

Document Review: Journal Articles, Performance Evaluations, and Organizational Citizenship Terminology

[http://doi.org/10.21272/bel.4\(2\).75-85.2020](http://doi.org/10.21272/bel.4(2).75-85.2020)

Julie D. Conzelmann, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4333-5532>

Associate Professor, Writing Coach, Jack Welch Management Institute & College of Business, University of Phoenix, Phoenix, Arizona, USA

Abstract

The purpose of conducting the document analysis was to visually compare various performance review documents with topical literature noting the exclusion of language that identifies and measures organizational citizenship behaviors among employees in formal performance evaluation processes. A document analysis consisted of reviewing 56 publicly accessible, recent, and random performance review documents and 30 peer-reviewed journal articles identifying terms related to organizational citizenship behaviors. The expectation was to support the argument that most publicly accessible organizational performance evaluation documents exclude any significant terms related to organizational citizenship behaviors exhibited by employees. Findings from the document review supported the research inquiry of exclusion of terms listed in historical literature generally related to organizational citizenship behaviors in current performance evaluations. The inclusion of terms related to organizational citizenship behaviors in literature was extremely high. Emerson's social exchange theory provided the theoretical foundation for the research. Podsakoff's organizational citizenship behavior research was the principle impetus for comparison of performance evaluations and current literature, focusing on related terms for organizational citizenship behaviors in the workplace. Implications are that the belief and feeling of employee value, as based on formal performance evaluations, requires organizational leaders to provide a document worthy of measuring all aspects of expected and unexpected work behaviors. This paper addresses a need for organizational leaders to revise formal performance evaluation documents to ensure altruistic and above and beyond citizenship behavior terms from the literature are also part of the reward and recognition process. Changes in the formal performance evaluation process are necessary for future organizational success.

Keywords: Altruism; Organizational Citizenship Behaviors; Performance Evaluations; Recognition and Rewards; Social Exchange Theory.

JEL Classification: D23, J29, M10, M12, M19.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

Cite as: Conzelmann, J. D. (2020). Document Review: Journal Articles, Performance Evaluations, and Organizational Citizenship Terminology. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, 4(2), 75-85. [http://doi.org/10.21272/bel.4\(2\).75-85.2020](http://doi.org/10.21272/bel.4(2).75-85.2020).

© The Author, 2020. This article is published with open access at Sumy State University.

Introduction

From a leadership perspective, the exclusion of recognition and rewards for employees who exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) during formal performance evaluations is lacking. Decades of research support such recognition. However, it appears the information to substantiate inclusion has not resulted in the actual implementation or creation of a useful, global performance evaluation document. To this end, the objective of this document analysis was to specifically note the difference in terminology contained in currently available, fair-use, publicly accessible employee performance evaluations representing the possible documents used for measuring employee contributions in the workplace, as compared to terminology currently available, peer-reviewed journal articles of the behaviors that organizational leaders expect, but do not provide recognition for during formal performance evaluations. The expectation was to offer substantive and proven arguments for the inclusion of updated terminology in organizational employee performance evaluations; including leadership recognition of employees to go above and beyond as part of their daily work tasks, ensuring a pat-on-the-back. From an employee perspective, a pat-on-the-back, or some form of recognition of a job well done, is a normal expectation. Formal recognition indicates one is not only doing a good job, but leaders are also aware of one's exceptional performance. There is a saying that "people are not

robots,” (Gumbus & Grodzinsky, 2008) yet, many employers treat employees in a more mechanized fashion, rather than as feeling and emotional beings.

Very little or exclusion of OCB terms in the formal job performance process limits the recognition of employee performance to only job-specific tasks, such as expected tasks listed upon one’s hire with an organization (Conzelmann, 2020). The exhibition of OCB goes beyond formal job task requirements for which leader’s measure employee performance (Ahn et al., 2018; Muldoon et al., 2017; Newman et al., 2017). OCBs are sometimes unnoticeable actions making the behavior and action difficult to measure to have any influence on future performance evaluations (Oh et al., 2015). Prior research substantially concluded a relationship exists between leadership support and recognition of OCBs (Ahn et al., 2018; Al Halbusi et al., 2018; Conzelmann, 2020; Gowthami, 2012; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Roess & Roche, 2017). Because no metrics exist for recognizing and measuring employee exhibition of OCB, prior researchers suggested an opportunity existed to determine an effective way to recognize and reward OCBs in performance evaluations (Conzelmann, 2020; Mathis & Jackson, 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Willer et al., 1997).

Many organizations use a performance appraisal process to identify areas of efficiencies and inefficiencies within the organization. Performance appraisals are results-based; rating employees based on completing tasks and meeting strategic goals (Conzelmann, 2020). Results of performance reviews may stimulate an increase in employee performance and justify the need to change employee salaries (Baeza et al., 2017; He et al., 2019; Jahangir et al., 2004). Employees perceive performance appraisals as a segue to weed out strongest and weakest performers, and as a tool for leaders to promote or terminate employees (Conzelmann, 2020; Oh et al., 2015). Results-based performance evaluations are necessary, including a trait and behaviorally focused section to the performance evaluation process, which can assist with the individualization of performance reviews (Conzelmann, 2020). According to several researchers, individual traits such as attitude, initiative, and creativity, coupled with individual behaviors of altruism, flexibility, motivation, and performance can and should be part of OCB, and recognized as influencing employee motivation to attain personal and organizational goals and objectives (Ahn et al., 2018; Al Halbusi et al., 2018; Conzelmann, 2020; Gowthami, 2012; Roess & Roche, 2017).

Literature Review

Research about OCB in organizations is plentiful. Studies about intricacies of employee relationships, leader-follower relationships, and recognition of altruistic behaviors revealed how important OCB is to organizational success. Some findings also linked succession planning, promotional opportunities, increased teamwork, and employee satisfaction and performance to recognition of OCBs (Baeza et al., 2017; Murtaza et al., 2016). Documents randomly selected from compilation of literature over a span of 30 years comprised the group of data for this study and are also part of the following literature review.

Of the various social theories, the social exchange theory is the most prominent for organizational citizenship behaviors (Emerson, 1976). Literature over several decades revealed employees exhibited OCB wherein the organization received a benefit and employees may have received a benefit for the effort (Jahangir et al., 2004). Social exchange is the give and take between individuals, and the altruistic application of intrinsic tasks with an expectation of recognition or rewards – the application of unrequested and unexpected above and beyond behaviors that benefit the organization (Al Halbusi et al., 2018; Blau, 1964; Emerson, 1976; Mo & Shi, 2017; Oh et al., 2015). The evolution of OCB in the past 30 years reveals several changes in terminology, reflected both in literature and employee performance evaluations. Changes are definitive from the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century, as revealed next.

Going back briefly to the research by Podsakoff et al. (1990), the expectation of employee performance was much different than in current times. OCB was not a new concept and was still evolving. Interestingly, the terminology afforded to leaders of what behaviors employees should exhibit was much different than today. Some terms are still relevant but seem hidden among the verbiage (Kumari & Thapliyal, 2017). Five terms were most prevalent at the end of the 20th century: conscientiousness, civic virtue, sportsmanship, altruism, and courtesy (Podsakoff et al., 1990: 121). Resultant research since in the 21st century identified new terminology, as explored in later literature.

Relationships of 10 listed terms vary among literature reviewed in this study in relation to OCB. Interestingly, OCB is a proven term to encapsulate many terms in such a way it is considered a dual-faceted construct: organizational benefit from altruistic behavior (Jahangir et al., 2004). Other researchers concluded there were as many as 30 dimensional terms of OCB and defining all these terms was too difficult in relation to measuring performance evaluations (Baeza et al., 2017; Jena & Goswami, 2013; Sharma, 2018). Researchers generally

agreed on a minimum of seven terms measuring employee OCB: Altruism, teamwork, prosocial, flexibility, motivation, productivity, and promotion (Jena & Goswami, 2013).

Role identity and environmental fit among employees is also related to OCB through altruistic behaviors as related to job tasks and boundaries (Argentero et al., 2008; Mushtaq et al., 2019; Yoshikawa & Wei Hu, 2017). Identifying the right individuals for promotion and succession planning requires recognizing OCB and having excellent leaders to model facets of expected behaviors (Ahn et al., 2018; Al Halbasi et al., 2018; Gowthami, 2012; Roess & Roche, 2017). Promotions and modeling OCB are also part of cultural processes usually defined under teamwork and motivation (Baeza et al., 2017; Gerpott et al., 2019; Mishra & Bost, 2018; Murtaza et al., 2016). OCB, and its antecedents, follow a lineage to leadership opportunities and raises wherein some definition of proper ethical terms should be noted formally for all employees (Gerpott et al., 2019; Mo & Shi, 2017; Reiley & Jacobs, 2016; Wang & Sung, 2016).

Measuring OCB in performance evaluations is a difficult concept, suggesting further research was necessary to reveal important terms and investigate how best to recognize and reward OCB (Ahn et al., 2018; Oh et al., 2015). Findings from one study revealed managers should determine if they are measuring employee contributions in terms of OCBs and performance (Muldoon et al., 2017; Newman et al., 2017). Current research focused on learning if older terminology in current performance review documents is a barrier toward organizational leaders measuring OCBs during formal performance evaluations as compared to the newer terminology used by current researchers to define OCBs and measure employee performance.

Organizational leaders must take note that employee retention depends upon providing recognition and rewards for a job well done (Ahn et al., 2018; Sguera et al., 2018; Tourigny et al., 2019). While most employees accept words of appreciation, such as “thank you,” or “nice job,” many people desire status, title, or monetary rewards (Conzelmann, 2020; Martí-Vilar et al., 2019; Way et al., 2018). Compensation and benefits include incentive strategies for performance improvement and organizational success. A focus on identifying high-performance employees who exhibit OCBs, measuring the extent to which employees meeting specific OCB criterion, and recognizing such behaviors can increase the sustainability and functionality of organizations (Bishop & Ross, 2018; He et al., 2019). Current research about what basic terms could define and measure OCB is timely and necessary.

Leaders want employees to give their best, and go above and beyond, in the workplace but they fail to do so. Terms used for organizational citizenship behaviors are lacking in current performance evaluations (Conzelmann, 2020). As such, organizational leaders should consider revisions to future formal performance evaluation documents to ensure altruistic and above and beyond citizenship behavior terms are also part of the reward and recognition process. Employee retention, satisfaction, teamwork, and performance are proved to increase based on rewards and recognition (Ahn et al., 2018; Conzelmann, 2020). Changes in the formal performance evaluation process that include a pat-on-the-back, or appropriate reward and recognition for contributions toward a job well done, are necessary for future organizational success (Conzelmann, 2020).

No prior proof or research exists that OCB or the other 10 terms noted in recent literature are widely and formally included in the performance review process (Conzelmann, 2020). Employees define inclusion as a member of organization by the amount of recognition and rewards received for OCB: being a team-player, showing flexibility, motivation, and socially acceptable and ethical behaviors (Conzelmann, 2020; Martí-Vilar et al., 2019; Way et al., 2018). Organizational growth also depends on several specific elements: leadership focus, altruistic employee contributions, culture, and organizational structure (Hesselbein et al., 1997; Lin & Liu, 2019), in addition to promotions, raises, and identification in succession processes. Employees are more satisfied and productive when receiving recognition for contributions, not only as part of completing job tasks, but also for going above and beyond.

Methodology

Elements of the selected design were grounded in a random document data analysis. A document analysis was an appropriate research method to identify terms most used in randomly obtained, fair-use, and publicly obtainable performance evaluations and peer-reviewed journal articles about the topic of organizational citizenship behaviors. A document analysis is an effective process because of the ease of accessibility, cost savings, and stability of information (Bowen, 2017).

The question of inquiry was what terms measuring OCB are missing from formal performance evaluations, as compared to peer-reviewed literature about organizational citizenship behaviors, such that employees may not receive recognition and rewards for going over and above while performing job tasks?

The data collection instrument is unique to this research because, as the researcher, I am the tool for acquiring, reviewing, sorting, analyzing, and reporting all information found. Researcher immersion in the data collection process provided internal validity because only the truth was reported. External validity is supported in as much as any other researcher could replicate this document analysis with similar performance evaluations and peer-reviewed articles and obtain similar results.

The sample for the document analysis were obtained via Google Scholar searches, Quantum Workplace (2020), online scholarly libraries, and databases and were read and reviewed for similar terminology related to OCB. No human subjects were involved in this data collection process, making this document analysis a straight-forward review, free from thoughts, feelings, emotions, and personal perspectives (Bowen, 2017; Cone & Foster, 2006; White, 2017). All documents reviewed were publicly available, fair-use, free of charge and downloaded from the Internet. A search for copyright concluded documents are copyrighted; permission was sought and granted to use performance evaluation documents with proper attribution.

Results

This document analysis included an Internet search of several websites with open-access and free performance evaluations, revealing hundreds of usable documents for this review. Documents were randomly selected, based on length and type of documents. Most notable during the review of various websites was performance evaluations are bland and generic—with no mention of the specific term OCB – as one of the individual behaviors’ employees might exhibit above and beyond generally expected work tasks. Verbiage used in performance evaluations rates all employees under the same terms, pigeonholing all into one of two employee groups: retainable or removeable. All documents were loaded into MAXQDA (2020) to identify specific terms related to OCB. The next step was noting occurrences between the two groups. After OCB related terms were identified for each group, data were coded, compared, and visual models of results were created.

A table was created to identify various terms from performance review documents used with permission from Quantum Workplace (see Appendix A) and another table was created to identify terms from peer-reviewed research documents regarding OCB (see Appendix B). Important terms illustrated below were part of a single case model. The bars shown reveal only the top six important terms in performance evaluations related to be a retainable employee (see Figure 1). Terms listed and not mentioned in any performance review documents and coded at zero [0] were prosocial, succession, altruism, and promotion.




Figure 1. Performance evaluation terminology. Top 11 terms extracted from performance review evaluations

Source: Appendix A

A random selection of peer-reviewed journal articles related to OCB were evaluated for the 11 general terms used for defining OCBs. Not only was the term OCB used over 10,000 times in all but five articles, but each of the 10 additional terms were listed in a minimum of 34 times and up to more than 2,700 times across the 30 articles. Important terms illustrated below were part of a single case model. The bars reveal the top six terms in peer-reviewed journal articles related to be a retainable employee (see Figure 2). Interestingly, some of the terminology shown in Figure 1 as the most used words in performance evaluations (teamwork and flexibility) are noted by researchers as the least important terms for identifying OCB, as illustrated in Figure 2. Conversely,

the terminology researchers note as some typical indicators of OCB (altruism and pro-social) in Figure 2 are the lesser or unused terms in performance evaluations, as shown in Figure 1. A visual model comparing performance evaluation with journal article terminology appears in Figure 3. Of note is the orange flat-line depicting the lack of OCB terminology in performance evaluations. More importantly, the chart indicates a definitive increase, or spike, of use in most OCB terminology from recent findings from peer-reviewed journal articles.




Figure 2. Journal article terminology. Top 11 terms extracted from peer-reviewed journal articles relating to OCB

Source: Appendix B




Figure 3. Comparison model of OCB terminology for journal articles and performance evaluations

Source: Appendix A; Appendix B

Discussion

Results of the document analysis revealed most of the identified terms measuring OCB were missing from formal performance evaluations, as compared to peer-reviewed literature about organizational citizenship behaviors, such that employees may not receive recognition and rewards for going over and above while performing job tasks. Information revealed over the past 30 years, minimum, researchers identified specific terms and behaviors employees exhibit that organizational leaders are not including in formal performance evaluation documents. The overarching issue observed over the most recent five years is organizations may be getting more effort and buy-in from employees than they acknowledge or reward (Ahn et al., 2018; Conzelmann, 2020; Lin & Liu, 2019; Newman et al., 2017; Oh et al., 2015; Reiley & Jacobs, 2016).

Organizational leaders should consider revising formal performance evaluation documents to recognize and reward employees for over and above contributions – leading to increased performance, job satisfaction, and retention of employees (Conzelmann, 2020). An obvious limitation of the research was using random performance review documents available on the Internet, wherein most are undated; although date stamps or other time-revealing information was investigated. A document analysis limited detail to the contents of each document, and in this case, the investigation included the analysis of only 11 terms. Using only documents in this analysis process also limited input that could have come from individuals who work directly with performance evaluations. The goal for this research was only to explore what data were publicly available in randomly accessible performance evaluations and randomly selected peer-reviewed articles about OCB and leaving human subject investigation for another time. The most notable limitation is bias, both in the selection of documents used, but also the perceived context and perception of information revealed (Bowen, 2017).

The notable exclusion of OCB terminology from the document analysis was proof organizational leaders are not giving credit where credit is due. Employees who feel they are appreciated and valued as members of an organization will always do more than expected and continue going above and beyond. A review of current performance evaluations and reviewing findings of this analysis could help organizational leaders revise current performance evaluations to include updated measures of expected and unexpected work behaviors (Conzelmann, 2020). When employees receive recognition and rewards for the altruistic portion of OCBs, organizations reap the benefits of increased job satisfaction, productivity, and employee retention

Findings from this document analysis provided several ideas for continued research regarding OCB and for organizational leaders to consider updating terminology reflecting employee exhibition of specific behaviors in formal performance evaluation documents. First, since the use of only 11 terms in random, publicly accessible performance evaluations were investigated in this document analysis, the next step is for organizational leaders to identify and examine additional terms, possibly 30 or more, that might be more descriptive and define OCB exhibited in the workplace (Baeza et al., 2017; Jena & Goswami, 2013). Second, organizational leaders should consider updating formal employee performance evaluations to include identified terminology for OCBs and acknowledge and reward altruistic and individual contributions of employees. Finally, continued research and improvements toward recognizing and rewarding the most important assets is essential for organizational success. The outcome from the document analysis reveals an additional opportunity for changes in the formal performance evaluation process. Recognition and rewards earned from exemplary performance, and exhibition of OCBs, relative to terms noted in this document analysis, include a pat-on-the-back as part of appropriate rewards and recognition for contributions toward a job well done. Implementing a “pat-on-the-back initiative,” providing certificates, letters of exemplary work completion, monetary rewards (bonuses and raises), promotions, and most certainly, the verbal “thank you, you are doing a great job” could help improve employee satisfaction, increase productivity and teamwork, and retain exemplary employees – all leading to future organizational success.

Conclusions

A disparity occurs when organizational leaders only measure a few aspects of employee performance and recognize and reward employees based solely on specific expected tasks, but ignore altruistic, above and beyond citizenship behaviors employees bring to the workplace. For many decades, researchers hypothesized employee contributions in the workplace are undervalued and undermeasured. Most findings in recently reviewed, random peer-reviewed journal articles substantiated a lack of recognition and rewards, observed mostly through employee input; that is, organizational leaders measured employee contributions based solely on certain factors not related to intrinsic and altruistic values exhibited by employees: OCBs. When compared to randomly selected, publicly accessible employee performance evaluation documents, the exclusion of specific terminology related to OCBs reveals a noteworthy disparity. Findings led to the suggestion for organizational leaders can improve employee productivity, job satisfaction, and retention if they update current formal employee performance evaluation documents to include the recently identified OCB terminology from current research, and offer employees a pat-on-the-back for a job well done.

Funding

This research was funded solely by the author.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks the Center for Educational and Instructional Technology Research, College of Doctoral Studies, University of Phoenix™, for supporting the preparation of this article. Specifically, Dr. Mansureh

Kebritchi, as the lead presenter for the journal article process. Additional support from Dr. Crystal J. Davis, Kellyn Miller, and Eric Conzelmann is appreciated.

References

1. Ahn, J., Lee, S., & Yun, S. (2018). Leaders' core self-evaluation, ethical leadership, and employees' job performance: The moderating role of employees' exchange ideology. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148, 457-470. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3030-0>.
2. Al Halbusi, H., Tehseen, S., Hamid, F. A. H., & Afthanorhan, A. (2018). A study of organizational justice on the trust in organization under the mediating role of ethical leadership. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, 2(4), 89-98. [http://doi.org/10.21272/bel.2\(4\).89-98.2018](http://doi.org/10.21272/bel.2(4).89-98.2018).
3. Argentero, P., Cortese, C. G., & Ferretti, M. S. (2008). Organizational citizenship behavior: Podsakoff et al.'s scale. *TPM*, 15(2), 61-75. Retrieved from: <https://www.tpm.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/15.2.1.pdf>.
4. Baeza, M. A., Wang, Y. J., & Wang, V. L. (2017). Analyzing organizational citizenship behavior in Mexico: A collectivist perspective. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 37(1), 16-27. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.21825>.
5. Bishop, R., & Ross, S. (2018). Trust and leadership in the military environment. *E-Journal of Social & Behavioural Research in Business*, 9(1), 76-83. Retrieved from: <http://www.ejsbrb.org>.
6. Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York, NY: Wiley, 351 p. Retrieved from: <https://www.amazon.com/Exchange-Power-Social-Life-Peter/dp/0887386288>.
7. Bowen, G. (2017). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>.
8. Cone, J. D., & Foster, S. L. (2006). Dissertation and Theses from Start to Finish: Psychology and Related Fields (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. 375 p. Retrieved from: <https://www.worldcat.org/title/dissertations-and-theses-from-start-to-finish-psychology-and-related-fields/oclc/62766080>.
9. Conzelmann, J. D. (2020, June). Leaders recognizing and rewarding organizational citizenship behaviors during formal employee performance evaluations. *e-Journal of Social & Behavioural Research in Business*, 11(1), 21-38. Retrieved from: [http://ejsbrb.org/upload/e-JSBRB%20%202%20Conzelmann%2011\(1\)%202020%20.pdf](http://ejsbrb.org/upload/e-JSBRB%20%202%20Conzelmann%2011(1)%202020%20.pdf).
10. Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2(1), 335-362. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.02.080176.002003>.
11. Gerpott, F., Quaquebeke, N. V., Schlamp, S., & Voelpel, S. C. (2019). An identity perspective on ethical leadership to explain organizational citizenship behavior: The interplay of follower moral identity and leader group prototypicality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156, 1063-1078. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3625-0>.
12. Gowthami, C. (2012). Succession planning a need or a necessity—A global perspective. *International Journal of Management, IT and Engineering*, 2(9), 341-352. Retrieved from: <http://www.ijmra.us>.
13. Gumbus, A., & Grodzinsky, F. (2008). Ethical and managerial implications of internet monitoring. In *Emerging business theories for educators and practitioners*, 257–315. Maureen L. Mackenzie and Stuart L. Rosenberg, (Eds.). Cambridge Scholars Press. Retrieved from: https://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1209&context=wcob_fac.
14. He, P., Peng, Z., Zhao, H., & Estay, C. (2019). How and when compulsory citizenship behavior leads to employee silence: A moderated mediation model based on moral disengagement and supervisor-subordinate guanxi views. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 155, 259-274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3550-2>.
15. Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M., & Beckhard, R. (Eds.). (1997). *The organization of the future*. New York, NY: The Peter F. Drucker Foundation for Nonprofit Management. 397 p. Retrieved from: <https://www.amazon.com/Leader-Future-Visions-Strategies-Practices/dp/0787909351>.
16. Jahangir, N., Akbar, M. M., & Haq, M. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *BRAC University Journal*, 1(2), 75-85. Retrieved from: <http://hdl.handle.net/10361/517>.
17. Jena, R. K., & Goswami, R. (2013). Exploring the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction among shift workers in India. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 32(6), 36-46. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.21513>.
18. Kumari, P., & Thapliyal, S. (2017). Studying the impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational effectiveness. *International Academic Journal of Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management*, 4(1), 2017, 9-21. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3187630>.
19. Lin, Y., & Liu, N. (2019). Corporate citizenship and employee outcomes: Does a high-commitment work system matter? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156, 1079-1097. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3632-1>.

20. Martí-Vilar, M., Corell-García, L., & Merino-Soto, C. (2019). Systematic review of prosocial behavior measures. *Revista de Psicología*, 37(1), 349-377. <https://doi.org/10.18800/psico.201901.012>.
21. Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2006). Human resource management (11th ed.). Mason, OH: Thompson-Southwestern. 633 p. Retrieved from: <https://www.amazon.com/Human-Resource-Management-Robert-Mathis/dp/1133953107>.
22. MAXQDA. (2020). Research software program. Retrieved from: <http://www.maxqda.com/>.
23. Mishra, V., & Bost, M., Jr. (2018). Investigating the effects of cultural-mindset priming on evaluation of job performance behaviors. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 14(4), 846-862. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v14i4.1617>.
24. Mo, S., & Shi, J. (2017). Linking ethical leadership to employees' organizational citizenship behavior: Testing the multilevel mediation role of organizational concern. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 141, 151-162. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2734-x>.
25. Muldoon, J., Keough, S. M., & Liguori, E. W. (2017). The role of job dedication in organizational citizenship behavior performance. *Management Research Review*, 40(10), 1042-1057. <https://doi.org/10.1108/mrr-07-2016-0168>.
26. Murtaza, G., Abbas, M., Raja, U., Roques, O., & Khalid, A. (2016). Rizwan Mushtaq. Impact of Islamic work ethics on organizational citizenship behaviors and knowledge-sharing behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2016(133), 325-333. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2396-0>.
27. Mushtaq, I., Muneeb, A., Farooq, R., & Ma, J. (2019). The Paradigm of OS and OCB: The influence of person-environment Fit in Pakistani banking firms. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, 3(1), 18-33. [https://doi.org/10.21272/bel.3\(1\).18-33.2019](https://doi.org/10.21272/bel.3(1).18-33.2019).
28. Newman, A., Schwarz, G., Cooper, B., & Sendjaya, S. (2017). How servant leadership influences organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of LMX, empowerment, and proactive personality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 145, 49-62. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2827-6>.
29. Oh, S. H., Chen, Y., & Sun, F. (2015). When is a good citizen valued more? Organizational citizenship behavior and performance evaluation. Social behavior and personality. *Society for Personality Research* 43(6), 1009-1020. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2015.43.6.1009>.
30. Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(90\)90009-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7).
31. Quantum Workplace. (2020). Future of work: 17 performance review templates to motivate employees. Retrieved from: <https://www.quantumworkplace.com/future-of-work/17-performance-review-templates-to-motivate-employees>.
32. Reiley, P. J., & Jacobs, R. R. (2016). Ethics matter: Moderating leaders' power use and followers' citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 134, 69-81. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2416-0>.
33. Roess, M., & Roche, M. (2017). Job desire and response distortion in personality assessments. *E-Journal of Social & Behavioural Research in Business*, 8(2), 1-15. Retrieved from: <http://www.ejsbrb.org>.
34. Sguera, F., Bagozzi, R. P., Huy, Q. N., Boss, R. W., & Boss, D. S. (2018). The more you care, the worthier I feel, the better I behave: How and when supervisor support influences (un)ethical employee behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 153, 615-628. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3339-8>.
35. Sharma, D. (2018). When fairness is not enough: Impact of corporate ethical values on organizational citizenship behaviors and worker alienation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 150, 57-68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3107-9>.
36. Tourigny, L., Han, J., Baba, V. V., & Pan, P. (2019). Ethical leadership and corporate social responsibility in China: A multilevel study of their effects on trust and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 158, 427-440. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3745-6>.
37. Wang, Y. D., & Sung, W. C. (2016). Predictors of organizational citizenship behavior: Ethical leadership and workplace jealousy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 135, 117-128. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2480-5>.
38. Way, S. A., Simons, T., Leroy, H., & Tuleja, E. A. (2018). What is in it for Me? Middle manager behavioral integrity and performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 150, 765-777. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3204-9>.
39. White, G. E. (2017). The Dissertation Warrior: The Ultimate Guide to Being the Kind of Person Who Finishes a Doctoral Dissertation or Thesis. Portland, OR: Triumphant Heart International, Inc. Available at: <https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/36208047-the-dissertation-warrior>.
40. Willer, D., Lovaglia, M. J., & Markovsky, B. (1997). Power and influence: A theoretical bridge. *Social Forces*, 76(2), 571-603. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2580725>.
41. Yoshikawa, T., & Wei Hu, H. (2017). Organizational citizenship behaviors of directors: An integrated framework of director role-identity and boardroom structure. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 143, 99-109. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2808-9>.

Appendix A. Compilation of Performance Evaluations from Publicly Accessible Website

Performance Evaluations	OCB	Flexibility	Motivation	Pro-Social	Altruism	Teamwork	Productivity	Succession	Satisfaction	Promotion	Raise
Peer Review Questionnaire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Performance Review Template 1	0	0	0	0	0	14	14	0	0	0	0
Employee Performance Review Template 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Performance Review Template 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0
Employee Performance Review Template 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0
Employee Performance Review Template 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0
Employee Performance Review Template 6	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Performance Review Template 7	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
One-On-One Meeting Template	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Simple-Performance-Review-Template	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Interpersonal Communication Templatea	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mid-year Performance Check Template	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Online Employee Progress Appraisal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Performance Agreement Template	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0
Employee Review Example 2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 3	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 9	0	4	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	14
Employee Review Example 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 13	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 16	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 17	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix A (cont.). Compilation of Performance Evaluations from Publicly Accessible Website

Employee Review Example 18	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 19	0	2	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 23	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 26	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 27	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 34	0	99	0	0	0	100	80	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 36	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 40	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 42	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 44	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Review Example 46	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	108	2	0	0	200	195	0	20	0	14

Source: Quantum Workplace, 2020

Appendix B. Compilation of Peer-reviewed Journal Articles and Data

Authors	Year	OCB	Flexibility	Motivation	Pro-Social	Altruism	Teamwork	Productivity	Succession	Satisfaction	Promotion	Raise
Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B, Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990)	1990	71	0	2	1	23	0	0	0	82	0	1
Jahangir, N., Akbar, M. M., Haq, M. (2004)	2004	611	0	53	41	21	0	10	0	231	0	0
Argentero, P., Cortese, C. G., & Ferretti, M. S. (2008)	2008	98	0	0	2	209	0	0	0	71	0	0
Gowthami, C. (2012)	2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	551	0	7	0
Jena, R. K., & Goswami, R. (2013)	2013	456	0	0	23	13	0	23	0	585	67	0
Oh, S. H., Chen, Y., & Sun, F. (2015)	2015	618	0	5	0	26	0	0	0	12	0	0
Murtaza, G., Abbas, M., Raja, U., Roques, O., & Khalid, A. (2016)	2016	160	0	8	0	1	0	0	0	50	0	0
Reiley, P. J., & Jacobs, R. R. (2016)	2016	448	0	23	0	0	0	3	0	51	4	0
Wang, Y. D., & Sung, W. C. (2016)	2016	1 049	0	26	34	0	0	0	0	12	11	0
Baeza, M. A., Wang, Y. J., & Wang, V. L. (2017)	2017	585	11	21	0	88	0	0	0	54	0	0
Kumari, P. & Thapliyal, S. (2017)	2017	167	11	26	0	49	0	14	0	139	0	0
Mo, S., & Shi, J. (2017)	2017	492	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	11	2	0
Muldoon, J., Keough, S. M., & Liguori, E. W. (2017)	2017	967	0	30	0	0	12	0	0	19	0	0
Newman, A., Schwarz, G., Cooper, B., & Sendjaya, S. (2017)	2017	617	0	92	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0
Roess, M., & Roche, M. (2017)	2017	0	0	106	0	0	12	4	0	19	0	0
Yoshikawa, T., & Wei Hu, H. (2017)	2017	765	0	104	0	6	0	0	0	22	0	9
Ahn, J., Lee, S., & Yun, S. (2018)	2018	173	0	16	12	0	0	0	0	27	1	0
Al Halbusi, H., Tehseen, S., Hamid, F. A. H., & Afthanorhan, A. (2018)	2018	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	28	0	9
Bishop, R., & Ross, S. (2018)	2018	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	8	0	0
Mishra, V., & Bost, M., Jr. (2018)	2018	130	0	56	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	1
Sguera, F., Bagozzi, R. P., Huy, Q. N., Boss, R. W., & Boss, D. S. (2018)	2018	240	0	15	13	0	12	0	0	256	0	20
Sharma, D. (2018)	2018	306	0	18	22	23	0	0	0	141	0	0
Way, S. A., Simons, T., Leroy, H., & Tuleja, E. A. (2018)	2018	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5	10
Gerpott, F., Quaquebeke, N. V., Schlamp, S., & Voelpel, S. C. (2019)	2019	597	10	22	22	0	0	0	0	16	2	12
He, P., Peng, Z., Zhao, H., & Estay, C. (2019)	2019	52	2	17	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Lin, Y., & Liu, N. (2019)	2019	83	0	33	19	0	0	18	0	245	22	0
Martí-Vilar, M., Corell-García, L., & Merino-Soto, C. (2019)	2019	0	0	8	2 468	106	0	0	0	7	0	0
Mushtaq, I., Muneeb, A., Farooq, R., & Ma, J. (2019)	2019	632	0	19	0	20	0	18	0	60	0	13
Tourigny, L., Han, J., Baba, V. V., & Pan, P. (2019)	2019	639	0	3	9	0	0	9	0	22	6	0
Conzelmann, J. D. (2020, June)	2020	158	0	5	0	12	26	41	6	46	9	6
Total		10 154	34	708	2 702	601	62	140	557	2 267	136	93
*Used with permission from QuantumWorks © 2020												

Source: Compiled by the author