

Lin Dar Ong¹

EMPLOYEES' JOB PERFORMANCE AT THE WORKPLACE

In-role behaviour has received considerable attention in organizational research. More recent research has begun to acknowledge the role of contextual performance in promoting effective organizational functioning. This article reviews the literature on 3 categories of job performance, namely organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB), counterproductive work behaviour (CWB), and task performance. It also discusses how improved job performance could benefit organizations and their members.

Keywords: organizational citizenship behaviour; counterproductive work behaviour; deviant behaviour; task performance.

Лін Дар Онг

ПРОДУКТИВНІСТЬ ПЕРСОНАЛУ НА РОБОЧОМУ МІСЦІ

У статті показано, що ролевій поведінці приділяється значна увага в організаційних дослідженнях. Нещодавні дослідження почали визнавати роль контекстної продуктивності в сприянні ефективній роботі організацій. Надано огляд літератури за 3 категоріями продуктивності праці, а саме: лояльність співробітників, контрпродуктивна робоча поведінка, а також виконання завдань. Обговорено, яким чином підвищення продуктивності роботи може принести користь організаціям та їхнім членам.

Ключові слова: лояльність співробітників; контрпродуктивна робоча поведінка; девіантна поведінка; виконання задач.

Лин Дар Онг

ПРОИЗВОДИТЕЛЬНОСТЬ ПЕРСОНАЛА НА РАБОЧЕМ МЕСТЕ

В статье показано, что ролевому поведению уделяется значительное внимание в организационных исследованиях. Недавние исследования начали признавать роль контекстной производительности в содействии эффективной работе организаций. Дан обзор литературы по 3 категориям производительности труда, а именно: преданность сотрудников, контрпродуктивное рабочее поведение, а также выполнение задач. Обсуждено, как повышение производительности работы может принести пользу организациям и их членам.

Ключевые слова: преданность сотрудников; контрпродуктивное рабочее поведение; девиантное поведение; выполнение задач.

Introduction. Performance management has been an important area of inquiry among organizational behaviour and industrial-organizational psychology researchers (Rogers and Wright, 1998). Previous studies have used multiple measures to define employees' job performance. Dyer and Reeves (1995), for example, organised job performance measures into different categories like human resource outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction, turnover intentions), organizational outcomes (such as productivity and product quality), as well as financial performance and accounting outcomes (such as profitability, revenues, and market value).

Motowidlo, Borman and Schmit (1997) preferred to organise job performance into two broad categories, namely core task and contextual performance. Rotundo

¹ PhD, Lecturer, Faculty of Business & Accountancy, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

and Sackett (2002) as well as Viswesvaran and Ones (2000) supported Motowidlo et al.'s job performance dimensions and recognized that job performance includes task performance and contextual performance such as organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) and counterproductive work behaviour (CWB). Other researchers noted that employees tend to engage in OCB and CWB by targeting the behaviour at organization and specific individuals (Baron and Neuman, 1996; Lee and Allen, 2002). This article aims to highlight the concepts of OCB, CWB, and task performance, as well as the importance of job performance.

The concept of organizational citizenship behaviour. Since Organ and his colleagues (Smith, Organ and Near, 1983) established the term "citizenship behaviour" to describe unrewarded employee behaviour, OCB has garnered tremendous attention among scholars. OCB is described differently across many studies; they include prosocial organizational behaviour (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986), extra-role behaviour (Van Dyne and LePine, 1998), contextual performance (Borman and Motowidlo, 1997; Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994), and organizational spontaneity (George and Jones, 1997). Some examples of OCB include assisting others with their duties, performing functions that are not required, and offering ideas to improve functioning of an organization (Piccolo and Colquitt, 2006).

Organ (1988) defined OCB as discretionary contributory actions that are not explicitly or formally rewarded by organizations and may enhance organizational effectiveness. However, subsequent research has demonstrated that managers take OCB into account when rating employees' performance and allocating rewards (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994). Organ (1997) subsequently revised his earlier definition of OCB and defined it as behaviour that contributes "to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance". This definition is similar to the definition of contextual performance introduced by Borman and Motowidlo (1997). They defined contextual performance as behaviour that maintains or improves the social and psychological context within core tasks performed.

According to the social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; as cited in Wayne, Shore, and Liden, 1997), there is an unspoken obligation to reciprocate quality social interactions. Consistent with the theory, past research has noted that employees are more likely to engage in OCB whenever they trust that their employer would act in their interests (Organ, 1998). Subsequent research similarly found that subordinates' perceptions of procedural justice and supervisory leadership practices are related to subordinates' OCB (Tepper and Taylor, 2003). In addition, studies on workplace social exchange relationships suggest that employees tend to exhibit OCB to reciprocate high quality leader-member exchange relationships (Ilies, Nahrgang, and Morgeson, 2007). Likewise, employees are more likely to help others in their groups when they have high quality team-member exchange (Kamdar and Van Dyne, 2007).

Existing research has demonstrated positive consequences of OCB. Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff and Blume (2009) summarized studies on the relationships between OCB and their outcomes. Their meta-analytic review showed that employees who engage in OCB are more likely to earn higher managers' ratings of employees' performance and reward allocation decisions. This finding suggests that OCB has implications on managers' evaluation of employees' performance. According to them,

OCB is negatively related to employees' turnover intentions, actual turnover, and absenteeism. They also reported that organizations with employees who engage in high levels of citizenship behaviour accomplish higher organizational-level outcomes such as productivity, efficiency, profitability, customer satisfaction. This supports Organ's (1988) contention that OCB has influential effects on organizational effectiveness.

In summary, OCB has been recognized as essential for the success of organizations (Organ, 1988).

The concept of counterproductive work behaviour. Researchers have become increasingly interested in counterproductive work behaviour (CWB), as evidenced by publication of special issues in academic journals. Among others, they include the *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* (2002, Vol. 10, No. 1-2), *International Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, (2009, Vol. 13, No. 2), and *Human Resource Management Review* (2010, Vol. 20, No. 1). This is not surprising, as CWB generally exists at workplace and has the potential to adversely affect well-being of organizational members (Penney and Spector, 2005).

CWB encompasses actions that violate organizational norms and has the potential to harm organizations and organizational stakeholders such as coworkers, supervisors and customers (Robinson and Bennett, 1995; Sackett, 2002). CWB is described as an aspect of job performance (Rotundo and Sackett, 2002); a behavioural strain, a form of retaliation (Skarlicki and Folger, 1997); and a type of protest behaviour at workplace (Kelloway, Francis, Prosser, and Cameron, 2010).

CWB has been described differently in many studies such as antisocial behaviour (Aquino and Douglas, 2003), dysfunctional workplace behaviour (Cole, Walter, and Bruch, 2008), workplace deviance (Robinson and Bennett, 1995), organizational misbehaviour (Vardi and Wiener, 1996), organizational delinquency (Hogan and Hogan, 1989), workplace aggression (Baron and Neuman, 1996; Fox and Spector, 1999) and organizational retaliatory behaviour (Skarlicki and Folger, 1997). These detrimental, potentially destructive acts may take different forms, from minor acts such as taking excessive breaks to serious acts such as theft.

According to Baron and Neuman (1996), there are two categories of CWB, namely organization-targeted CWB (CWBO) and individuals-targeted CWB (CWBI). Some examples of CWBO include trying to look busy while doing nothing and coming to work late without permission; whereas CWBI includes behaviour such as insulting someone about their job performance and starting an argument with a coworker (Fox, Spector and Miles, 2001).

The occurrence of CWB has serious implications for organizations and employees such as lost productivity, increased insurance costs, lost or damaged property, as well as greater dissatisfaction, job stress and turnover (Penney and Spector, 2005). According to Bowling and Gruys (2010), CWB could result in substantial financial and personal costs to an organization and its members. When an employee engages in workplace deviant behaviour such as acting rudely toward someone at work and intentionally working slower, the performance of business units is likely to suffer (Dunlop and Lee, 2004).

As CWB is associated with negative outcomes, researchers have exerted much effort to understand the determinants of CWB. Past research has focused on individ-

ual differences such as agreeableness, conscientiousness and negative affectivity (Mount, Ilies, and Johnson, 2006) and organizational environmental factors such as organizational injustice, interpersonal conflict at work and detrimental behaviour in organization (Penney and Spector, 2005; Fox et al., 2001) as antecedents of CWB.

As injustice or mistreatment could come from different sources, employees tend to target their CWB at a particular source that mistreats them (Jones, 2009). For example, Bruk-Lee and Spector (2006) report that conflict with coworkers is positively and significantly related to individuals-targeted CWB. According to Jones, interpersonal and informational justices are related to supervisors-targeted CWB. This is because employees tend to seek revenge against the sources of interpersonal and informational injustice, which most often are their supervisors.

CWB would adversely affect an organization or its members. It is therefore in the best interests of organizations to prevent the occurrence of CWB. The following subsection discusses different dimensions of CWB.

Task Performance. Task performance refers to the activities that are directly involved in the accomplishment of core job tasks (Borman and Motowidlo, 1997). It involves activities that are formally recognized by organizational reward systems (Williams and Anderson, 1991). Organ and Paine (1999) consider task performance as "part and parcel of the workflow that transforms inputs of energy, information and materials into outputs in the form of goods and services to the external constituency". A bank teller, for example, would be involved in activities such as accepting cash and cheques for deposit, preparing money orders, exchanging foreign currency, processing cash withdrawals and money transfer, as well as receiving loan and utility bills payments. These activities are recognized by his/her formal job requirements or formal reward systems. Literature suggests that there are differences between task performance and OCB. According to Borman and Motowidlo, task performance varies across jobs, whereas contextual performance is common across numerous jobs. Employees' job-relevant knowledge is more highly correlated with task performance compared to their contextual performance, whereas personality variables are linked more strongly to contextual performance criteria, such as helping others, than to task performance (Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994).

The antecedents of task performance have been the subject of thorough research. Turnley, Bolino, Lester and Bloodgood (2003), for example, showed that psychological contract fulfilment is positively related to task performance. Other factors such as occupational embeddedness (Ng and Feldman, 2009), trust in supervisor (Mayer and Davis, 1999), as well as ethical leadership and individual's effort (Piccolo, Greenbaum, Hartog and Folger, 2010) are positively related to task performance. The importance of task performance is discussed in the following section.

The importance of job performance. Past research has demonstrated that employees' job performance can significantly influence their performance appraisal (Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994; Whiting, Podsakoff and Pierce, 2008). This is because employees' performance generally serves as a basis for supervisor's performance evaluations decisions. Performance appraisals may in turn affect employees' career development, promotions, and rewards allocation such as pay increments (Spence and Keeping, 2010).

Rotundo and Sackett (2002), for example, evaluated the relative importance of task performance, OCB and CWB in managers' ratings of subordinates' overall job performance. They indicated that task performance, OCB and CWB contribute to overall job performance ratings. In the cross-cultural research on performance by Rotundo and Xie (2008), task performance, OCB and CWB significantly predicted the ratings of employees' overall job performance.

According to Lapiere, Bonaccio and Allen (2009), task performance, supervisor directed OCB and coworkers-targeted CWB are related to supervisors' willingness to mentor. Therefore, employees who wish to get favourable appraisals or supervisor mentorship should strive to achieve high task performance, engage in OCB and commit less CWB at work.

Research on OCB has focused mainly on its consequences for organizational effectiveness (Organ, 1988). Managers should value OCB because it contributes to organizational productivity (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach, 2000). According to Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler and Ensley (2004), coworkers' OCB is positively related to employees' job satisfaction and affective commitment when employees perceive that their coworkers have good intentions. Furthermore, Hui, Lam and Law (2000) reported that employee self-ratings and supervisor ratings of OCB are related to employees' promotion.

Research on CWB focused on its detrimental outcomes. Employees who frequently engage in CWB are less likely to engage in OCB (Dalal, 2005). According to Dunlop and Lee (2004), CWB is negatively associated with supervisors' ratings of the performance of business units. Nevertheless, Krischer, Penney and Hunter (2010) suggested that some forms of CWB may be beneficial for employees and organizations because they could serve as a means for employees to cope with job stressors like interpersonal conflict, role ambiguity, work overload, lack of social support, and perceptions of injustice. For example, taking occasional longer breaks may help employees to reduce burnout at work.

Conclusion. Taken together, researchers typically recognized that job performance is a multidimensional construct; it includes 3 broad categories, namely task performance, OCB and CWB (Rotundo and Sackett, 2002; Viswesvaran and Ones, 2000). Given that improved job performance benefits organizations and employees, it is not surprising that researchers and practitioners have tried to find ways to foster positive work behaviour and enhance employees' capability to perform assigned tasks.

References:

- Aquino, K., Douglas, S. (2003). Identity threat and antisocial behaviour in organizations: The moderating effects of individual differences, aggressive modeling, and hierarchical status. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 90(1): 195-208.
- Baron, R.A., Neuman, J.H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 22(3): 161-173.
- Borman, W.C., Motowidlo, S.J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10(2): 99-109.
- Bowling, N.A., Gruys, M.L. (2010). Overlooked issues in the conceptualization and measurement of counterproductive work behaviour. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(1): 54-61.
- Brief, A.P., Motowidlo, S.J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviours. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4): 710-725.
- Cole, M.S., Walter, F., Bruch, H. (2008). Affective mechanisms linking dysfunctional behaviour to performance in work teams: A moderated mediation study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 945-958.

Dalal, R.S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6): 1241-1255.

Dunlop, P.D., Lee, K. (2004). Workplace deviance, organizational citizenship behaviour, and business unit performance: The bad apples do spoil the whole barrel. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 25(1): 67-80.

Dyer, L., Reeves, T. (1995). 'Human resource strategies and firm performance: what do we know and where do we need to go?'. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 6(3): 657-667.

Fox, S., Spector, P.E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 20(6): 915-931.

Fox, S., Spector, P.E., Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 59(3): 291-309.

George, J.M., Jones, G.R. (1997). Organizational spontaneity in context. *Human Performance*, 10(2): 153-170.

Hogan, J., Hogan, R. (1989). How to measure employee reliability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(2): 273-279.

Hui, C., Lam, S.S.K., Law, K.K.S. (2000). Instrumental values of organizational citizenship behaviour for promotion: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5): 822-828.

Jones, D.A. (2009). Getting even with one's supervisor and one's organization: relationships among types of injustice, desires for revenge, and counterproductive work behaviours. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 30(4): 525-542.

Kamdar, D., Van Dyne, L. (2007). The joint effects of personality and workplace social exchange relationships in predicting task performance and citizenship performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(5): 1286-1298.

Kelloway, E.K., Francis, L., Prosser, M., Cameron, J.E. (2010). Counterproductive work behaviour as protest. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(1): 18-25.

Krischer, M.M., Penney, L.M., Hunter, E.M. (2010). Can counterproductive work behaviours be productive? CWB as emotion-focused coping. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(2): 154-166.

Lapierre, L.M., Bonaccio, S., Allen, T.D. (2009). The separate, relative, and joint effects of employee job performance on supervisors' willingness to mentor. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 74(2): 135-144.

Lee, K., Allen, N.J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behaviour and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1): 131-142.

Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H. (1999). The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(1): 123-136.

Motowidlo, S.J., Van Scotter, J.R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4): 475-480.

Motowidlo, S.J., Borman, W.C., Schmit, M.J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 10(2): 71-83.

Mount, M., Ilies, R., Johnson, E. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviours: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 59(3): 591-622.

Ng, T.W.H., Feldman, D.C. (2009). Occupational embeddedness and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 30(7): 863-891.

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

Organ, D.W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 12: 43-72.

Organ, D.W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behaviour: It's construct cleanup time. *Human Performance*, 10(2): 85-97.

Organ, D.W., Paine, J.B. (1999). A new kind of performance for industrial and organizational psychology: Recent contributions to the study of organizational citizenship behaviour. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 14, pp. 337-368). NY: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Penney, L.M., Spector, P.E. (2005). Job stress, incivility, and counterproductive work behaviour (CWB): The moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 26(7): 777-796.

Piccolo, R.F. & Colquitt, J.A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviours: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2): 327-340.

Piccolo, R.F., Greenbaum, R., Hartog, D.N., Folger, R. (2010). The relationship between ethical lead-

ership and core job characteristics. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 31(2-3): 259-278.

Podsakoff, N.P., Whiting, S.W., Podsakoff, P.M., Blume, B.D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviours: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1): 122-141.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B. (1994). An examination of the psychometric properties and nomological validity of some revised and reduced substitutes for leadership scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(5): 702-713.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B., Bachrach, D.G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviours: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3): 513-563.

Robinson, S.L., Bennett, R.J. (1995). A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviour: A Multi-Dimensional Scaling Study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2): 555-572.

Rogers, E.W., Wright, P.M. (1998). Measuring organizational performance in strategic human resource management: Problems, prospects and performance information markets. *Human Resource Management Review*, 8(3): 311-331.

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

Rotundo, M., Xie, J.L. (2008). Understanding the domain of counterproductive work behaviour in China. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(5): 856-877.

Sackett, P.R. (2002). The structure of counterproductive work behaviours: Dimensionality and relationships with facets of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1-2): 5-11.

Skarlicki, D.P., Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3): 434-443.

Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W., Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behaviour: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4): 653-663.

Spence, J.R., Keeping, L.M. (2010). The impact of non-performance information on ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 31(4): 587-608.

Tepper, B. J., Taylor, E.C. (2003). Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviours. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(1): 97-105.

Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M.K., Hoobler, J., Ensley, M.D. (2004). Moderators of the relationships between coworkers' organizational citizenship behaviour and fellow employees' attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3): 455-465.

Turnley, W.H., Bolino, M.C., Lester, S.W., Bloodgood, J. M. (2003). The impact of psychological contract fulfillment on the performance of in-role and organizational citizenship behaviours. *Journal of Management*, 29(2): 187-206.

Van Dyne, L., LePine, J.A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviours: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1): 108-119.

Vardi, Y., Wiener, V. (1996). Misbehaviour in organizations: A motivational framework. *Organization Science*, 7(2): 151-165.

Viswesvaran, C., Ones, D.S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8(4): 216-226.

Wayne, S.J., Shore, L.M., Liden, R.C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40: 82-111.

Whiting, S.W., Podsakoff, P.M., Pierce, J.R. (2008). Effects of task performance, helping, voice, and organizational loyalty on performance appraisal ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1): 125-139.

Williams, L.J., Anderson, S.E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviours. *Journal of Management*, 17(3): 601-617.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 19.03.2012