive behaviors, positively influence organizational culture and team performance. Motowidlo, Borman, and Schmit (1997) proposed a model that integrated both task performance and contextual performance. Adaptive performance recognized as a key component, focusing on how employees respond to change, uncertainty and innovation (Pulakos et al., 2000). Podsakoff et al. (2000) further developed the concept of OCB, emphasizing the importance of these behaviors for team functioning and organizational effectiveness. Ali and Farid (2020) examined the role of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in virtual teams, highlighting the challenges and opportunities for contextual performance in digital environments. The contextual performance paradigm expanded further in the late 1990s and early 2000s with the work of scholars like Organ (1988) and Podsakoff et al. (2000), introduced the idea that OCB behaviors like helping colleagues, volunteering for extra tasks, and supporting organizational initiatives should be considered part of employees' overall performance. Thus, employees' performances are categorized as task performance, contextual performance, adaptive performance, proactive performance, creative performance, counterproductive work behavior, team performance, citizenship performance (Organizational Citizenship Behavior – OCB), interpersonal performance, learning and development and well-being and sustainability performance. Employee performance theories have evolved over time, offering various perspectives on what constitutes effective performance in the workplace. These theories integrate both task-oriented and contextual behaviors, exploring factors like motivation, behavior and individual traits that impact an employee's overall performance. Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) proposed that performance is influenced by job demands and resources.

There are problems for both OCB as well as employee behavioral performance regarding inconsistency in recognition and reward (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Existing problems with Organizational Citizenship Behavior

(OCB) are exploitation of employees (Podsakoff, et al., 2000), role overload and burnout (Organ, 1988), unequal contribution (Organ, 1988) and negative impact on task performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). When employees' extra-role behaviors i.e. OCB are not formally acknowledged, they may become demotivated. This is especially problematic when these behaviors are vital to the organization but do not receive formal acknowledgment. Engaging in OCB or demonstrating a strong focus on contextual performance can sometimes lead to role conflict. Employees may struggle to balance the extra-role demands with the responsibilities of their primary job, leading to stress, reduced satisfaction, and poor performance (Borman & Motowidlo 1997). Both OCB and employee behavioral performance are sometimes assessed through subjective measures, leading to bias in performance appraisals. When performance evaluations are not standardized, employees may receive inconsistent feedback, creating dissatisfaction and lowering morale (Viswesvaran & Ones, 2012). Drawbacks of employee behavioral performance are overemphasis on contextual performance, Role overload and burnout, lack of clear expectations, and undue pressure for extra-role behavior, difficulty in measurement contextual performance (OCB) relies on subjective assessments and can vary widely depending on the observer's perspective (Viswesvaran & Ones 2012). Focus on extra-role behaviors at the expense of task performance (Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997). Based on these issues the problems statements include; What are the major components to measure the employees' behavioral performance? organizational citizenship behavior is the components of contextual performance? contextual performance and employees behavioral performance includes the same components?

The primary objectives of this study are to synthesize existing academic literature on employee performance through a behavioral lens. To review the key components of employee's behavioral performance. The study is additional significance because contextual performance has evolved over time, with scholars contributing varying perspectives from its conceptualization to its application in different timeframes. Katz's (1964) and Katz & Kahn's (1978) role theory highlighted the importance of extra-role behaviors. Motowidlo and Borman (1997) developed the theory of contextual performance to extend the OCB framework. Their model emphasizes the importance of contextual behaviors, which include both OCB and behaviors. After 2010s holistic and team-based performance as collaborative workplaces, emotional intelligence as became a central factor in employee performance. In modern perspectives on performance as COVID-19 are hybrid work, diversity and inclusion, sustainability, corporate social responsibility, and technological adaptability. Performance now included contextual behaviors, such as helping coworkers, maintaining positive attitudes, and adhering to organizational norms.

Literature Review

Task and contextual performance are the major components of employee's performance. Task performance includes both the quantity and quality of the work produced. Borman and Motowidlo (1993) defined task performance is primarily concerned with the execution of formal job duties. Motowidlo, Borman, and Schmit (1997) emphasized completing job-specific tasks effectively and Viswesvaran and Ones (2012) referred to the core functions of the job. Borman and Motowidlo (1987) introduced the idea of contextual performance. George and Brief (1992) explored the relationship between mood and contextual performance. Borman and Motowidlo (1993) defined organizational environment and go beyond the formal job description, such as helping others, maintaining a positive attitude and complying with organizational norms. Van Dyne, Cummings, and McLean-Parks (1995) introduced as a behavioral trait that is influenced by organizational commitment and personal values. Motowidlo, Borman and Schmit (1997) defined contextual performance in terms of behaviors that complement task performance and contribute to the organizational climate, such as helping others or demonstrating organizational loyalty. Contextual performance encompasses behaviors that improve the organizational environment, including helping coworkers, maintaining a positive attitude, and acting in ways that reflect the values and goals of the organization. Van Scotter and Motowidlo (2000) emphasized that contextual performance predicts overall job performance ratings by supervisors, even if not explicitly required by job descriptions. Borman and Penner (2001) expanded the definition of contextual performance which includes behaviors that improve the organizational climate, facilitate teamwork, and foster a cooperative work environment, even if they are not part of formal job requirements. Hui, Lee and Rousseau (2004) explored how organizational justice and leader-member exchange (LMX) influence

contextual performance. Ilies, Nahrgang, and Morgeson (2007) conducted a meta-analysis to better understand the relationship between contextual performance and task performance, as well as the antecedents and outcomes of contextual performance. Bakker and Demerouti (2008) focused on job resources and how they affect both task and contextual performance. They defined voluntary behaviors that contribute to the organizational, social, psychological environment and differentiating it from task performance. Viswesvaran and Ones (2012) discussed how contextual performance is important in modern workplaces, especially in roles requiring teamwork and collaboration. Sonnentag (2020) looked at how contextual performance, especially in terms of extra-role behaviors like OCB, is particularly important in remote and hybrid work environments, emphasizing proactive behavior and helping others as a way to maintain team cohesion.

The foundational theory for organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is primarily based on social exchange theory (SET), developed by Blau (1964), and further expanded by Organ in 1988. Bateman and Organ (1977, & 1983) introduced the term citizenship behaviors to describe discretionary behaviors by employees that were not formally recognized but were crucial to organizational effectiveness. Focused primarily on altruism (helping others) as a key component. Bateman and Organ (1983) contributed to the early development of the OCB, they highlighted the importance of altruism (helping others) and conscientiousness (going beyond basic job duties) as critical elements of contextual performance. Organ (1988) defined organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as voluntary, discretionary behavior that is not directly recognized by the formal reward system but contributes to the effective functioning of the organization. Organ (1997) revised the definition and OCBs might be indirectly expected by organizations. Podsakoff, et al. (2000) provided an in-depth review of OCB, recognizing the importance of various dimensions such as altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue. They identified seven dimensions of OCB; with more two components; organizational compliance and individual initiative. Borman and Motowidlo (2003) broadened the definition of OCB by integrating it with contextual performance and emphasizing how these behaviors contribute to overall job performance and organizational effectiveness. Bolino and Grant (2020), Dabke, Chitode & Madaan (2022) have seen OCB further integrated with broader themes such as employee well-being, workplace diversity, psychological safety and the role of technology in facilitating organizational behaviors. Dabke, Chitode, and Madaan (2022) argued that OCB remains a critical factor in organizational success but now incorporates aspects such as well-being, mindfulness, and stress management. Drawbacks of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) are potential for exploitation, risk of role conflict, perceptions of favoritism, eegative impact on task performance, and unintended negative consequences (Podsakoff, et al., 2000). Thus, OCB further includes in the modern dimensions in remote work contexts; virtual altruism, digital civic virtue and remote courtesy, respecting others' time zones and digital. It focuses on improving organizational outcomes indirectly (Podsakoff & mackenzie, 1997) and how well employees perform their core job responsibilities, along with their interactions with colleagues and other organizational stakeholders (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997).

Regarding the discussion on the components of OCB. Organ (1988) determined altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. Bateman and Organ (1983); Organ and Ryan (1995) include Altruism and Conscientiousness later expanded to include other behaviors like sportsmanship and courtesy. George and Brief (1992); Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000) define the same as organ (1988). Moorman (1991) and Van Dyne, Cummings, and Mclean-Parks (1995) add more with the components of helping behavior (Altruism), conscientiousness, and courtesy and civic virtue. Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) Components are altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy and civic virtue. OCB is often assessed through qualitative methods such as peer evaluations, self-reports, and supervisor assessments. Employee behavioral performance is measured through a combination of quantitative and qualitative metrics. It may include formal job performance evaluations as well as informal assessments of behavior (Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000). Lambert and Hogan (2013) argued as there are three essential elements of OCB. The first is that it is not role prescribed (Kohan and Mazmanian, 2003), The second element is that it does not benefit the person doing the OCB (Smith et al., 1983) and third element is that there are no rewards associated with OCB as it is usually outside the normal purview of the job (Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2004).

Theories of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB): Organ's (1988) theory of OCB outlines how discretionary

behaviors like altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, and civic virtue are voluntary but essential for organizational success. These behaviors contribute to a positive organizational environment and team collaboration, even though they are not formally recognized in job descriptions. Podsakoff's (1990) model of OCB expanded on Organ's work by categorizing OCB into five components. They linked OCB to various outcomes, including organizational effectiveness, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Van Dyne, Cummings, and McLean-Parks (1995) applied social exchange theory to OCB, suggesting that employees engage in OCB as a form of social exchange. Social exchange OCB is viewed as a form of social reciprocity, where employees expect to be rewarded in some way for their extra-role behaviors. Podsakoff et al. (2000) refined Organ's (1988) original model by adding additional dimensions of OCB and examining the antecedents and outcomes of these behaviors. Podsakoff et al. (2000) extended Organ's (1988) categories and explored individual factors and organizational factors that influence OCB, and Judge and Organ (2001) supported. Lepine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) proposed a multidimensional model of OCB, which categorizes OCB into positive and negative behaviors. They found that both individual and situational factors, such as mood and motivation, can influence the expression of OCB. Their model also discusses the distinction between OCB-I (OCB directed toward individuals) and OCB-O (OCB directed toward the organization). Organ's (2006) expanded model of OCB, and refined his original OCB model by emphasizing the contextual nature of OCB behaviors. He also explored the antecedents of OCB, including leadership behaviors and organizational culture, which significantly impact the occurrence of OCB.

Employee behavioral performance refers to a wide range of actions, attitudes and behaviors exhibited by employees in the workplace. Organ (1988) argued that the employee behavioral performance includes voluntary, extra-role behaviors that are not formally required but enhance the effectiveness of the organization by improving the work environment and supporting other employees. Employee behavioral performance is characterized by work engagement, where employees show enthusiasm, energy, and dedication in both their task performance and voluntary behaviors that support the organization (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). Borman and Motowidlo (1993), Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit (1997) and Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, (2007) argued that employee behavioral performance composed of task performance and contextual performance as well as subcomponents of contextual performance are organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), conscientiousness and teamwork and collaboration. Contextual performance often involves extra-role behaviors that contribute to the social and psychological environment of the organization. Griffin, Neal, and Parker (2007) argued that EBP include adaptive performance, which refers to the ability to adjust to changing work demands, in addition to task-related behaviors and other discretionary efforts like cooperation and helping colleagues. Bakker & Demerouti (2008) well-defined employee behavioral performance includes both task-oriented behaviors and extra-role behaviors that focus on maintaining positive relationships and enhancing organizational functioning. Van Dyne, Cummings, and Mclean-Parks (1995) encompasses behaviors that are discretionary and extra-role, such as organizational citizenship behaviors, and help in maintaining organizational functioning, even though they are not formally required. Early foundations with task performance, after 1980s they emergence of contextual performance (Organ, 1988), Expanding the concept of contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo 1993 and Organ 1998), integration with job engagement and adaptability (Motowidlo, Borman, and Schmit 2000; Bakker & Demerouti 2008), emotional and social dimensions (Ilies, Nahrgang, and Morgeson 2007; Griffin, Neal, and Parker 2007) with the integration of digital skills and well-being.

The review of further employees' behavior includes adaptive performance; Employees who exhibit adaptive performance are flexible and capable of adjusting their behaviors in response to new demands, changes in the work environment, or evolving job roles. Counterproductive work behaviors are the negative aspects of employee behavior that can undermine the organization. These behaviors may be classified as intentional or unintentional but generally have a detrimental effect on organizational effectiveness; absenteeism, workplace aggression, theft, sabotage, or disengagement. Proactive behavior refers to actions that involve anticipating future challenges and taking initiative to address them before they become problems. Employees displaying proactive behavior often engage in problem-solving, innovation, and initiative-taking. Suggesting improvements, proposing new ideas, seeking out additional training. Employees' contextual performance includes, such as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and interpersonal counterproductive work behavior (CWB), but not on task performance

(Devonish, 2013).

Theories of Behavioral Performance (Skinner's,1953) operant conditioning theory based on behavioral psychology, suggests that performance is shaped by the consequences of past behaviors. Mcclelland's (1961) theory of needs emphasized three primary needs the need for achievement, affiliation, and power. The Social Exchange Theory of Blau (1964) is crucial to understanding employee behavior, particularly extra-role behaviors such as OCB. Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory focuses on the role of expectations in employee behavior. Hackman and Oldham's (1976) job characteristics model proposed that certain job characteristics influence employees' internal states, which, in turn, affect their job performance and satisfaction. This model helps explain how employees' behavior can be shaped by the nature of their work. Katz and Kahn (1978) introduced a theory that connects employee behavior to organizational structures and environments. Deci and Ryan's (1985) self-determination theory focused on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and their effect on employee behavior. Campbell's (1990) job performance model categorizes performance into task performance and contextual performance. Motowidlo and Borman's (1997) contextual performance theory includes voluntary behaviors like helping others and demonstrating organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) that contribute to the broader organizational environment. Their theory suggests that these behaviors are integral to overall job performance. They proposed a job performance theory that distinguishes between task performance and contextual performance (OCB). Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behavior (1991) expands on the theory of reasoned action and focuses on the relationship between attitudes, intentions and behaviors. This theory is widely applied to understanding employees' voluntary behaviors, including OCB.

The study determines research gap as the more studies was conducted in the task performance and organizational citizenship behavior but limited study has been identified and conducted in the contextual performance of employees and behavioral performance of employees based on the OCB in my best knowledge. The health and education services are more included for the study. In the Nepalese study only focus on OCB but not linking with contextual performance and employee's behavioral performance based on OCB. Thus, this study is outlined to envision of the behavioral perspectives of employees' behavioral performance.

Research Methods

The study is based on systematic review methods. The study focusses on peer-reviewed journal articles published in the last 10-35 years. It includes studies on behavioral factors such as contextual performance, OCB, CPWB, motivation, emotional intelligence, personality traits, organizational behavior, and leadership styles. The study excluded the articles that focus solely on non-behavioral factors like task performance technology or external economic conditions. It uses academic databases such as PubMed, JSTOR, Scopus, Google Scholar, and Web of social science. It filters the Peer-reviewed articles only. The inclusion criteria are the articles on the relationship between behavioral factors and employee performance, quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-method research designs and Studies conducted in various industries and cultural settings. It excluded the articles without empirical evidence (e.g., opinion pieces) and non-human factors (e.g., AI, robotics). The study used the article screening process in the initial screening review article titles and abstracts to ensure relevance. Full-Text review evaluate the methodology, population, sample, variables studied and key findings for relevance and quality. The quality assessment: through use a standard checklist like CASP (Critical Appraisal Skills Program) for systematic reviews. Its emphasis the thematic analysis with the identify recurring themes and patterns related to behavioral perspectives in the studies. Synthesis and reporting across studies to provide a comprehensive overview of behavioral factors that influence employee performance. The study highlighted the gaps in the literature and suggest areas for future research. It conducts inter-rater reliability checks in multiple reviews involved. Ensuring transparency by maintaining a review protocol and audit trail.

Results from Empirical Appraisal

Applications of employee behavioral performance in service organizations improving employee cooperation and teamwork (Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1994), enhancing customer satisfaction and service quality (Bettencourt, 1997), George & Brief (1992) found that a supportive organizational climate positively influences the occurrence

of OCB. Organ and Ryan (1995) highlighted that a supportive organizational climate is required to enhance the OCB, enhancing organizational culture and employee motivation (Organ, 1997), improving organizational performance and innovation (Podsakoff et al., 1997), reducing workplace conflicts and stress (Podsakoff, et al., 2000), increasing employee retention and job satisfaction (Lepine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002, Organ, 1988). Organ and Ryan (2015) organizations move away from rigid, performance-focused metrics, they may increasingly assess employees on how their behaviors contribute to the overall success of the organization (Sonnentag, 2018) and Sonnentag (2020) explored the relationship between OCB and employee engagement and argued that employees who engage in OCB tend to be more committed and satisfied with their jobs.

Blau (1964) suggested that employees may engage in OCB as a form of reciprocal exchange, Tajfel and Turner (1979) found that when employees perceive themselves as part of the organizational in-group, Morrison (1994) found that employees who feel a strong sense of commitment to the organization are more likely to engage in OCB. Self-efficacy and personal values play an important role in shaping an individual's willingness to engage in extra-role behaviors and task-related performance (Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997). Higher levels of motivation, engagement, and satisfaction often lead to better overall performance, both in completing assigned tasks and in engaging in voluntary behaviors (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). OCB, as a form of voluntary behavior, is also driven by employees' desire to contribute to a positive work environment (Podsakoff et al., 2000), organizational culture (Podsakoff et al., 2000) and performance (Viswesvaran & Ones, 2012). Organ (1988) and Podsakoff et al. (2000) argued that personality traits like agreeableness and conscientiousness are strongly linked to OCB. Podsakoff et al. (2000) found a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and OCB, they also found that transformational leadership behaviors lead to higher levels of OCB among employees. Eisenberger et al. (2001) found that high perceived organizational support and demonstrated that when employees feel supported by their organization, they are more likely to exhibit OCB. Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) applied social exchange theory to explain that employees who perceive positive treatment. Graen & Uhl-Bien (1995) and Ilies et al. (2007) showed that employees who perceive their relationship with leaders as supportive and respectful are more likely to engage in OCB.

Future prospects of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) are increased and enhanced of organizational effectiveness (Podsakoff et al., 2000), Promotion of a Positive work environment (Organ, 1988) and increased job satisfaction and commitment (Organ, 1988), integration with technology and AI (Jiang, et al., 2012), focus on employee well-being and sustainable behaviors (Bolino, et al., 2013), As organizations become more global and digitally connected, scholars will likely explore how these factors impact contextual performance. The integration of well-being and employee mental health into performance paradigms is another growing area of interest, as employee happiness and mental health are increasingly recognized as integral to sustainable high performance. The employees' behavioral performance paradigm continues to evolve. Future research will likely explore deeper into how artificial intelligence (AI), automation, and remote work reshape the relationship between mission and contextual behavior. Significance of EBP is holistic approach to employee contribution (Viswesvaran & Ones, 2012), impact on organizational success (Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997) as well as employee development and growth (Viswesvaran & Ones, 2012) and importance in remote and hybrid work environments (Tews, Michel, & Noe, 2018).

Review from the Nepalese perspectives; Dhungana, Dahal, and Chapagain (2018) found that among all the dimensions of OCB conscientiousness is high in the employees of civil service in Nepal. Shrestha and Bhattarai (2022) confirmed the positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior, Likewise, the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior supports organizational commitment and effectiveness among teachers to promote better educational achievement in schools. Upadhyay and Adhikari (2020) concluded that authority, autonomy, promotion, salary, recognition, career opportunity has a positive and significant relationship with organizational citizenship behavior. Mahat et al. (2023) showed that there was a positive correlation between OCB and job satisfaction. The researchers realize the need to Organization Citizenship behavior for better performance.

The form of performances are differences. Organ (1988) argued discretionary behavior that employees perform in addition to their formal tasks. While OCB is often a part of contextual performance, OCB specifically focuses on

helping others and going beyond job expectations. Borman and Motowidlo (1993) argued contextual performance enhance organizational functioning through behaviors like cooperation and helping others. Motowidlo, Borman, and Schmit (1997) defined contextual performance as those behaviors that enhance organizational functioning but are not directly related to formal job duties such as cooperation and helping coworkers and differentiated contextual performance from OCB by emphasizing that contextual performance includes both voluntary behaviors (like OCB) and behaviors that demonstrate commitment, such as compliance with rules and standards. They also argued that contextual performance contributes to a supportive and efficient organizational climate, including aspects like voluntary cooperation and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The above concept is deviated with Viswesvaran and Ones (2012) they proposed that employee behavioral performance is a more inclusive framework that captures both task and contextual performance and argued that contextual performance focuses on behaviors that are beneficial to the work environment.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and employee behavioral performance are related concepts, but they differ in their scope, focus, and implications for organizational outcomes. OCB is a specific aspect of employee behavioral performance, focusing on extra-role behaviors (Organ, 1988). Borman and Motowidlo (1993) argued that OCB is a significant part of employee behavioral performance but does not encompass the entire construct. Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994) introduced the concept of contextual performance and its distinction from task performance. Motowidlo, Borman, and Schmit (1997) emphasized that OCB is a subset of contextual performance, which, in turn, is part of the broader employee behavioral performance. Borman & Borman and Penner (2001) explored into the broad spectrum of employee behavior, contextual performance, and counterproductive behaviors, linking them to organizational outcomes. Viswesvaran and Ones (2012) suggested that employee behavioral performance involves a broader range of behaviors and extra-role behaviors that is OCB.

Contextual factors influencing OCB and employee behavioral performance: The social exchange theory influences employee behavioral performance by increasing the likelihood of extra-role behaviors like helping others or taking initiative. Employees engage in OCB as a form of reciprocity for positive treatment they receive from the organization, such as fair treatment, rewards, and support (Blau, 1964). The design of the job plays an important role in shaping of contextual performance. Job improvement, which provides employees with more autonomy, variety, and significance in their roles, has been linked to higher levels of OCB (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Perceptions of organizational justice, such as fairness in decision-making, distribution of rewards and treatment of employees are critical in influencing OCB. Employees who perceive fairness within the organization are more likely to engage in OCB, as they feel a stronger sense of obligation to contribute positively (Colquitt et al., 2001). Employees who perceive a strong alignment between their values and the organization's values are more likely to exhibit positive behaviors beyond their formal role requirements (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). The future of employee behavioral performance will likely see a greater focus on adaptive behaviors (Fleishman, 2016).

The study Conclude that the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is the leading factor of employee's behavioral performance (EBP). Conscientiousness, teamwork, adaptive performance and collaboration are another important component of positive EBP. Absenteeism and counter productive work behavior are the negative OCB. OCB contributes to long-term organizational success by enhancing teamwork, morale and organizational culture. Employees who demonstrate high levels of OCB often help improve the functioning of the entire organization and foster a positive work environment. While employee behavioral performance also affects organizational outcomes, it is more directly tied to task completion and achieving performance targets. Positive behavioral performance can lead to immediate improvements in productivity and efficiency, in addition to enhancing interpersonal relations within the organization. Thus, applications of OCB in service organizations with enhancing customer service quality, promoting teamwork and cooperation, reducing employee turnover, improving organizational reputation, enhancing organizational innovation and building a positive organizational climate.

The discussion institute that the Organ (1988), Borman and Motowidlo, (1997), Augnis (2009), Guest (1995) and Campbell (1990) also support this results that the OCB is the key part of employees' behavioral performance. Organizations need to maintain friendly environment to enhance EBP. This finding is consistency with the study of Sonnentag (2018), Van Dyne, Cummings, and Mclean-Parks (1995) encompasses behaviors that are discretionary

and extra-role, such as organizational citizenship behaviors. Griffin, Neal, and Parker (2007) and Fleishman (2016) include adaptive performance as EBP. The study deviated to the findings of Bakker and Demerouti (2008) and Viswesvaran & Ones (2012) includes task performance as EBP. Performance management systems, employee feedback and AI-driven tools, organizations can gain a more accurate and comprehensive picture of employee behavior (Cascio & Boudreau, 2016). Dhungana, Dahal and Chapagain (2018) support the theory of Organ (1988) that among all the dimensions of OCB conscientiousness is high in the employees. Shrestha and Bhattarai (2022) confirmed the positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. Upadhyay and Adhikari (2020) concluded that the requirements of favorable climate in the organization to increase EBP. Mahat et al. (2023) concluded that it need to enhance job satisfaction in Organization Citizenship behavior for better performance.

The future implications regarding employee's performance based on this study are the future employee behavioral performance evaluations will likely shift toward a more holistic approach that balances task performance, contextual performance, and personal development. Organizations need to maintain sociable environment to the employees for helping behavior. With advances in people analytics and data-driven decision-making, organizations will increasingly use technology to track and assess employee behavioral performance. Performance management systems, employee feedback, and AI-driven tools need to be adopted to evaluate the employees' behavior.

References

Aguinis, H. (2009). Performance management (2nd ed.). Upper saddle Riler. NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*(2), 179-211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Ali, M., & Farid, T. (2020). Organizational citizenship behavior in the digital age: A framework for understanding virtual teams. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 31*(3), 263-281. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21339

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(3), 309-328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115.

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.

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1977). A behavioral approach to the design and analysis of work motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 62*(5), 475–481. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.62.5.475

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal, 26*(4), 587–595. https://doi.org/10.2307/255908

Bettencourt, L. A. (1997). Customer voluntary performance: Customers as partners in service delivery. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 25*(3), 263-277. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02894367

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Wiley.

Bolino, M. C., Klotz, A. C., Turnley, W. H., & Harvey, J. (2013). Exploring the dark side of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*(4), 542-559. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1856.

Bolino, M. C., & Grant, A. M. (2020). The expanded role of organizational citizenship behavior: Integrating a dynamic perspective. *Academy of Management Annals, 14*(2), 332–372. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0067

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1987). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 99–109.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain of job performance. *Human Performance, 6*(1), 71-91. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup0601_5

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. Handbook of psychology: Volume 12: Industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 71-98).

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 99-109. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_3

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2003). Expanding the criterion domain of job performance: The importance

of contextual performance. *Human Resource Management Review, 13*(3), 245-269. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(03)00039-4

Borman, W. C., & Penner, L. A. (2001). Employee behavioral performance and organizational outcomes. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (2nd ed., pp. 687-732). Consulting Psychologists Press.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 425-445. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 874-900.

Dabke, A. A., Chitode, A., & Madaan, P. (2022). Organizational citizenship behavior: A systematic review of recent trends and its integration with employee well-being, workplace diversity, psychological safety, and technology. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 33*(4), 742–760. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2022.1850498

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Devonish, D. (2013). The relationship between workgroup diversity and employees' contextual performance: The moderating role of organizational justice. *Employee Relations, 35*(4), 411–429. https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-12-2012-0068

Dhungana, P., Dahal, A. & Chapagain, N. (2018). Public Policy and Governance in South Asia: Towards Justice and Prosperity, Nepal administrative staff college jawalakhel, Lalitpur

Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. (2001). Perceived organizational support, discretionary work behavior, and the role of organizational justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(5), 800-808.

Fleishman, E. A. (2016). New perspectives on employee performance in the 21st century. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 17*(1), 37-47. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100616644132

Gates, G. (1995). A review of literature on leadership and emotion: exposing theory, posing questions, and forwarding an agenda. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 2*(4), 98.

George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good–doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work–organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(2), 310–329. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.2.310

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*(2), 250-279. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7

Herzberg, F. (1959). The motivation to work. John Wiley & Sons.

Hui, C., Lee, C., & Rousseau, D. M. (2004). Psychological contract and organizational citizenship behavior in China: Investigating generalizability and instrumentality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(2), 311–321. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.2.311

Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Leader-member exchange and citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 269-277.

Jiang, K., Lepak, D. P., Hu, J., & Baer, J. C. (2012). How does human resource management influence organizational outcomes? A meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal, 55*(6), 1264-1294. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0088

Judge, T. A., & Organ, D. W. (2001). Self-esteem and personality in the prediction of job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 480-492. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.480

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). Wiley.

Katz, D. (1964). The Motivational Basis of Organizational Behavior, Behavioral Science (9:2), pp. 131-133

Kohan, S., & Mazmanian, A. (2003). Organizational citizenship behavior: Not role prescribed. *Journal of*

Organizational Behavior, 24(4), 381–394. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.197

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(2), 281-342. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x

Lambert, E. G., & Hogan, N. L. (2013). The importance of organizational citizenship behavior in predicting job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 153*(2), 138–152. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2012.661931

LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 52-65. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.52

Mahat, U., K.C., G., Ghimire, S., Raut, B.B., & Khatiwada, P. (2023). Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior and its triggering factors: a study in A, B & C category banking sector of Hetauda. *International Research Journal of MMC, 4*(1), 78–91. https://doi.org/10.3126/irjmmc.v4i1.51864)

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*(4), 370-396. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346

Mayo, E. (1933). The human problems of an industrial civilization. New York: Macmillan.

McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton University Press.

McGregor, D. (1960) The Human Side of Enterprise. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York.

Motowidlo, S. J., & Borman, W. C. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 71-83. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_1

Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 71–83. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_1

Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(4), 475-480. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.4.475

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(6), 845–855. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.6.845.

Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(6), 1543–1567. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/xxxxx.

Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: Good soldiers or good managers? *Human Resource Management Review, 7*(2), 225-250. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(97)90016-9

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(3), 589-618. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.589

Organ, D. W. (2006). Organizational citizenship behavior: Recent trends and developments. *Human Resource Management Review, 16*(2), 114-125. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2006.03.003

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995, 2015). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*(4), 775-802. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research, 31*(3), 351-363. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224379403100305

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). The influence of organizational citizenship behaviors on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 133-151. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management, 22*(2), 259-298. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639602200205

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(3), 513-563. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307

Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: Development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(4), 612–624. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.4.612

Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 66–80. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.66

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. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248

Shrestha, M. and Bhattarai, P. C. (2022). Contribution of Job Satisfaction to Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Survey of the School Teachers of Nepal Volume 7, Issue 1 (2022), pp. 36-49 *Journal of School Administration Research and Development* ISSN: 2470-8496 Print/ ISSN: 2470-850X Online ojed.org/jsard

Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. Free Press.

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

Somech, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2004). Towards an understanding of organizational citizenship behavior: The role of leadership, empowerment, and trust. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 144*(6), 511–531. https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.144.6.511-531

Sonnentag, S. (2018). The psychological and physiological processes underlying employee performance: A holistic view. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 39*(4), 518-528. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2289

Sonnentag, S. (2020). The role of contextual performance in the work environment: Implications for remote and hybrid work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 105*(5), 501-510. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000464.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Brooks/Cole.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. Harper & Brothers.

Tews, M. J., Michel, J. W., & Noe, R. A. (2018). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on team effectiveness in the context of virtual work. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 33*(5), 681-693. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-9546-6

Upadhyay, J.P., Adhikari, P. R. (2020). Impact of Motivation on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Nepalese Non-Life Insurance Companies *PRAVAHA, Journal* Issue 1.

Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & McLean Parks, J. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (A bridge over muddied waters). *Research in Organizational Behavior, 17*, 215-285.

Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2000). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(3), 526–535. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.526

Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 8*(4), 216-226. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00149

Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2012). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 20*(2), 111-117. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2012.00611.x

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Wiley.