



ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE: AN INPUT TO NON-TEACHING PERSONNEL'S ENHANCEMENT CAPABILITY TRAINING PROGRAM IN A STATE UNIVERSITY

Dianne Karen P. Ezebb

Laguna State Polytechnic University-San Pablo City Campus

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate the effect of organizational citizenship behavior on employee performance at Laguna State Polytechnic University. The researcher sought to assess the extent to which the employees of the non-teaching employees manifested organizational citizenship behavior core values such as altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue and courtesy. It also looked into the performance level of the non-teaching employees in terms of quantity of work, quality of work, job knowledge, cooperation, and human relation. The total sample of 87 was all non-teaching employees of from the Administrative Services. This study used the descriptive-correlation method to determine the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior, the respondents' profile, and the performance of employees. The primary data collection tool used was a survey questionnaire designed by the researcher and validated by field experts and analyzed using simple linear regression on SPSS V23. The Non-teaching employees were aged 20-30, mostly on a Job Order or Contract of Service status of employment. Hold a Bachelor Degree and shows 36 out of 87 were CSC passer including board examination from the PRC. The level of organizational citizenship behavior manifested by the employee was noted to have a highly observed interpretation based on the result. As to the level of performance of the non-teaching employees it was noted to have a highly performed explanation based on the result. The level of organizational citizenship behavior manifested by the employee has no significant difference to the profile variables presented. It concludes that the hypothesis was failed to reject. The level of employee performance manifested by the respondents has no significant difference to the profile variables in terms of age, employment status, years in service, education and eligibility. It concludes that the hypothesis was failed to reject. The level of organizational citizenship core values manifested by the employee has significant affect to the performance level of the non-teaching employees of LSPU, therefore, it concludes that the hypothesis is rejected. The results show that organizational citizenship behavior has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The data indicate that OCB has a substantial effect on employee performance.

KEYWORDS: *Organizational Citizenship Behavior, work performance, non-teaching employees*

INTRODUCTION

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is a concept that is constantly changing that focuses on how and why people give back to their organizations in ways other than their clearly defined job functions. Organizations have long been interested in how management affects employees' attitudes toward their jobs, as well as what kind of commitment people are ready to make to the company.

According to De Geus, 2020, findings obtained through the OCB have spurred public organizations to embrace citizenship behavior to boost performance. Indeed, public entities today struggle to sustain service levels under shrinking finances while also coming under increased scrutiny and performance demands from citizens (Hassan et al., 2015). Therefore, because OCB encourages staff to go above and beyond officially specified position criteria, it may be a crucial component of organizational responses to such difficulties. However, other researchers have discovered evidence of OCB's detrimental impacts, including occupational stress and role creep (Bolino et al. 2013; Koopman, Lanaj, and Scott 2016).

As Perkbox (2020, December 10) put it so well, employees are the company's propelling force. Therefore, it should not come as a surprise that the daily performance of a workforce has a substantial impact on a company's ability to prosper or fail.

If businesses want to succeed in today's market, they must figure out how to maintain their employees performing at their highest levels and get the most out of them. By assisting employees in developing within their roles and responsibilities, a business can establish a pipeline of future leaders in addition to aiding in the hiring, retention, and development of the most talented employees. all of which contribute to prosperity in the long run.

In addition to requiring continuous monitoring, evaluation, and planning, enhancing employee performance is a crucial step in achieving organizational objectives.

Employee performance, commonly referred to as job performance, is the total value that an employee brings to an organization in the form of a range of behaviors that support organizational objectives both directly and indirectly. Both task



performance and contextual performance, often known as extra-role performance, are components of job performance.

Training may be perceived by employees as an organization's effort to assist them in meeting the higher standards. Perceived organizational support is positively associated with diligence, and it is also positively associated with a drive to assist colleagues. This indicates that training opportunities may have a beneficial correlation with OCB, which is why it is being investigated in the present study.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to provide input to training program that improved the quality and excellent service of the employees of the Laguna State Polytechnic University and reveal the relation of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and employee performance.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research design used in the study was the descriptive-correlation method to determine the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior, the respondents' profile, and the performance of employees in the Laguna State Polytechnic University. The descriptive design was used to identify the description of the profile of the respondents' related factors. The correlation method was used to determine the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior, the respondents' profile, and the performance of the respondents.

The respondents of this study were the proportional total of 368 non-teaching employees across the campuses of Laguna State Polytechnic University. With the response rate of 23.64%, total of 87 respondents. It consists of the regular, casual, job order/contract or service which served the university.

The instrument used to gather data for the study are self-made survey questionnaire. Checklist-type of

questionnaire was utilized by the researcher to answer the problems stated. In addition, the questionnaire was constructed by adopting the statements from different sites and articles relevant to the considered indicators. The questionnaire was composed of three parts. The first part was used to determine the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, employment status, years in service, education and eligibility. The Second part determined the level of organizational citizenship behavior of the employees in terms of Altruism, Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship, Civic Virtue, Cooperation, and Courtesy using the 4-point Likert-type scales answerable by: 4-Always Observed, 3-Sometimes Observed, 2-Seldom Observed, and 1- Never Observed. Last part was utilized to determine the level of performance of the employees in terms of Quantity of Work, Quality of Work, Job Knowledge, Cooperation, and Human Relation using the 4-point Likert-type scales answerable by: 4-Highly Performed, 3-Performed, 2-Fairly Performed, and 1- Never Performed.

The data are gathered online, and the respondents answered with the use of Google Forms. Furthermore, a letter of confidentiality to the respondents were included in the survey to give them assurance that their personal information was kept confidential. Then data gathered from the administrative employees of Laguna State Polytechnic University-System. After collecting responses, the researcher sought advice, assistance, and supervision from the statistician for the encoding and interpretation of the results that supported the formation of findings and conclusions.

Frequency and percentage were used to measure the respondents profile variables. Mean and standard deviation were utilized to get the perceived level of OCB core values and employee performance. Analysis of variance were applied to obtain the significant difference of OCB and profile variables and employee performance and profile variables. Pearson R correlation were used to meet the significant relationship between OCB and employee performance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Description of the Profile of the Respondents

Table 1. Frequency Distribution of Respondents According to Age

| Age Range | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------|-----------|---------|
| 20-30 | 43 | 49.4 |
| 31-40 | 27 | 31.0 |
| 41-50 | 15 | 17.2 |
| 51 ABOVE | 2 | 2.3 |
| Total | 87 | 100.0 |

Table 1 depicted a frequency distribution of 87 people who responded corresponding to their age. 49.4% of those surveyed were in the age range within 20 and 30, 31.0% seemed aged across 31 and 40, 17.2% got aged within 41 and 50, as well 2.3% had been aged 51 or above. This indicated that the sample was primarily comprised of respondents who were younger.

The table illustrated the frequency distribution of employment status among 87 respondents. The majority of respondents (78.2%) are working as Job Order/Contract of Service laborers. It was then followed by the 18.4% of respondents who are regular employees. Casual employees constitute the smallest percentage of respondents (3.4%).



Table 2. Frequency Distribution of Respondents According to Employment Status

| Employment Status | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Regular | 16 | 18.4 |
| Casual | 3 | 3.4 |
| Job Order/Contract of Service | 68 | 78.2 |
| Total | 87 | 100.0 |

Table 2 indicated that a large proportion of respondents are employed as being Job Order/Contract of Service employees. This may be because the job order or contractual of service system has become more flexible and enables organizations to hire and fire workers more readily and

don't item for them to be regular. It may also be suggestive of an abundance of informal and unstable employment in the job market. It is essential to remember that these data might not be representative of the entire population.

Table 3. Frequency Distribution of Respondents According to Years in Service

| Years in Service | Frequency | Percent |
|------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Below 1 Year | 12 | 13.8 |
| 1-5 | 41 | 47.1 |
| 6-10 | 19 | 21.8 |
| 11-15 | 8 | 9.2 |
| 16-20 | 4 | 4.6 |
| 21 Above | 3 | 3.4 |
| Total | 87 | 100.0 |

Table 3 displayed the frequency distribution of 87 individuals who responded by years of service. Twelve (13.8%) of the people who responded have been employed for a period of time shorter than one year. 41 of those surveyed (47.1%) have served for 1 to 5 years, 19 (21.8%) for 6 to 10 years, 8 (9.2%) for 11 to 15 years, 4 (4.6%) for 16 to 20 years, and 3

(3.4%) for over 21 years. The vast majority of respondents have served in service for one to five years, and the total number of respondents declines as the number of years in service rises. This may suggest that the majority of respondents are somewhat relatively new in their respective professions.

Table 4. Frequency Distribution of Respondents According to Educational Attainment

| Educational Attainment | Frequency | Percent |
|------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Bachelor Degree | 80 | 92.0 |
| Master's Degree | 7 | 8.0 |
| Doctoral Degree | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 87 | 100.0 |

Table 4 demonstrated the frequency distribution among the 87 respondents based on their level of education. The plurality of those surveyed (80 of a total of 87) hold a Bachelor's degree, as shown. There are no participants with a doctoral degree, while 8% of respondents hold a master's degree.

displayed. 19.5% of respondents are eligible for CSC Professional, 12.6% are eligible for CSC Subprofessional, 9.2% are eligible for Other people, 28.7% have no eligibility, and 29.9% have a score of 5.00. The majority of respondents were either ineligible for the civil service examination (28.7%) or received a score of 5.00 (29.9%), indicating that they were not adequately prepared for the exam.

In table 5, the frequency distribution of 87 respondents' eligibility for a civil service examination is

Table 5. Frequency Distribution of Respondents According to Eligibility

| Eligibility | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| CSC PROF | 17 | 19.5 |
| CSC SUBPROF | 11 | 12.6 |
| OTHERS | 8 | 9.2 |
| NONE | 25 | 28.7 |
| 5.00 | 26 | 29.9 |
| Total | 87 | 100.0 |



Additionally, it also showed that those deemed eligible for CSC Professional (19.5%) and CSC Subprofessional (12.6%) were better prepared for the exam than the others. Additionally, the frequency of 8 or having 9.2 percent are the others eligibility including board examinations from Professional Regulation Commission. This information can be utilized for future research on the most effective methods of getting ready for the civil service exam.

Level of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The statistical tables presented on this part contain the level of organizational citizenship behavior: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue and courtesy of the employees of the Laguna State Polytechnic University.

The Table 6 shows that the organizational citizenship behavior in regards to altruism is *always observed* among the respondents. The employee take initiative to assist new employees to the department (*Mean= 3.84, SD= 0.37*) with a remark *always observed*. Likewise, the employees help other employees complete their tasks when the have been absent (*Mean= 3.74, SD= 0.44*) and help other employees when their workload seems too much (*Mean= 3.74, SD= 0.49*). Meanwhile, the lowest mean score (*Mean= 3.62, SD= 0.49*) which shows that the employees volunteer to do tasks beyond expected responsibilities which indicated also as *always observed* by the respondents.

Table 6. Level of organizational citizenship behavior as to Altruism

| Indicative Statement As an employee... | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
|---|------|----------------|-----------------|
| I take initiative to assist new employees to the department. | 3.84 | 0.37 | Always Observed |
| I volunteer to do tasks beyond expected responsibilities. | 3.62 | 0.49 | Always Observed |
| I help other employees complete their tasks when the have been absent. | 3.74 | 0.44 | Always Observed |
| I help other employees when their workload seems too much. | 3.74 | 0.49 | Always Observed |
| I give suggestions to improve the overall quality of performance in our department. | 3.63 | 0.49 | Always Observed |
| Overall Mean | 3.71 | | Always Observed |

Note: 3.26 – 4.00 - Always Observed; 2.51 – 3.25 - Sometimes Observed; 1.76 – 2.50 - Seldom Observed; 1.00 – 1.75 - Never Observed

The overall mean was 3.71, showed that organizational citizenship behavior has *always observed* with regards to altruism. The results reveal that those surveyed always recognize using initiative in helping new employees within the department, serving to do duties above expected responsibilities, assisting other employees in completing their tasks even though they have been absent, assisting other employees while their workload appears excessive, and offering suggestions to enhance the general level of their performance in the department.

The findings indicated that respondents are extremely likely to take part in altruistic workplace behaviors, indicating that they concern about the overall performance of their department as well as have the willingness to put in additional

effort to assist their colleagues (Bolino, et al., 2013; Florescu & Nastase, 2014).

In table 7, it revealed that the organizational citizenship behavior in regards to conscientiousness is *always observed* among the respondents. The employee makes sure everything is settled at work before taking absence (*Mean= 3.86, SD= 0.35*) with a remark *always observed*. In addition, the employees exhibit punctuality in the workplace (*Mean= 3.72, SD= 0.50*). Hence, the lowest mean score (*Mean= 3.44, SD= 0.83*) which shows that the employees barely absent from work and use day off which means that it is *always observed* by the respondents.

Table 7. Level of organizational citizenship behavior as to Conscientiousness

| Indicative Statement As an employee... | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
|--|------|----------------|-----------------|
| I exhibit punctuality in the workplace. | 3.72 | 0.50 | Always Observed |
| I observe on-time work breaks. | 3.63 | 0.53 | Always Observed |
| I barely absent from work and use day off. | 3.44 | 0.83 | Always Observed |
| I work beyond eight hours if needed. | 3.66 | 0.57 | Always Observed |
| I make sure everything is settled at work before taking absence. | 3.86 | 0.35 | Always Observed |
| Overall Mean | 3.66 | | Always Observed |

Note: 3.26 – 4.00 - Always Observed; 2.51 – 3.25 - Sometimes Observed; 1.76 – 2.50 - Seldom Observed; 1.00 – 1.75 - Never Observed



The level of organizational citizenship behavior with regards to conscientiousness pegged the overall mean 3.66 showing that it *always observed* among the respondents. The data demonstrates that employees are constantly observed demonstrating punctuality in their places of employment, observing promptly work breaks, being hardly missing from work and utilizing vacation days, and working above eight hours when necessary. Additionally, they ensure that everything at work is in order before leaving.

Conscientiousness is essential for a business because it demonstrates that employees are treating their roles carefully and completing their work in a timely manner (Kim et al., 2016). This information also indicates that employees take their roles seriously and are accountable for their actions (Soltani-Nejad et al., 2022). This is essential for a business because it can cultivate an atmosphere of trust and respect, leading to increased productivity and morale.

Table 8. Level of organizational citizenship behavior as to Sportsmanship

| Indicative Statement As an employee... | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
|--|------|----------------|-----------------|
| I make sure to work with positivity. | 3.92 | 0.27 | Always Observed |
| I separate personal issues to maintain better work relationship. | 3.87 | 0.33 | Always Observed |
| I never talk down to a co-worker who has tried and been unable to complete a task. | 3.83 | 0.41 | Always Observed |
| I remain humble and continue to treat my co-workers with respect after being praised or awarded. | 3.93 | 0.25 | Always Observed |
| I assure to do better if I made a mistake. | 3.92 | 0.27 | Always Observed |
| Overall Mean | 3.89 | | Always Observed |

Note: 3.26 – 4.00 - Always Observed; 2.51 – 3.25 - Sometimes Observed; 1.76 – 2.50 - Seldom Observed; 1.00 – 1.75 - Never Observed

Table 8 illustrated that the organizational citizenship behavior in connects to sportsmanship is *always observed* among the respondents. The employee remains humble and continue to treat their co-workers with respect after being praised or awarded (*Mean= 3.93, SD= 0.25*) with a remark *always observed*. Additionally, the employees make sure to work with positivity and assure to do better if made a mistake (*Mean= 3.92, SD= 0.27*) respectively. Hence, the lowest mean score (*Mean= 3.83, SD= 0.41*) which implies that the employees never talk down to a co-worker who has tried and been unable to complete a task which indicates that it is *always observed* by the respondents.

The level of organizational citizenship behavior in connects to sportsmanship gauged the overall mean 3.89 presenting that it *always observed* among the respondents. It is founded on responses to all five indicating sportsmanship statements. This proves that employees exhibit positive sportsmanship-related behaviors and attitudes.

It demonstrates that employees sustain an upbeat mentality and exhibit appropriate sportsmanship-related

behaviors (Teal, 2013). This can assist organizations in fostering a positive and efficient work environment and fostering collaboration and teamwork (Fapohunda, 2013; Salas et al., 2015). They ensure to work with optimism, distinguish private problems to maintain productive relationships (Malinowski, 2015), never put down a coworker who has tried and failed to finish a task, remain modest and continue to treat coworkers with respect after receiving praise or an award, and promise to do better if they make a mistake (Apello, 2016).

Table 9 elucidated that the organizational citizenship behavior in relates to civic virtue indicators is *always observed* among the respondents. The employee is open to receive feedback (*Mean= 3.89, SD= 0.39*). Moreover, the employees communicate well with their fellow employees (*Mean= 3.87, SD= 0.38*). However, the lowest mean score (*Mean= 3.63, SD= 0.51*) which shows that the employees express their ideas freely in the workplace which signified also as *always observed* by the respondents.

Table 9. Level of organizational citizenship behavior as to Civic Virtue

| Indicative Statement As an employee... | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
|---|------|----------------|-----------------|
| I take part in decision-making of the department. | 3.45 | 0.57 | Always Observed |
| I express my ideas freely in the workplace. | 3.63 | 0.51 | Always Observed |
| I communicate well with my fellow employees. | 3.87 | 0.38 | Always Observed |
| I seek clarifications on areas I do not understand. | 3.85 | 0.39 | Always Observed |
| I am open to receive feedback. | 3.89 | 0.39 | Always Observed |
| Overall Mean | 3.74 | | Always Observed |

Note: 3.26 – 4.00 - Always Observed; 2.51 – 3.25 - Sometimes Observed; 1.76 – 2.50 - Seldom Observed; 1.00 – 1.75 - Never Observed



The overall mean was 3.74, showing that the organizational citizenship behavior has *always observed* with relation to civic virtue. The results imply that employees taking an active role in making choices of the department, convey their ideas openly in the work environment, interact well with other staff members, seek clarifications regarding areas they don't understand, and are willing to getting feedback, all at an excellent level. This is an encouraging sign for the workplace as it represents an encouraging work environment. It demonstrates that employees are invested and ready to make a contribution to the accomplishments of the organization. This

sort of behavior additionally encourages trust and cooperation between employees, that can contribute to better efficiency and effectiveness.

Organizational citizenship behavior becomes crucial for any organization, as it may assist to create an enjoyable place to work which will lead to improved performance and productivity (Podsakoff et al., 2014). Organizations must attempt to establish an atmosphere of collaboration along with trust, and need to recognize and motivate employees who showcase civic virtue in their jobs (Zayas-Ortiz, et al., 2015).

Table 10. Level of organizational citizenship behavior as to Courtesy

| Indicative Statement As an employee... | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
|---|------|-------------------|-----------------|
| I consider the opinion of others. | 3.93 | 0.25 | Always Observed |
| I greet my fellow employees and other guests. | 3.95 | 0.21 | Always Observed |
| I give advance notice if I cannot go to work. | 3.91 | 0.29 | Always Observed |
| I answer queries and concerns promptly. | 3.89 | 0.36 | Always Observed |
| I follow the instructions of my supervisor. | 3.97 | 0.18 | Always Observed |
| Overall Mean | 3.93 | | Always Observed |

Note: 3.26 – 4.00 - Always Observed; 2.51 – 3.25 - Sometimes Observed; 1.76 – 2.50 - Seldom Observed; 1.00 – 1.75 - Never Observed

Table 10 revealed that the organizational citizenship behavior pertaining to courtesy is *always observed* among the respondents. The employee follows the instructions of their supervisor (*Mean= 3.97, SD= 0.18*) which state *always observed*. As follows, the lowest mean score (*Mean= 3.89, SD= 0.36*) which shows that the employees answer queries and concerns promptly which indicates that it is *always observed* by the respondents.

The level of organizational citizenship behavior pertaining to courtesy depicts the overall mean 3.93 showing that it *always observed* among the respondents. The results indicate that employees constantly consider the opinions of others, greet coworkers and other visitors, provide notice in advance if they are unable to report to work, provide prompt responses to questions and concerns, and adhere to the directives of their supervisors. It means that employees are demonstrating an elevated standard of workplace courtesy.

This information is essential for managers and leaders in organizations because it provides a glimpse into the general state of workplace civility displayed by employees (Day & Nielsen, 2017). It also enables the discovery of areas where adjustments can be implemented to ensure that employees' interactions with others reflect the utmost level of courtesy (Elamin & Tlaiss, 2015). Organizations can establish a pleasant and courteous work environment if they are aware of the degree of courtesy displayed by their employees.

Level of Performance of Employees

The statistical tables presented on this part contain the level of performance as to quantity of work, quality of work, job knowledge, cooperation and human relation of the employees of the Laguna State Polytechnic University.

Table 11. Level of performance of employee as to Quantity of Work

| Indicative Statement As an employee... | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
|---|------|-------------------|------------------|
| I come to work earlier or on time. | 3.36 | 0.61 | Highly Performed |
| I complete tasks on time. | 3.72 | 0.45 | Highly Performed |
| I submit reports within the period of submission. | 3.78 | 0.42 | Highly Performed |
| I respond to calls and emails immediately. | 3.75 | 0.44 | Highly Performed |
| I relay communication such as request letters, memos, and advisories. | 3.84 | 0.37 | Highly Performed |
| Overall Mean | 3.69 | | Highly Performed |

Note: 3.26 – 4.00 – Highly Performed; 2.51 – 3.25 - Performed; 1.76 – 2.50 – Fairly Performed; 1.00 – 1.75 - Not Performed

Table 11 disclosed that the organizational citizenship behavior concerning to quantity of work is *highly performed* among the

respondents. The employee relay communication such as request letters, memos, and advisories (*Mean= 3.84, SD= 0.37*)



with a remark *highly performed*. Furthermore, the employees submit reports within the period of submission (*Mean= 3.78, SD= 0.42*). Otherwise, the lowest mean score (*Mean= 3.36, SD= 0.61*) which evinces that the employees come to work earlier or on time off which means that it is *highly performed* by the respondents.

The level of organizational citizenship behavior concerning to quantity of work shows the overall mean 3.69 showing that it *highly performed* among the respondents. In fact, the average results of standard deviation are quite low at 0.45, indicating that the scores are reliable and consistent. The employee has demonstrated outstanding performance in all domains, with the maximum rating (3.84) for transmitting communication including request memos, letters, and advisories. This demonstrates the employee's dependability

and punctuality in communicating with other staff members or colleagues (Trialih et al., 2017). The employee's work output is exceptional, and their ratings are consistent and reliable. This is an indication of their dedication to and performance on the job (Top et al., 2015).

In table 12 depicted that the organizational citizenship behavior in connects to quality of work is *highly performed* among the respondents. Similarly, the employee manages to prioritize tasks (*Mean= 3.86, SD= 0.37*) and perform tasks following the standards (*Mean= 3.86, SD= 0.35*) with a remark *highly performed*. Meanwhile, the lowest mean score (*Mean= 3.77, SD= 0.42*) which implies that the employees review reports for technical errors prior to submission which indicates that it is *highly performed* by the respondents.

Table 12. Level of performance of employee as to Quality of Work

| Indicative Statement As an employee... | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
|--|------|----------------|------------------|
| I manage to prioritize tasks. | 3.86 | 0.37 | Highly Performed |
| I perform tasks following the standards. | 3.86 | 0.35 | Highly Performed |
| I provide prompt service. | 3.79 | 0.41 | Highly Performed |
| I review reports for technical errors prior to submission. | 3.77 | 0.42 | Highly Performed |
| I solicit the approval/consent of my supervisor(s) in performing actions and submitting reports. | 3.84 | 0.37 | Highly Performed |
| Overall Mean | 3.83 | 0.28 | Highly Performed |

Note: 3.26 – 4.00 – Highly Performed; 2.51 – 3.25 - Performed; 1.76 – 2.50 – Fairly Performed; 1.00 – 1.75 - Not Performed

The level of organizational citizenship behavior in connects to quality of work gauged the overall mean 3.83 presenting that it *highly performed* among the respondents. The results indicate that the staff member is performing exceptionally well in all areas, alongside an overall mean score of 3.83 on a scale of 4. The relatively low standard deviation of 0.28 indicates that the worker's performance is uniform across all areas. This employee has the responsibility prioritizing tasks, performing tasks in accordance with standards, providing immediate assistance, evaluating records for technical shortcomings before submission, and obtaining approval/consent from their supervisor(s) prior to performing activities and submitting reports (Gunawan & Amalia, 2015; Nayak & Sahoo, 2015). These results demonstrate that this employee excels in all

aspects of quality control when is likely dependable and trustworthy as soon as it comes to completing assignments.

Table 13 explicated that the organizational citizenship behavior in relates to job knowledge indicators is *highly performed* among the respondents. The employee shares their job knowledge with other employees for work efficiency (*Mean= 3.91, SD= 0.29*). Moreover, the employees show passion for learning and expanding their skills (*Mean= 3.86, SD= 0.38*). However, the lowest mean score (*Mean= 3.79, SD= 0.41*) which shows that the employees perform tasks with enough work knowledge and look for innovative ways to improve procedures and processes which signified also as *highly performed* by the respondents correspondingly.

Table 13. Level of performance of employee as to Job Knowledge

| Indicative Statement As an employee... | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
|--|------|----------------|------------------|
| I perform tasks with enough work knowledge. | 3.79 | 0.41 | Highly Performed |
| I show passion for learning and expanding my skills. | 3.86 | 0.38 | Highly Performed |
| I share my job knowledge with other employees for work efficiency. | 3.91 | 0.29 | Highly Performed |
| I look for innovative ways to improve procedures and processes. | 3.79 | 0.44 | Highly Performed |
| I contribute my knowledge and/or expertise for better services. | 3.85 | 0.39 | Highly Performed |
| Overall Mean | 3.84 | | Highly Performed |

Note: 3.26 – 4.00 – Highly Performed; 2.51 – 3.25 - Performed; 1.76 – 2.50 – Fairly Performed; 1.00 – 1.75 - Not Performed



The overall mean was 3.84, it showed that the organizational citizenship behavior is *highly performed* with relation to job knowledge. The results show that the aggregate mean is 3.84, indicating that the employee's job knowledge is excellent. Every single among the five indicative sentences has a high mean, ranging between 3.79 and 3.91. This further demonstrates the employee's superior job knowledge performance. In addition, the standard deviation across all of the five illustrative statements is low, with values ranging from

0.29 to 0.44, indicating that the employee's performance is consistent in all five areas.

The employee performs exceptionally well in terms of job knowledge. The high mean scores and low standard deviation scores indicate that the employee consistently performs well in all five areas. It's a positive indicator of the employee's suitability for the position (Anesukanjanakul et al., 2019; Beier et al., 2018).

Table 14. Level of performance of employee as to Cooperation

| Indicative Statement As an employee... | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
|---|------|----------------|------------------|
| I collaborate well with my colleagues. | 3.85 | 0.36 | Highly Performed |
| I follow the rules and regulations of the department. | 3.94 | 0.23 | Highly Performed |
| I commend colleagues for their accomplishments. | 3.83 | 0.41 | Highly Performed |
| I show respect to ideas and opinions not similar to mine. | 3.94 | 0.23 | Highly Performed |
| I provide cordial service to my fellows and clients. | 3.91 | 0.29 | Highly Performed |
| Overall Mean | 3.89 | | Highly Performed |

Note: 3.26 – 4.00 – Highly Performed; 2.51 – 3.25 - Performed; 1.76 – 2.50 – Fairly Performed; 1.00 – 1.75 - Not Performed

Table 14 disclosed that the organizational citizenship behavior in the matter of cooperation is *highly performed* among the respondents. The employee follows the rules and regulations of the department and show respect to ideas and opinions not similar to them (*Mean= 3.94, SD= 0.23*) which state *highly performed* respectively. Hence, the lowest mean score (*Mean= 3.83, SD= 0.41*) which shows that the employees commend colleagues for their accomplishments which indicates that it is *highly performed* by the respondents.

that it *highly performed* among the respondents. This indicates that the employee is consistently performing at a high level in terms of cooperation, and that the employee's performance is quite consistent throughout all the statements.

The level of organizational citizenship behavior in the matter of cooperation depicts the overall mean 3.89 showing

The data indicates that the employee possesses a high level of cooperation performance. This suggests that the employee is going to be a good team member who is ready to work together with others, adhere to rules and regulations, demonstrate respect for thoughts and views, and offer cordial support for colleagues and clients (Mulyani et al., 2020; Tanjung & Wahdiniwaty, 2020).

Table 15. Level of performance of employee as to Human Relation

| Indicative Statement As an employee... | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
|---|------|----------------|------------------|
| I express my thoughts and ideas with consideration with my fellow employees. | 3.86 | 0.35 | Highly Performed |
| I participate in programs that foster interaction of employees. | 3.69 | 0.51 | Highly Performed |
| I accept feedback from my fellow employees. | 3.92 | 0.31 | Highly Performed |
| I seek the assistance of my colleagues and supervisor. | 3.89 | 0.32 | Highly Performed |
| I maintain good relationship with other employees inside and outside the workplace. | 3.95 | 0.21 | Highly Performed |
| Overall Mean | 3.86 | 0.22 | Highly Performed |

Note: 3.26 – 4.00 – Highly Performed; 2.51 – 3.25 - Performed; 1.76 – 2.50 – Fairly Performed; 1.00 – 1.75 - Not Performed



Table 15 stated that the organizational citizenship behavior germane to human relation is *highly performed* among the respondents. The employee maintains good relationship with other employees inside and outside the workplace (*Mean= 3.95, SD= 0.21*) with a remark *highly performed*. Furthermore, the employees accept feedback from their fellow employees (*Mean= 3.92, SD= 0.31*). Otherwise, the lowest mean score (*Mean= 3.69, SD= 0.51*) which evinces that the employees participate in programs that foster interaction of employees which means that it is *highly performed* by the respondents.

The level of organizational citizenship behavior with regards to human relation reveals the overall mean 3.86 showing that it *highly performed* among the respondents. The mean score for each of the statements is greater than 3.5, demonstrating a high level of performance. Additionally, the

average deviation is quite low, indicating that the findings are consistent. All of the table's illustrative statements indicate that the employee's Human Relation skills are highly developed.

This demonstrated that the employee understands the significance of keeping up interactions with colleagues both inside and outside the workplace and is able to articulate what they are thinking with courtesy (Arimie & Oronsaye, 2020; Hartati, 2020).

Significant Difference of OCB and Profile of the Respondents

The statistical tables presented on this part contain the difference of organizational citizenship behavior when grouped according to profile variables.

Table 16. Test of Significant Difference of OCB and Profile of the Respondents with regards to Age

| | | df | SS | MS | F | Sig. | Analysis | Decision |
|-------------------|----------------|----|-------|------|------|------|----------|----------|
| Altruism | Between Groups | 3 | 0.43 | 0.14 | 1.38 | 0.25 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 83 | 8.66 | 0.10 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 9.10 | | | | | |
| Conscientiousness | Between Groups | 3 | 0.23 | 0.08 | 0.63 | 0.60 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 83 | 9.88 | 0.20 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 10.11 | | | | | |
| Sportsmanship | Between Groups | 3 | 0.20 | 0.09 | 1.21 | 0.31 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 83 | 4.66 | 0.06 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 4.87 | | | | | |
| Civic Virtue | Between Groups | 3 | 0.34 | 0.12 | 1.10 | 0.35 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 83 | 8.64 | 0.10 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 8.99 | | | | | |
| Courtesy | Between Groups | 3 | 0.13 | 0.04 | 1.53 | 0.21 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 83 | 2.27 | 0.03 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 2.40 | | | | | |

Table 16 illustrated the age-related difference between OCB (Organizational Citizenship Behavior) and Profile. The significance of five variables was examined: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship/obedience, civic virtue, and courtesy. The data indicate that there is no significant difference in either OCB profile as well as age group across all five variables. All five variables have Sig. values greater than 0.05, indicating there is no statistically significant distinction across the OCB profile and age group. This demonstrates that age has no effect on OCB. This result corresponds with previous study

data that suggests OCB is independent of age to a substantial degree. Workers who are older don't seem to differ all that much from those who are younger regarding their propensity to show compassion OCB. Therefore, despite the fact that younger people been discovered to be more focused on competition. They don't appear to place substantially less value on assisting coworkers, which is obviously a conclusion that is good because a good working environment influences organizational performance (Mauritz 2012).

Table 17. Test of Significant Difference of OCB and Profile of the Respondents with regards to Employment Status

| | | df | SS | MS | F | Sig. | Analysis | Decision |
|-------------------|----------------|----|-------|------|------|------|----------|----------|
| Altruism | Between Groups | 2 | 0.52 | 0.26 | 2.52 | 0.09 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 84 | 8.58 | 0.10 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 9.10 | | | | | |
| Conscientiousness | Between Groups | 2 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.11 | 0.90 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 84 | 10.08 | 0.12 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 10.11 | | | | | |



| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----|------|------|------|------|---------|--------|
| Sportsmanship/ Obedience | Between Groups | 2 | 0.16 | 0.08 | 1.46 | 0.24 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 84 | 4.70 | 0.07 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 4.87 | | | | | |
| Civic Virtue | Between Groups | 2 | 0.29 | 0.14 | 1.38 | 0.26 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 84 | 8.70 | 0.10 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 8.99 | | | | | |
| Courtesy | Between Groups | 2 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.40 | 0.70 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 84 | 2.38 | 0.03 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 2.40 | | | | | |

Table 17 showed the results of an analysis of differences between Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Profile in relation to Employment Status. The results of the study revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups in terms of altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship/obedience, civic virtue, and courtesy. All of these Sig. values are below the 0.05 threshold, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference between the two categories. Regarding Employment Status, this table indicates that there is no significant difference between the OCB and Profile. The significance results support

the claim made by (Podsakoff et al., 2009) that citizenship behavior may be a major factor in inspiring employees to stay with their existing companies. This is true despite the fact that there was no discernible difference in the strength of the association between DC and citizenship behavior between part-time and full-time workers. They proposed that charitable deeds like helping others could raise staff spirits and foster a sense of loyalty to the business, which would help with employee retention.

Table 18. Test of Significant Difference of OCB and Profile of the Respondents with regards to Years in Services

| | | df | SS | MS | F | Sig. | Analysis | Decision |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----|-------|------|------|------|----------|----------|
| Altruism | Between Groups | 5 | 1.38 | 0.28 | 2.90 | 0.02 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 81 | 7.72 | 0.10 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 9.10 | | | | | |
| Conscientiousness | Between Groups | 5 | 0.88 | 0.18 | 1.54 | 0.19 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 81 | 9.23 | 0.11 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 10.11 | | | | | |
| Sportsmanship/ Obedience | Between Groups | 5 | 0.31 | 0.06 | 1.12 | 0.36 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 81 | 4.55 | 0.06 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 4.87 | | | | | |
| Civic Virtue | Between Groups | 5 | 1.62 | 0.32 | 3.57 | 0.01 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 81 | 7.36 | 0.10 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 8.99 | | | | | |
| Courtesy | Between Groups | 5 | 0.19 | 0.04 | 1.41 | 0.23 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 81 | 2.21 | 0.08 | | | | |
| | Total | 5 | 1.38 | | | | | |

Table 18 it showed the significant difference of OCB and Profile in relation to Years in Service. The five variables which were tested concerning the significance. The two variables indicating that the variables have significant difference which was the Altruism having Sig. values of 0.02 and Civic Virtue corresponding with the Sig. values of 0.01. It implies that those with a longer period of service are more altruistic and possess greater civic virtue compared to those with a shorter duration of service. Meanwhile the three remaining variables indicate that there is no significant difference between the OCB and years in services in particular to conscientiousness, sportsmanship/obedience, and courtesy. These results demonstrate that people with more service years have a greater degree of OCB and service years in comparison to those with fewer service years. This suggests that duration of service can have a positive effect on organizational citizenship

behaviors with respect to years in service. Companies sometimes struggle to find the best staff. But it's considerably harder to keep employees. It's time to give back if you have staff who have supported you despite these difficulties. Awards for years of service are one method to honor their commitment and loyalty. Their loyalty and dedication deserve to be recognized (Pathak, A. (2023)).

Table 19 illustrated the education-related difference between OCB and Profile of the respondents. The significance of five variables was explored. The data indicate that there is no significant difference in either OCB profile as well as Education across all five variables. All five variables have Sig. values greater than 0.05, indicating there is no statistically significant distinction across the OCB profile and Education among the respondents. This demonstrates that education has no effect on OCB.



Table 19. Test of Significant Difference of OCB and Profile of the Respondents with regards to Education

| | | df | SS | MS | F | Sig. | Analysis | Decision |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----|-------|------|------|------|----------|----------|
| Altruism | Between Groups | 1 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 3.00 | 0.09 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 85 | 8.79 | 0.10 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 9.10 | | | | | |
| Conscientiousness | Between Groups | 1 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.18 | 0.68 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 85 | 10.08 | 0.12 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 10.11 | | | | | |
| Sportsmanship/ Obedience | Between Groups | 1 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.80 | 0.37 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 85 | 4.82 | 0.06 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 4.87 | | | | | |
| Civic Virtue | Between Groups | 1 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.78 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 85 | 8.98 | 0.11 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 8.99 | | | | | |
| Courtesy | Between Groups | 1 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.50 | 0.48 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 85 | 2.38 | 0.03 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 2.40 | | | | | |

The importance of education can be understood by keeping in mind that a worker's educational background affects their capacity to comprehend new instructions or cutting-edge technologies. Their level of qualification will determine how responsive they are (Kasika, B. D. 2015).

In table 20, it showed the significant difference of OCB and Profile in relation to Eligibility of the respondents. The five variables which were tested regarding the significance. The data implied that there is no significant difference in either OCB profile as well as eligibility across all variables.

Table 20. Test of Significant Difference of OCB and Profile of the Respondents with regards to Eligibility

| | | df | SS | MS | F | Sig. | Analysis | Decision |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----|-------|-------|------|------|----------|----------|
| Altruism | Between Groups | 4 | 0.63 | 0.16 | 1.52 | 0.20 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 82 | 8.47 | 0.10 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 9.10 | | | | | |
| Conscientiousness | Between Groups | 4 | 0.98 | 0.24 | 2.19 | 0.08 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 82 | 9.13 | 0.11 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 10.11 | | | | | |
| Sportsmanship/ Obedience | Between Groups | 4 | 0.33 | 0.08 | 1.47 | 0.22 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 82 | 4.54 | 0.06 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 4.87 | | | | | |
| Civic Virtue | Between Groups | 4 | 0.94 | 0.24 | 2.39 | 0.06 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 82 | 8.05 | 0.10 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 8.99 | | | | | |
| Courtesy | Between Groups | 4 | 0.11 | 0.03 | 1.01 | 0.41 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 82 | 2.29 | 0.030 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 2.40 | | | | | |

All five variables have Sig. values greater than 0.05, implying that there is no statistically significant distinction across the OCB profile and Eligibility. This demonstrates that eligibility has no effect on OCB. Local authorities were frequently investigated. Policy areas include those pertaining to defense are clearly in the lead. These types of agencies are at the forefront of the delivery of public services, frequently (as in the case of education and health) deal with the general population on a daily basis, and are crucial for extra-role

behaviors because of this whereby selfless act of kindness, diligence, and other OCB qualities may directly affect results on people (De Geus, 2020).

Significant Difference of Employee Performance and Profile of the Respondents

The statistical tables presented on this part contain the difference of employee performance when grouped according to profile variables.



Table 21. Test of Significant Difference of Employee Performance and Profile in relation to Age

| | | df | SS | MS | F | Sig. | Analysis | Decision |
|------------------|----------------|----|------|------|------|------|----------|----------|
| Quantity of Work | Between Groups | 3 | 0.56 | 0.19 | 1.97 | 0.12 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 83 | 7.82 | 0.09 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 8.38 | | | | | |
| Quality of Work | Between Groups | 3 | 0.54 | 0.18 | 2.44 | 0.07 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 83 | 6.16 | 0.07 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 6.70 | | | | | |
| Job Knowledge | Between Groups | 3 | 0.48 | 0.16 | 2.14 | 0.10 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 83 | 6.17 | 0.07 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 6.65 | | | | | |
| Cooperation | Between Groups | 3 | 0.22 | 0.07 | 1.64 | 0.19 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 83 | 3.76 | 0.05 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 3.99 | | | | | |
| Human Relation | Between Groups | 3 | 0.12 | 0.04 | 0.81 | 0.49 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 83 | 3.99 | 0.05 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 4.11 | | | | | |

Table 21 revealed that there is no significant correlation between age and employee performance or profile. This indicates that there is no relationship between employee age and performance or profile. For each criterion, the "Between Groups" column indicates the level of significance of the difference within the younger as well as older employee categories. As none of these figures are less than 0.05, it is possible to concluded that the two groups do not differ significantly. Within each age category, the "Within Groups" column indicates the significance level of the difference. As none of these values is less than 0.05, it can be determined that

there is also no significant difference between age groups. Given that what constitutes old varies greatly across many nations, cultures, industries, and industrial sectors, there is no universally recognized cut-off point between young and older personnel. In some instances, the term is also no longer as closely tied to chronological age as it formerly was. Given that there isn't a single acknowledged standard for what constitutes a "old employee," the problem of age classifications appears to be a prevalent factor among various approaches to the elderly workforce. Older workers are still employable because they are in the second half of their working lives and have not yet reached retirement age. (Pahos, N., & Galanaki, E. 2018).

Table 22. Test of Significant Difference of Employee Performance and Profile in relation to Employment Status

| | | df | SS | MS | F | Sig. | Analysis | Decision |
|------------------|----------------|----|------|------|------|------|----------|----------|
| Quantity of Work | Between Groups | 2 | 0.13 | 0.07 | 0.67 | 0.51 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 84 | 8.25 | 0.10 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 8.38 | | | | | |
| Quality of Work | Between Groups | 2 | 0.20 | 0.10 | 1.26 | 0.30 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 84 | 6.51 | 0.08 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 6.70 | | | | | |
| Job Knowledge | Between Groups | 2 | 0.43 | 0.22 | 2.90 | 0.06 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 84 | 6.22 | 0.07 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 6.65 | | | | | |
| Cooperation | Between Groups | 2 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.84 | 0.43 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 84 | 3.91 | 0.05 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 3.99 | | | | | |
| Human Relation | Between Groups | 2 | 0.28 | 0.14 | 3.12 | 0.05 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 84 | 3.82 | 0.05 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 4.11 | | | | | |

The data presented in the table 22 compared the performance of personnel based on their employment status. The study measured five distinct facets of employee performance: work quantity, work quality, job knowledge, cooperation, as well as human relations. The results showed that there was no significant correlation between employment status and employee performance. All table values indicate that the data are not statistically significant. This result suggested that employee performance is not significantly affected by employment status. Motivation, commitment to the task, and

personality may be more significant in determining employee performance. Therefore, employers ought to assess employee performance based on these factors instead of employment status. Employers who use this exchange strategy do not aspire to uphold a long-term relationship with staff. As opposed to that, by employers look for a long-term partnership using a social exchange perspective with staff members and show you care about their personal health and career options by Cho and Johanson (2008).



Table 23. Test of Significant Difference of Employee Performance and Profile in relation to Years in Service

| | | df | SS | MS | F | Sig. | Analysis | Decision |
|------------------|----------------|----|------|------|------|------|----------|----------|
| Quantity of Work | Between Groups | 5 | 0.28 | 0.06 | 0.56 | 0.73 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 81 | 8.10 | 0.10 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 8.38 | | | | | |
| Quality of Work | Between Groups | 5 | 0.54 | 0.11 | 1.43 | 0.22 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 81 | 6.16 | 0.08 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 6.70 | | | | | |
| Job Knowledge | Between Groups | 5 | 0.62 | 0.12 | 1.65 | 0.16 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 81 | 6.04 | 0.08 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 6.65 | | | | | |
| Cooperation | Between Groups | 5 | 0.40 | 0.08 | 1.79 | 0.12 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 81 | 3.59 | 0.04 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 3.99 | | | | | |
| Human Relation | Between Groups | 5 | 0.27 | 0.06 | 1.16 | 0.34 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 81 | 3.83 | 0.05 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 4.11 | | | | | |

Table 23 demonstrated was the significance of differences in employee performance as well as profile by length of service. The results of the analysis revealed that there are no significant differences across employees with different years of service. The quantity of work had the highest significance of difference with a value of 0.73, then came human relations with a value of 0.34, job knowledge with a value of 0.16, and cooperation with a value of 0.12. This indicates that the work performance of employees and profile do not vary considerably with respect to their length of service.

Years of service awards or service awards honor employees who have devoted a significant period of time to the business. It is a form of employee appreciation strategy that includes marking service milestones like 5, 10, or 20 years of employment. It should be highlighted that employees do not automatically receive them for merely reporting to work each day. They want to understand why these workers stayed for such a long time. These factors could include their successes, accomplishments, professional relationships, and shared learnings (Pathak, A. (2023).

Table 24. Test of Significant Difference of Employee Performance and Profile in relation to Education

| | | df | SS | MS | F | Sig. | Analysis | Decision |
|------------------|----------------|----|------|------|------|------|----------|----------|
| Quantity of Work | Between Groups | 1 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.52 | 0.47 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 85 | 8.33 | 0.10 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 8.38 | | | | | |
| Quality of Work | Between Groups | 1 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 2.11 | 0.15 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 85 | 6.54 | 0.08 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 6.70 | | | | | |
| Job Knowledge | Between Groups | 1 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 2.52 | 0.12 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 85 | 6.46 | 0.08 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 6.65 | | | | | |
| Cooperation | Between Groups | 1 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.80 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 85 | 3.98 | 0.05 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 3.99 | | | | | |
| Human Relation | Between Groups | 1 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 1.93 | 0.17 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 85 | 4.01 | 0.05 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 4.11 | | | | | |

Table 24 information demonstrated that there is no significant correlation between employee performance and educational background. Each of the five categories' Sig. values exceeds 0.05, indicating that there is certainly no statistically significant distinction between the two groups. This indicates that education is likely not a significant predictor of employee

performance within these categories. Others agree that their job performance is primarily correlated with their educational background, but less directly, as it serves as a signaling or screening tool required for advancement or career development (Kasika, B. D. (2015).

**Table 25. Test of Significant Difference of Employee Performance and Profile in relation to Eligibility**

| | | df | SS | MS | F | Sig. | Analysis | Decision |
|------------------|----------------|----|------|------|------|------|----------|----------|
| Quantity of Work | Between Groups | 4 | 1.04 | 0.26 | 2.91 | 0.03 | Sig. | Reject |
| | Within Groups | 82 | 7.34 | 0.09 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 8.38 | | | | | |
| Quality of Work | Between Groups | 4 | 0.31 | 0.08 | 0.98 | 0.42 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 82 | 6.40 | 0.08 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 6.70 | | | | | |
| Job Knowledge | Between Groups | 4 | 0.14 | 0.04 | 0.45 | 0.78 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 82 | 6.51 | 0.08 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 6.65 | | | | | |
| Cooperation | Between Groups | 4 | 0.34 | 0.09 | 1.90 | 0.12 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 82 | 3.65 | 0.04 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 3.99 | | | | | |
| Human Relation | Between Groups | 4 | 0.25 | 0.06 | 1.31 | 0.27 | No Sig. | Accept |
| | Within Groups | 82 | 3.86 | 0.05 | | | | |
| | Total | 86 | 4.11 | | | | | |

In relation to eligibility, table 25 showed a significant difference in employee performance and profile. Specifically, there was a 0.03-significance difference in the quantity of labor between the groups. It means that there was a statistically significant difference in the amount of work completed between the categories. With sig. values of 0.42, 0.78, 0.12, and 0.27, respectively, the quality of work, job knowledge, cooperation, and human relations did not differ significantly between groups. This indicates that there were no significant differences between the groups in these areas of performance. All tiers of government have studied OCB. The effectiveness of these agencies' performance particularly noticeable, and as a result, their organizational Public scrutiny of their employees'

professionalism is common. scrutiny. These groups work with citizens on the ground level of interaction as a supporter of good citizenship. This stands for a situation that is much different from the private sector, because in a sense, citizens in the public sector are owners in the sense that Taxes are used to support the organization, which was created by statute law. In fact, going above and beyond urgent service requirements to ensure citizens receive fair and equitable treatment (De Geus, 2020).

Correlation between OCB and Levels of Employee Performance

Correlation between organizational citizenship behavior and level of employee performance.

Table 26. Correlation between OCB and Levels of Employee Performance

| Organizational Citizenship Behavior | Employee Performance | r-value | Degree of Correlation | Analysis | Decision |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------|-----------------------|-------------|----------|
| Altruism | Quantity of Work | 0.403 | Weak | Significant | Reject |
| | Quality of Work | 0.537 | Moderate | Significant | Reject |
| | Job Knowledge | 0.447 | Moderate | Significant | Reject |
| | Cooperation | 0.398 | Weak | Significant | Reject |
| | Human Relation | 0.424 | Moderate | Significant | Reject |
| Conscientiousness | Quantity of Work | 0.534 | Moderate | Significant | Reject |
| | Quality of Work | 0.324 | Weak | Significant | Reject |
| | Job Knowledge | 0.358 | Weak | Significant | Reject |
| | Cooperation | 0.248 | Weak | Significant | Reject |
| | Human Relation | 0.265 | Weak | Significant | Reject |
| Sportsmanship | Quantity of Work | 0.317 | Weak | Significant | Reject |
| | Quality of Work | 0.573 | Moderate | Significant | Reject |
| | Job Knowledge | 0.404 | Weak | Significant | Reject |
| | Cooperation | 0.596 | Moderate | Significant | Reject |
| | Human Relation | 0.450 | Moderate | Significant | Reject |
| Civic Virtue | Quantity of Work | 0.309 | Weak | Significant | Reject |
| | Quality of Work | 0.569 | Moderate | Significant | Reject |
| | Job Knowledge | 0.614 | Strong | Significant | Reject |
| | Cooperation | 0.653 | Strong | Significant | Reject |



| | | | | | |
|----------|------------------|-------|----------|-------------|--------|
| Courtesy | Human Relation | 0.602 | Moderate | Significant | Reject |
| | Quantity of Work | 0.338 | Weak | Significant | Reject |
| | Quality of Work | 0.538 | Moderate | Significant | Reject |
| | Job Knowledge | 0.565 | Moderate | Significant | Reject |
| | Cooperation | 0.590 | Moderate | Significant | Reject |
| | Human Relation | 0.582 | Moderate | Significant | Reject |

Range: ± 0.81 - ± 1.00 - Very Strong; ± 0.61 - ± 0.80 - Strong; ± 0.41 - ± 0.60 - Moderate; ± 0.21 - ± 0.40 - Weak; ± 0.00 - ± 0.20 - Negligible

Table 26 indicated a moderate correlation between OCB and Employee Performance Levels. There is a moderate correlation between altruism, sportsmanship, and courtesy and quantity of work, quality of work, job knowledge, cooperation, and human relations. The range of r-values between 0.403 and 0.590 shows a moderate correlation across OCB and Employee Performance Levels. On the other hand, conscientiousness has a weak correlation with the same variables, with r-values ranging between 0.248 and 0.534. Civic Virtue has the strongest correlation with the same variables, with r-values ranging from 0.309 to 0.653, indicating a strong relationship between OCB and Employee Performance Levels. The data indicate that OCB has a substantial effect on employee performance.

The paper addresses the relationship between group-level Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and performance, with a focus on how the measurement of OCB (individual referent vs. group referent) moderates this relationship. The study found that the relationship between performance and individual OCB was weaker compared to OCB viewed as a group phenomenon, which was in line with the initial prediction. The findings suggest that measuring OCB at the group level, with the group as the reference point, yields a stronger correlation with performance. Nielsen et al. (2009) found that the relationship between OCB and performance at the group level was influenced by significant moderators such as the measurement of OCB, OCB rating source, and common rating source.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The non-teaching employees were aged 20-30, mostly on a Job Order or Contract of Service status of employment. Hold a Bachelor Degree and shows 36 out of 87 were CSC passer including board examination from the PRC.

The level of organizational citizenship behavior manifested by the employee was noted to have a highly observed interpretation based on the result. This shows that the organizational citizenship behavior always observed by the respondents.

As to the level of performance of the non-teaching employees it was noted to have a highly performed explanation based on the result. This reveals that the performance of the non-teaching employees is manifested among the respondents.

The level of organizational citizenship behavior manifested by the employee has no significant difference to the profile variables presented. It concludes that the hypothesis was failed to reject.

The level of employee performance manifested by the respondents has no significant difference to the profile variables in terms of age, employment status, years in service, education and eligibility. It concludes that the hypothesis was failed to reject.

The level of organizational citizenship core values manifested by the employee has significant affect to the performance level of the non-teaching employees of LSPU, therefore, it concludes that the hypothesis is rejected.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are given. It is recommended that the organization may recognize these employees who went extra mile of their work. Provide assistance to the young employees to have their CSC eligibility for them to be able to apply for a regular position if available. It is also recommended that the organization promote more opportunity to maintain this status of performance manifested by their employees. It is recommended for the organization to look out for those employees with shorter duration of service and let them take actively participate in the decision making of the organization. It is recommended for the organization to provide professional working environment that promotes satisfactory employment condition, and encourage them to prepare and take the Civil Service Examination for professional growth. It is suggested that the organization provide its members with the opportunities to learn necessary skills to continually meet the current and future job demands.

REFERENCES

1. Abd-Allah, O. M. (2016). *The Relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Employee Engagement in Cement Industry in Egypt*. *International Journal of Management and Commerce Innovations* ISSN 2348-7585 (Online), Vol. 4, Issue 1, pp: (362-376).
2. Ahmad, K. A. (2011). *The Association between Training and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Digital World*. *Communications of the IBIMA*, 1-11.
3. Alkahtani, A. H. (2015). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Rewards*. *International Business Research*, 8(4). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v8n4p210>
4. Anesukanjanakul, J., Banpot, K., & Jernsittiparsert, K. (2019). *Factors that influence job performance of agricultural workers*. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 7(2), 71-86.
5. Appelo, J. (2016). *Managing for happiness: games, tools, and practices to motivate any team*. John Wiley & Sons.
6. Ariani, D. W. (2013). *The Relationship Between Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, And Counterproductive Work Behavior*. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 4(2), 46.
7. Arimie, J. C., & Oronsaye, A. O. (2020). *Assessing employee relations and organizational performance: a literature review*. *International Journal of Applied Research in Business and Management*, 1(1), 1-17.
8. Beier, M. E., Young, C. K., & Villado, A. J. (2018). *Job knowledge: Its definition, development and measurement*. *The SAGE handbook of industrial, work and*



- organizational psychology: personnel psychology and employee performance, 3, 279-298.
9. 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.
 10. Chen, J., & Dai, L. (2018). Comment on the Research Progress of the Impact of Organizational Citizenship Pressure. *Psychology*.
 11. Cheung, C. (2000). Commitment to The Organization in Exchange for Support from The Organization. *Social Behavior and Personality*. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2000.28.2.125>
 12. Chiu, S., & Tsai, M. (2006). Relationships Among Burnout, Job Involvement, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *The Journal of Psychology*, 140(6), 517-530. <https://doi.org/10.3200/jrlp.140.6.517-530>
 13. Cho, S. (2008). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Employee Performance: A Moderating Effect of Work Status in Restaurant Employees. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*.
 14. Day, A., & Nielsen, K. (2017). What Does Our Organization Do 16 to Help Our Well-Being? Creating Healthy Workplaces and Workers. An introduction to work and organizational psychology: An international perspective, 295.
 15. De Geus, C. J. C., Ingrams, A., Tummers, L., & Pandey, S. K. (2020). Organizational Citizenship Behavior in The Public Sector: A Systematic Literature Review Aand Future Research Agenda. *Public Administration Review*, 80(2), 259-270.
 16. Dinka, D. D. (March 8, 2018). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Employees' Performance Assessment: The Case of Dire Dawa University. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Business*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 2018, pp. 15-26.
 17. Elamin, A. M., & Tlaiss, H. A. (2015). Exploring the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational justice in the Islamic Saudi Arabian context. *Employee Relations*.
 18. Fapohunda, T. M. (2013). Towards effective team building in the workplace. *International journal of education and research*, 1(4), 1-12.
 19. Fatma Triani, H. H. (November 2020). Effect of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Employee Performance at PT Surya Dermato Medica Palembang. *International Journal of Community Service & Engagement*, Vol. 1, No. 1.
 20. Gunawan, H., & Amalia, R. (2015). Wages and employees performance: The quality of work life as moderator. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 5(1), 349-353.
 21. Halbesleben, J. R., & Wheeler, A. R. (2015). To invest or not? The role of coworker support and trust in daily reciprocal gain spirals of helping behavior. *Journal of Management*, 41(6), 1628-1650.
 22. Hartati, T. (2020). The role of human relations in increasing employee performance. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, 3(1), 127-133.
 23. Kasika, B. D. (2015). The effect of educational qualification on job performance: The case of Social Security Commission in Namibia (SSC). <http://hdl.handle.net/11070/1441>
 24. Kim, K., del Carmen Triana, M., Chung, K., & Oh, N. (2016). When do employees cyberloaf? An interactionist perspective examining personality, justice, and empowerment. *Human Resource Management*, 55(6), 1041-1058.
 25. Kloutsiniotis, P. V., & Mihail, D. M. (2020). The Effects of High Performance Work Systems In Employees' Service-Oriented OCB. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 90, 102610.
 26. Koys, D. J. (2001). The Effects of Employee Satisfaction, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, And Turnover on Organizational Effectiveness: A Unit-Level, Longitudinal Study. *Personnel Psychology*, 54(1), 101-114.
 27. LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. H. (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>
 28. Malär, L., Nyffenegger, B., Krohmer, H. & Hoyer W. D. (2012). "Implementing an intended brand personality: A dyadic perspective". *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-011-0251-8>
 29. Malinowski, P., & Lim, H. J. (2015). Mindfulness at work: Positive affect, hope, and optimism mediate the relationship between dispositional mindfulness, work engagement, and well-being. *Mindfulness*, 6, 1250-1262.
 30. Mangkunegara, A. a. P., & Agustine, R. (2016). Effect of Training, Motivation and Work Environment on Physicians' Performance. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*.
 31. Mauritz, A. V. P. (2012). Employee Age & Organizational Citizenship Behavior An Empirical Study on the influence of Occupational Future Time Perspective. *Tilburg University School of Social and Behavioral Studies*.
 32. Miao, R., & Kim, H. (2010). Perceived Organizational Support, Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance: An Chinese Empirical Study. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 03(02), 257-264.
 33. Moon, K.-K. (2016). The Effects of Diversity and Transformational Leadership Climate on Organizational Citizenship Behavior in The U.S. Federal Government: An Organizational-Level Longitudinal Study. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 40(2), 361-381.
 34. Mulyani, S. R., Sari, V. N., & Sari, M. W. (2020). Model of employee motivation and cooperative performance. *Utopia y Praxis Latinoamericana*, 25(1), 232-242.
 35. Nayak, T., & Sahoo, C. K. (2015). Quality of work life and organizational performance: The mediating role of employee commitment. *Journal of Health management*, 17(3), 263-273.
 36. Nielsen, T. M., Hrivnak, G. A., & Shaw, M. L. (2009). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Performance. *Small Group Research*, 40(5), 555-577.
 37. O'Driscoll, M. P., & Randall, D. M. (1999). Perceived Organisational Support, Satisfaction with Rewards, And Employee Job Involvement and Organisational Commitment. *Applied Psychology*, 48(2), 197-209.
 38. Olowookere, E. I., & Adejuwon, G. (2015). Development and Validation of Organizational Citizenship Behaviours Scale (OCBS) for the Nigerian Context. *Psychology*, 06(05), 533-539.
 39. Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. *Lexington books/DC heath and com*.
 40. Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: Benefits & Best Practices. (2022, October 13). <https://www.personio.com/hr-lexicon/organizational-citizenship-behavior/>
 41. Pahos, N., & Galanaki, E. (2018). Staffing practices and employee performance: the role of age. *Evidence-Based*



- HRM: a Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship. doi:10.1108/ebhrm-01-2018-0007
42. Pathak, A. (2023). *Years of Service Awards: A Guide To Recognize Tenure At Work. Nurture an Engaged and Satisfied Workforce | Vantage Circle HR Blog.*
43. Perkbox. (2020, December 10). *Employee Performance: 9 Steps to Measure, Evaluate & Improve.* Perkbox. <https://www.perkbox.com/uk/resources/blog/employee-performance>
44. Podsakoff, N. P., Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Maynes, T. D., & Spoelma, T. M. (2014). *Consequences of unit-level organizational citizenship behaviors: A review and recommendations for future research.* *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(S1), S87-S119.
45. Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). *Individual and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis.* *Journal of applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122.
46. 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.
47. Rajput, Kiransinh. (2022). *Green Human Resource Management Practices and Perceived Corporate Social Responsibility as Predictors of Workplace Behaviour, Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda (India).*
48. Salas, E., Shuffler, M. L., Thayer, A. L., Bedwell, W. L., & Lazzara, E. H. (2015). *Understanding and improving teamwork in organizations: A scientifically based practical guide.* *Human resource management*, 54(4), 599-622.
49. Shahidul Hassan, Deneen M. Hatmaker, *Leadership and Performance of Public Employees: Effects of the Quality and Characteristics of Manager-Employee Relationships, Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, Volume 25, Issue 4, October 2015, Pages 1127-1155,*
50. Shim, D. C., & Faerman, S. (2015). *Government Employees' Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Impacts of Public Service Motivation, Organizational Identification, And Subjective OCB Norms.* *International Public Management Journal*, 20(4), 531-559.
51. Soltani-Nejad, N., Jahanshahi, M., Karim Saberi, M., Ansari, N., & Zarei-Maram, N. (2022). *The relationship between social responsibility and public libraries accountability: The mediating role of professional ethics and conscientiousness.* *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 54(2), 306-324.
52. Somech, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2004). *Exploring organizational citizenship behaviour from an organizational perspective: The relationship between organizational learning and organizational citizenship behaviour.* *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(3), 281-298. <https://doi.org/10.1348/0963179041752709>
53. Tanjung, A., & Wahdiniwati, R. (2020, January). *The influence of motivation on employee satisfaction and the impact of employee performance in cooperation. In International Conference on Business, Economic, Social Science, and Humanities-Economics, Business and Management Track (ICOBEST-EBM 2019) (pp. 134-137).* Atlantis Press.
54. Teal, C. (2013). *Predicting organisational citizenship behaviour: More than job satisfaction and personality.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Bathurst: Charles Sturt University.
55. Telha, A., Rodrigues, A., Páscoa, C. & Tribolet, J. (2016). *"The Competency Architecture as Error Limiting Element and Efficiency Enhancer in Business Processes". In Procedia Computer Science (Vol. 100, pp. 665-670).* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2016.09.209>
56. Top, M., Akdere, M., & Tarcan, M. (2015). *Examining transformational leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational trust in Turkish hospitals: public servants versus private sector employees.* *The international journal of human resource management*, 26(9), 1259-1282.
57. Trialih, R., Wei, H. L., & Anugrah, W. (2017). *Knowledge sharing behavior and quality among workers of academic institutions in Indonesia.* *International Journal of Business and Society*, 18(S2), 353-368.
58. van Loon, N. M., Vandenabeele, W., & Leisink, P. (2017). *Clarifying the Relationship Between Public Service Motivation and In-Role and Extra-Role Behaviors: The Relative Contributions of Person-Job and Person-Organization Fit.* *The American Review of Public Administration*, 47(6), 699-713. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074015617547>
59. Verlinden, N. (2021b). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Benefits and 3 Best Practices.* AIHR. <https://www.aihr.com/blog/organizational-citizenship-behavior/>
60. Zayas-Ortiz, M., Rosario, E., Marquez, E., & Colón Gruñeiro, P. (2015). *Relationship between organizational commitments and organizational citizenship behaviour in a sample of private banking employees.* *International journal of sociology and social policy*, 35(1/2), 91-106.