International Journal of

HRM and Organizational Behavior

www.ijhrmob.com

editor@ijhrmob.com

International Journal of
HRM and Organizational Behavior
ISSN 2454 - 5015

In the field of human resource management, there are several fundamental problems associated with contextual performance and organizational citizenship behaviour.

Vasantha P
International Management Institute. Bhubaneswar.

Abstract
In this post, we'll look at a few of the more fundamental problems that may arise when trying to apply concepts like contextual performance and corporate citizenship behavior to HRM. Arguments are made that careful definition and measurement of the behavioral dimensions that these terms embrace are more important than labeling issues and differences between the origins and definitions of the terms, contextual performance, and organizational citizenship behavior. It also takes into account the contrasts made by Law, Wong, and Mobley regarding the conceptual status of organizational citizenship behavior and contextual performance as latent variables or aggregate constructions. Finally, it investigates how these words' connoted patterns of behavior affect organizational efficiency and the motivation, contentment, and dedication of individual workers.

Introduction
Behavioral patterns embedded in ideas about contextual performance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) have many important implications, both theoretical and practical, for virtually all kinds of human resource practices including job analysis, recruitment, selection, training, development,performance appraisal, compensation, and even labor and employee relations(Werner, 2000). In the course of exploring these implications, however, scho-lars and practitioners alike are sure to confront some basic conceptual challenges. The purpose of this article is to try to bring these issues into sharper focus.
SHOULD WE SAY ‘‘CONTEXTUAL" OR SHOULD WE SAY ‘‘CITIZENSHIP"?

Borman and Motowidlo (1993) introduced the term, contextual performance, and related it to the term, OCB, which Organ and his colleagues (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983) introduced 10 years earlier. The two terms refer to behavioral elements that are similar in many respects, similarenough that one might reasonably wonder whether two labels are really needed for what could seem to be very similar behavioral domains, and if theyare, when one label might be more appropriate than the other. What seems to be underappreciated, however, is that although the terms refer to many of thesame types of behaviors, they also connote differences that are arguably important enough to justify preserving a distinction between them.

According to Organ (1997, p. 92), ideas about OCB developed from hisconviction that job satisfaction affected ‘‘people's willingness to help colleaguesand work associates and their disposition to cooperate in varied and mundaneforms to maintain organized structures that govern work." His student, Smith(Smith et al., 1983), tried to define specific behaviors that reflected thiswillingness and disposition by asking managers to describe things they wouldlike their subordinates to do, but which they could not require them to do,either by force, offers of rewards, or threats of punishment. Behaviors thatemerged through this process form the basis of what subsequently became awidely used instrument for measuring OCB. Thus, the concept of OCB wasoriginally conceived out of an interest in behavioral consequences of jobsatisfaction that were presumed to have important implications for organiza-tional effectiveness and was originally defined as behaviors that managerswanted their subordinates to perform but could not require them to perform.Ideas about contextual performance have a very different origin.

In contrast, the part of the performance domain that Borman and Motowidlobelieved was often ignored or downplayed in selection research and practice includes activities such as volunteering, persisting, helping, following rules, and endorsing organizational objectives. They argued that these activities are organizationally important for a different reason; ‘‘they support the organiza- tional, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function." (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, p. 73) It is precisely because they presumed these activities are organizationally valuable because of their effects on the environment or context of the technical core that Borman and Moto- widlo introduced the term ‘‘contextual performance" to refer to them.
As a consequence of this basic difference in the way the two terms
originated, their definitions were also importantly different. Organ (1988, p.4) defined OCB formally as ‘‘individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in theaggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization." On the other hand, as Organ (1997, p. 90) incisively pointed out about contextual performance, ‘‘What is different from OCB

is that contextual performance as defined does not require that the behavior be extra-role (discretionary) nor that it be nonrewarded. The defining quality is that it be ‘non-task', or moreto the point, that it contribute to the maintenance and/or enhancement of the

This makes it important for peoplewho use the term to be very explicit about which of the alternative definitionsthey are adopting. If they adopt the original definition, they might also want to explain why they are not deterred by the conceptual difficulties that Organ (1997) described in connection with the original definitional requirements thatOCB be both discretionary and nonrewardable.

Whatever its formal definition, OCB refers to patterns of behavior that are similar, although not necessarily identical, to patterns of behavior embraced by contextual performance. Both, for instance, include some form of interper- sonal helping. This means that when investigators study interpersonal help- ing, they can legitimately claim to be studying an aspect of either contextual performance, OCB, or of another related concept, extra-role behavior (Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995).

Which term they choose as an overall descriptor of their behavioral variable will probably depend mostly on the reason for their scholarly interest in interpersonal helping and possibly in part too on their aesthetic preference for one word over another. If they are interested in helping behavior because they believe it is ‘‘behavior which benefits the organization and/or is intended to benefit the organization, which is discretionary and which goes beyond existing role expectations," (Van Dyne et al., 1995, p. 218) they might declarethat they are studying an aspect of extra-role behavior. If they are interested in helping behavior because they believe it is ‘‘individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization," (Organ, 1988, p. 4) they might declare that they are studying an aspect of OCB according to its original definition. If they are interested inhelping behavior because they believe the reason it is organizationally important is that it maintains and enhances the social and psychological context of work, and because they want to contrast its antecedents or consequences with those of task performance, they might declare that they are studying some aspect of contextual performance. Or if they object to the term, contextual performance, for reasons similar to Organ's (1997) when he complained that it is ‘‘cold, gray, and bloodless," (p. 91) they might prefer instead to use the term, OCB, according to its revised definition.

WHAT IS THE BEHAVIORAL CONTENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AND CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE?

If, as implied above, the behavioral content of OCB and contextual perfor- mance is more important than the labels we attach to these concepts, it is fairto ask what that behavioral content might be. Through a factor analysis of items that were developed by asking managers what actions they would like to see their subordinates to perform, but cannot require them to perform,Smith et al. (1983) identified two broad dimensions of OCB. They labeled them altruism (helping specific individuals) and general compliance (gener- ally doing what good employees should do). Later, Organ (1988) offered a taxonomy of organizational citizenship dimensions that included altruism, conscientiousness (which is the same as what Smith et al., 1983 had labeled general compliance), sportsmanship (not complaining about minor annoy- ances), courtesy (keeping others informed of matters that might affect them),and civic virtue (contributing responsibly to corporate governance by staying informed of political developments and expressing opinions about them). More recently, Organ (1997) pared back his dimensional taxonomy by em- phasizing only three forms of OCB—helping (which was earlier called altru- ism), courtesy, and conscientiousness.

Borman and Motowidlo (1993) originally suggested five dimensions of contextual performance: volunteering, persisting with extra effort, helping and cooperating, following organizational rules and procedures, and endorsing organizational objectives. Coleman and Borman (2000) tried more system- atically to integrate the behavioral content of concepts such as contextual performance, OCB, and extra-role behavior and settled finally on three factors, which they labeled interpersonal citizenship performance (helping, altruism),organizational citizenship performance (compliance, loyalty, endorsing orga- nizational objectives, conscientiousness, civic virtue, following rules, etc.), and job/task citizenship performance (persisting, extra effort). Readers will readily recognize points of similarity between Organ's (1997) dimension of helpfulness and Coleman and Borman's (2000) dimension of interpersonal citizenship performance, and between Organ's dimension of conscientiousness and Cole- man and Borman's dimensions of organizational citizenship performance and job/task citizenship performance.

What about civic virtue? It appears as an element of Coleman and
Borman's dimension of organizational citizenship performance. Graham's (2000) discussion of civic virtue in the context of political philosophy, however, shows that the notion of civic virtue has a very rich and interdisciplinary intellectual tradition. This compels an argument for pre- serving civic virtue as a separate category of OCB (or contextual perfor- mance, or extra-role behavior, or citizenship

performance), rather than submerging it in a more general behavioral dimension.

In any event, Coleman and Borman's (2000) argument that there is no onebest way to partition these behavioral domains and that different taxonomies could be useful for different purposes, is very well taken. In fact, although behavioral patterns reflecting helpfulness toward individuals, and conscien- tious compliance with organizational objectives and expectations seem to runthrough virtually all of these related domains (according to Coleman and Borman's analysis), other behavioral dimensions could also be important to highlight. For example, civic virtue, as mentioned, might be one example of a behavioral dimension worth highlighting separately; voice behavior (LePine &Van Dyne, 1998, 1999; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998) might be another; personalinitiative (Frese, Kring, Soose, & Zempel, 1996) might be a third; and adaptive
performance (Hesketh & Neal, 1999) might be still a fourth. It bears repeatingthat the important thing is to carefully define organizationally relevant behavioral variables and study their relations with other variables. Whether the behavioral variables happen to fit any particular definition of contextual performance, or OCB, or extra-role behavior, etc., or whether the investigatorchooses to label those behavioral variables as part of one of these broader domains, is less important.

Accordingly, there are good reasons for both (1) trying to identify rela- tively broad categories of behavior in these domains as Coleman and Bor- man (2000) did, and (2) preserving narrower, more focused behavioral dimensions such as civic virtue, voice, personal initiative, and adaptive performance as worthy of study in their own right. It might also be importantto show that the broader dimensions can be empirically distinguished from each other and that the narrower dimensions, too, can be empirically distinguished from each other. If this literature continues to rely heavily on ratings by external observers such as peers or supervisors for measures ofthese behavioral variables, the problem of distinguishing empirically between them has to take into consideration questions about the inter-rater reliabilityof these ratings.

For instance, Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996) asked whether task performance could be empirically distinguished from interpersonal aspects of contextual performance, which they labeled interpersonal facilitation, and from motivational aspects of contextual performance, which included ele- ments of both organizational citizenship performance and job/task citizen- ship performance in Coleman and Borman's (2000) integrated model, and which Van Scotter and Motowidlo labeled job dedication. They found that correlations corrected for inter-rater reliability supported distinguishingtask performance from interpersonal facilitation, but not from job dedica- tion. This raises the possibility that if Coleman and Borman's dimensions were put to a similar test, it might not be possible to distinguish a measureof task performance from either organizational citizenship performance or, especially, from job/task citizenship performance. Of course, if it is not thepurpose of their integrated model to identify parts of the criterion domain that are different from task performance, it is not necessarily important to show that its dimensions can be empirically distinguished from task performance. They should still be empirically distinguishable from each other, however.

ARE CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR LATENT CONSTRUCTS, AGGREGATE CONSTRUCTS, OR SOMETHING ELSE?

Although the dust might not yet have settled around efforts to define the behavioral content of contextual performance and OCB, so far, at least, everyone seems to agree that both concepts are multidimensional. Then, it becomes fair to ask what sort of multidimensional concepts they are.According to the aggregate model, however, the multidimensional construct is a composite formed by an algebraic combination (usually a linear sum) of itsdimensions. The underlying construct does not have causal effects on its dimensions in this case. Relations between the construct and its dimensions can be represented by structural arrows that go from the dimensions to theconstruct. These are not ‘‘causal" arrows, however. They indicate only that thedimensions are part of the definition of the multidimensional construct. In this case, therefore, each dimension is a deficient indicator of the multidimensionalconstruct.

All of the reliable variance of a specific dimension is related to the multidimensional construct, but the reliable variances of other dimensions, which do not necessarily overlap with each other, also contribute to the multidimensional construct. Law et al. (1998) suggested that job satisfactionis an example of an aggregate multidimensional construct. They argued that overall job satisfaction is, by definition, the sum of its facets including satisfaction with pay, supervision, work, supervisor, etc. According to Law et al. (1998, pp. 745—746) ‘‘No dimension alone can represent a latent constructcalled overall job satisfaction; this construct exists only as the summed aggregate of its dimensions."

As defined in Motowidlo, Borman, and Schmit's (1997) theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance, contextual performance is anaggregate multidimensional construct. Their theory describes a performance domain that consists of all the behavioral episodes that are performed by an individual and that have positive or negative consequences for organizationaleffectiveness over a defined

period of time. It defines job performance as the aggregated value to the organization of those behavioral episodes. Some of those episodes have positive or negative value to the organization because they have positive or negative effects on the social, organizational, and psychologi- cal context of the technical core. The aggregated value of all of those behavioral episodes is contextual performance. Thus, contextual performance is the algebraic sum of the contribution values of behavioral episodes representing all the dimensions that are a part of contextual performance.

What sort of multidimensional construct OCB might be is more difficult todetermine. In fact, Law et al. (1998) specifically pointed to OCB as an exampleof a multidimensional construct in which relations between the construct and its dimensions are unspecified. They argued that the conceptual meaning of OCB and its relations with other variables depends on whether it is definedaccording to the latent model as the common factor that underlies its dimen- sions or according to the aggregate model as the sum of its dimensions.

If defined according to the latent model, perhaps the underlying construct would be something like ‘‘people's willingness to help colleagues and work associates and their disposition to cooperate in varied and mundane forms tomaintain organized structures that govern work." (Organ, 1997, p. 92) This would make OCB a volitional construct. It would be a motivational state observable from its presumed effects on the various dimensions of OCB (suchas helping, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, and courtesy) andwould be represented as the common factor that taps variance common to allthese behavioral dimensions.

If defined according to the aggregate model, perhaps the underlying con- struct is exactly the same as contextual performance, with Organ's (1997) redefinition of OCB. Then, it would be the aggregated value to the organizationof all behavioral patterns that contribute to organizational effectiveness byenhancing and/or maintaining the social, organizational, and psychological context of work.

A third possibility is that OCB is neither of these. Perhaps, it makes better sense to think of it as a label for different patterns of behavior that all have to do with helping and cooperating in various ways, but without assuming either that there is a latent construct that drives all these behaviors in the same way,or that they possess some quality such as contribution value to the organiza- tion that can be aggregated. This would make it a term with a conceptual status similar to that of ‘‘leadership," which can refer to behavioral patternssuch as consideration, initiating structure, and participative decision-making, and ‘‘personality," which can refer to dispositions such as extraversion, agree-ableness, neuroticism, and so forth.

Neither leadership nor personality, in thissense, would be construed either as a latent variable or as an aggregate variable. In fact, they are not variables at all. The reason they are useful termsis that they provide convenient labels for sets of other terms that do representvariables and that belong together conceptually.

WHAT ARE THE ORGANIZATIONAL AND INDIVIDUAL CONSEQUENCESOF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AND CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE?

According to Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997), behaviors covered by the term, organizational citizenship, can reasonably be expected to enhance coworkers' productivity, enhance managers' productivity, free up organizational re- sources for other productive purposes, help coordinate activities between team members and work groups, make the organization a more satisfying place to work and thus help attract and retain productive employees, main- tain performance consistency and stability, and improve organizational adaptability. Through all these means, such behaviors should contribute to organizational effectiveness and therefore have a noticeable effect on financialmeasures of firm success.

Exactly how and to what extent such behaviors affect firm financial performance, however, is not yet clear (Werner, 2000). The contribution of contextual performance to firm financial performance is likely to be verydifficult to estimate because the connection between contextual performance and firm financial performance is indirect and mediated by its effects on factors such as those enumerated by Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997). The contribution of task performance to firm financial performance might be easierto estimate, at least in principle, because task performance affects the production of organizational goods and services more directly.

Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997) also mentioned potential moderators of effects of OCBs on firm productivity and pointed out that sometimes, behaviors such as helping can increase productivity and sometimes they can decrease it.The idea that the same behaviors that might be considered effective citizenship or aspects of contextual performance in one setting can be ineffective in another is also suggested by Paine and Organ's (2000) analysis of the culturalmatrix of OCB. If, as their results suggest, citizenship behaviors are inter- preted or evaluated differently in different national cultures, some forms of OCB are probably more organizationally valuable in some cultures than in others. Thus, national culture could importantly moderate relations between the frequency with which people perform OCBs and the degree to which they contribute to organizational effectiveness.

Van Scotter's study (2000) illustrates how contextual performance can haveother important consequences, this time for individuals. Van Scotter argued that if contextual performance is organizationally valued, people who are particularly effective in this part of the performance domain are likely to receive more systemic rewards and for that reason, experience higher levels ofboth job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This article developed several themes about basic issues likely to confrontscholars and practitioners interested in applying ideas about contextual performance and organizational citizenship to human resource management.First, there is the labeling issue. The terms, organizational citizenship behavior and contextual performance, arose from very different research concerns and intellectual traditions, even though the behavioral elements theyembrace are similar in many respects. Along with the term, extra-rolebehavior, they represent different reasons for investigators to be interestedin the same or similar dimensions of organizational behavior, such as helpingand compliance. It is important to define these behavioral dimensions carefullyand unambiguously so their relations with other variables can become known.It is not so important whether the investigator's interest in these behaviorsstems primarily from ideas related to either contextual performance, OCB, orextra-role behavior, except to the extent these ideas shed light on theinvestigator's research questions about the specific behavioral dimensionsunder investigation. Thus, although there might be a good reason to preservedistinctions between these terms, their behavioral content is more important
than their labels.

Second, efforts to identify the behavioral content of contextual performance,OCB, extra-role behavior, and related terms can be aimed at either relatively broad dimensions like those developed by Coleman and Borman (2000) and mentioned by Organ (1997), or narrower dimensions such as civic virtue, voice, personal initiative, and adaptive performance. Both types of taxonomies are important and potentially useful. So far, it seems that the broader categories are likely to include elements of helping individuals, elements of compliance with organizational objectives and rules, and, perhaps, elements of extraor- dinary effort and persistence. If we continue to rely on ratings to measure these dimensions, however, it would be prudent to establish that whatever behavioral dimensions we define are empirically distinguishable, even when inter-rater reliability is taken into account.

Third, if the argument of Law et al. (1998) is correct that the conceptual meaning of a multidimensional construct and of its relations with other variables depend on whether it is defined according to the latent model oraccording to the aggregate model, it becomes important to know what types of multidimensional constructs are meant by terms such as contextual perfor- mance and OCB. The performance model described by Motowidlo et al. (1997)defines contextual performance as an aggregate construct. Whether OCB is also an aggregate construct, or a latent construct, or simply a label for a set of various forms of helpful and compliant behaviors, is yet to be determined.

Fourth, questions about organizational and individual consequences of OCB and contextual performance are especially important for human resource management scholars and practitioners. It would be useful to be able to express their organizational consequences in economic terms and show howand to what extent they contribute to financial firm performance. This is likely to prove very difficult to accomplish, however, because the causal chain fromeffective individual performance in these areas to firm financial performance ismediated by its consequences for others' individual behavior and effectivenessand by the implications of others' individual behavior and effectiveness for organizational effectiveness. Contextual performance and OCB also have important implications for individuals in organizations. Effective performance in these areas can lead to systemic rewards and thereby affect individuals' motivation to behave in these ways as well as their satisfaction and organiza-tional commitment.

REFERENCES

Allen, T., Barnard, S., Rush, M., & Russell, J. (2000). Ratings of organizational citizenship behavior in human resource management. Human Resource Management Reviev, 10(1), 97—114.

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relation-ship between affect and employee ‘‘citizenship." Academy of Management Journal, 26, 587—595.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include ele- ments of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, & W. C. Borman (Eds.), Personnel selection in organizations (pp. 71—98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Coleman, V. I., & Borman, W. C. (2000). Investigating the underlying structure of the citizen-ship performance domain. Human Resource Management Reviev, 10(1), 25 —44.

Frese, M., Kring, W., Soose, A., & Zempel, J. (1996). Personal initiative at work: Differences between East and West Germany. Academy of Management Journal, 39, 37—63.

Graham, J. W. (2000). Promoting civic virtue organizational citizenship behavior: Contem- porary questions rooted in classical quandaries from political philosophy. Human Resource Management Reviev, 10(1), 61—77.

Hesketh, B., & Neal, A. (1999). Technology and performance. In D. R. Ilgen, & E. D. Pulakos (Eds.), The changing nature of performance: Implications for staffing, motivation, and development (pp. 21—55). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Law, K. S., Wong, C. S., & Mobley, W. H. (1998). Toward a taxonomy of multidimensional constructs. Academy of Management Reviev, 23, 741—755.

LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83, 853—868.

LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (1999). Effects of individual differences on voice and task performance. Paper submitted to the Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta.

Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. Human Performance, 10, 71—83.

Organ, D. W. (1977). A reappraisal and reinterpretation of the satisfaction—causes—perfor- mance hypothesis. Academy of Management Reviev, 2, 46—53.

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

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. Hu- man Performance, 10, 85—97.

Paine, J. B., & Organ, D. W. (2000). The cultural matrix of organizational citizenship beha- vior: some preliminary conceptual and empirical observations. Human Resource Man- agement Reviev, 10(1), 45—59.

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. Human Performance, 10, 133—151.

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 653—663.

Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & Parks, J. M. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit ofconstruct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). In L. L. Cummings, & B. M. Staw (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (Vol. 17, pp. 215 — 285). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behavior: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. Academy of Management Journal, 41, 108—119.

Van Scotter, J. R. (2000). Relationships of task performance and contextual performance with turnover, job satisfaction, and affective commitment. Human Resource Manage-ment Reviev, 10(1), 79—95.

Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedica-tion as separate facets of contextual performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 525—531.

Werner, J. M. (2000). Implications of OCB and contextual performance for human resource management. Human Resource Management Reviev, 10(1), 3—24.