CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The role of individual differences in characteristics or dispositional traits affecting work performance has received much attention in the recent literature (Furnham, Jackson, & Miller, 1999; Hough & Oswald, 2000; S. Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997) and there is ample evidence that numerous individual characteristics strongly influence performance and play a significant role in predicting the performance (Colquitt, LePine, & Noe, 2000).

Some examples of the individual differences explored in the past and current research, have been constructs such as Growth Need Strength (Hackman & Oldham, 1980), and Self Efficacy (Bandura, 1982). Of these factors Self Efficacy has seemingly received the most empirical attention (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998a). The benefits stemming from research investigating the relationships between individual characteristics and performance are substantial and previous research reinforces the need for further investigation (J. Ford, Smith, Weissbein, Gully, & Salas, 1998). Demonstration of potential associations of certain traits with increases in work performance could lend powerful tools to practitioners for designing and implementing selection systems, training programs, and performance management systems.

Although a great deal of past empirical and theoretical performance research has focused on Self Efficacy and its role in the performance; Growth Need Strength has mostly been used only as a moderating influence and not been given the attention it deserves as an independent variable. (Kanfer, 1990) provides a category of motivational influences called "distal" and these distal variables closely resemble the individual difference personality factors. (Kanfer & Ackerman, 1996) define "distal" influences as those motivational influences which affect an individual’s decision to exert effort. By utilizing distal influences, individual differences can be studied for
their direct effects beyond moderation upon work performance. The primary distal influence included within this study is Growth Need Strength.

Thus the chosen variables Self Efficacy and Growth Need Strength were studied for their relative association with each other and with the multidimensional construct of performance. The dimensional components of work performance used in this study are Job performance; Career performance, Innovator performance, Team performance and Organization performance. Also based on various studies, five demographic variables were identified i.e. age, gender, job tenure or work experience, education level and organizational hierarchical position or Management level; that were expected to co-vary with the independent and dependent variables of the Research (Borman & Brush, 1993; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Narayanan, Menon, & Spector, 1999; Ng & Feldman, 2008; Quinones, Ford, & Teachout, 1995; Tesluk & Jacobs, 1998).

In the following sections, the conceptualization of the Predictor (Growth Need Strength; Self Efficacy) and Criterion (Performance) variables is presented. An attempt is also made to explore and present the researched relationships between the chosen variables as documented by the past literature.

### 2.2 Self Efficacy and Its Construct

#### 2.2.1 Introduction to Self Efficacy

Self-efficacy refers to people’s judgments about their capability to perform particular tasks. (Bandura, 1994) defines self efficacy as an individual’s belief in his or her ability to produce designated levels of performance. Self-efficacy is the central mechanism of self-regulation: “People’s beliefs in their efficacy influence the choices they make, their aspirations, how much effort they mobilize in a given endeavor, how long they persevere in the face of difficulties and setbacks, whether their thought patterns are self-hindering or self-aiding, and the amount of stress they experience in coping with taxing environmental demands” (Bandura, 1991, p. 257). Self Efficacy
represents a positive belief and is distinct from the concepts of “ability” or “outcome expectancy”.

Furthering this generic description of Self Efficacy by Bandura, (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998b, p. 66) defined Self Efficacy for work place as “the employee's conviction or confidence about his or her abilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources or courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context.” According to (John Schaubroeck & Merritt, 1997) Self-efficacy is also a measure of an employee’s confidence in his or her abilities to marshal personal resources and deploy an appropriate response strategy to address job situations.

According to (Spreitzer, 1995) Competency and Self Efficacy are related concepts. Competence, or self-efficacy, is an individual's belief in his or her capability to perform activities with skill (Gist, 1987). Competence is analogous to agency beliefs, personal mastery, or effort-performance expectancy (Bandura, 1989). Competence results in effort and persistence in challenging situations (Gecas, 1989), coping and high goal expectations (Ozer & Bandura, 1990), and high performance (Locke, Frederick, Lee, & Bobko, 1984).

Self Efficacy can be explained at different levels. In terms of this study, we broaden the use of Self Efficacy beyond a single task to the work domain. Employees may be more or less efficacious in the work domain such as a group of more specific tasks. As (Bandura, 1998, p. 53) has concluded, "Comparative studies show that domain-linked measures of perceived efficacy are good predictors of motivation and action." This broadens the conceptualization of very specific task efficacy e.g. generalized Self Efficacy (Sherer, et al., 1982). In this study too employees' perception of their Self Efficacy is tapped through the chosen Self Efficacy scale developed by (Sherer, et al., 1982).
2.2.2 Supporting Reasons for Choosing Self Efficacy as a Variable in this Study

Social- cognitive theory has been described as “the theory heard ‘round the world”’ (D. Smith, 2002, p. 30). Its central variable Self Efficacy has been studied in more than 10,000 investigations in the past 25 years (Judge, et al., 2007) and addressed as “the wave of the future” in work motivation research (Landy, 1989). Thus, it is evident that Self Efficacy has proven to be one of the most studied concepts in contemporary psychology research. Any concept of such widespread use and apparent universality merits critical examination of its usefulness (Judge, et al., 2007).

Self Efficacy has been very popular in Industrial Organizational psychology and almost all areas in organizational research have utilized Self Efficacy, including training (Kozlowski, et al., 2001), leadership (Chen & Bliese, 2002), newcomer socialization and adjustment (Saks, 1995), performance evaluation (Bartol, Durham, & Poon, 2001), stress (Jex, Bliese, Buzzell, & Primeau, 2001; J Schaubroeck, Jones, & Xie, 2001), political influence behaviors (Bozeman, Hochwarier, Perrewe, & Brymer, 2001), creativity (Redmond, Mumford, & Teach, 1993), negotiation (C. Stevens & Gist, 1997), and group–team processes (Feltz & Lirgg, 1998).

Moreover empirical research has demonstrated that Self Efficacy is also related to a number of other work performance measures such as adaptability to advanced technology (Hill, et al., 1987); coping with career related events (Stumpf, et al., 1987); managerial idea generation (Gist, 1989); managerial performance (Wood, et al., 1990); and skill acquisition (Mitchell, et al., 1994). Thus as Bandura and other researchers have demonstrated, Self Efficacy can have an impact on everything from psychological states to behavior to motivation.

Also interestingly although past studies have focused on the positive relationship between Self Efficacy and performance, recently there have been studies that have indicated on the contrary. (Bandura & Locke, 2003; Vancouver & Kendall, 2006; Vancouver, et al., 2002; Vancouver, et al., 2001) have challenged the conventional view of self-efficacy as a positive influence on performance by finding a negative within-person relationship between self-efficacy and performance.
(A. M. Schmidt & DeShon, 2010) examined performance ambiguity as a potential boundary condition for this negative self-efficacy effect. As hypothesized, they found that Self Efficacy was negatively related to subsequent performance under conditions of high ambiguity but was positively related to performance when performance ambiguity was low. According to (Moores & Chang, 2009) psychological literature has suggested, that rather than promoting behavior, Self Efficacy can lead to overconfidence and hence reduce performance over time. Therefore they studied the relationship between Self Efficacy and performance in a field study and found that for the sample as a whole, Self Efficacy was positively and significantly related to performance, and that performance was positively and significantly related to subsequent Self Efficacy. When levels of over- and under-confidence were taken into account, however, the relationships changed. In particular, overconfidence leads to a significant negative relationship between self-efficacy and subsequent performance.

In Industrial Organizational psychology, the most focal variable that self-efficacy has been related to, is work-related performance. Meta-analytic evidence suggests that Self Efficacy is strongly related to performance; r=0.34 (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998a). At the same time, because there may be other distal predictors of work performance that have an association with self-efficacy, this simple correlation does not speak of the predictive validity of self-efficacy over and above individual differences. Analysis by (Judge, et al., 2007) indicates that although Self Efficacy is moderately correlated with performance, once the individual differences are taken into account, the predictive validity of Self Efficacy attenuates.

Additionally because Self Efficacy is defined as individuals’ beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance (Bandura, 1994), it appears likely that individuals bring with them to the work situation certain characteristics that are related to this self-efficacy (Kanfer, 1990). Considering the conceptual association of Self Efficacy and other individual differences with performance, and their possible associations with each other, it is surprising that little research has investigated these joint influences (Judge, et al., 2007) and suggest a ripe area for future research to
integrate individual differences variables in models of performance. In this study, a distal variable studied in conjunction with Self Efficacy is Growth Need Strength.

Thus considering the past vast research showing positive relationship between Self Efficacy and Performance and also keeping in mind the contemporary doubts on the relationship, it emerges that Self Efficacy will be a valuable variable for studying its relation with performance. Therefore this study chooses Self Efficacy as a predictor variable to study its influence on performance, in conjunction with Growth Need Strength, a distal individual difference variable, as the second predictor.

2.2.3 Self Efficacy - A Distinct Construct

Perceived self-efficacy is concerned with people’s beliefs in their capabilities to produce given attainments (Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 2006). It is a major determinant of intention. Perceived self-efficacy is distinct from other constructs such as self-esteem, locus of control, and outcome expectancies. Perceived efficacy is a judgment of capability while self-esteem is a judgment of self worth. Thus they are entirely different phenomena. Locus of control is concerned with belief about outcome contingencies i.e. whether outcomes are determined by own actions or by forces outside control. It does not have anything to do with perceived capability rather only the source of control of the outcomes.

Another important distinction concerns performance outcome expectations. Perceived self-efficacy is a judgment of capability to execute given types of performances while outcome expectations are judgments about the outcomes that are likely to flow from such performances. As self-efficacy is also more specific and circumscribed than self-confidence i.e. a general personality trait that relates to how confidently people feel and act in most situations (Heslin & Klehe, 2006).
2.2.4 Sources of Self Efficacy Beliefs

(Bandura, 1997) claims that Self Efficacy beliefs are developed by information obtained from four main sources of influence i.e. Mastery experiences, Vicarious experiences, Verbal persuasion and Psychological arousal.

Mastery Experiences – They constitute the information obtained by an individual directly through successful or unsuccessful activities. Successes build a robust belief in one’s efficacy while the failures undermine it. It is the most effective way of creating a strong sense of efficacy and provides the most authentic evidence of whether one can muster whatever it takes to succeed (Bandura, 1982; Gist, 1989).

Vicarious experiences - Successful or unsuccessful activities of others resembling the individual can strengthen an individual’s judgment as to whether he can succeed or not in similar activities. Seeing people similar to themselves succeed by perseverant effort raises observer’s beliefs that they too possess the capabilities required to master comparable activities (Bandura, 1986) and observing others fail despite high efforts undermines level of motivation (Brown & Inouye, 1978).

Verbal persuasion – Encouragement, suggestions and recommendations that an individual can or cannot succeed also affects Self Efficacy at differing levels. People who are persuaded verbally that they possess the capabilities to master given activities are likely to mobilize greater effort and sustain it than if they harbor self doubts and dwell on personal deficiencies when problems arise (Schunk, 1989). However it is more difficult to instill high beliefs of efficacy by verbal persuasion than to undermine them.

Psychological arousal – People also rely partly on their physiological and emotional states in judging their capabilities. Stress and tension are interpreted as signs of vulnerability to poor performance. Mood also affects people’s judgments of their performance. Positive mood enhances perceived Self Efficacy and despondent mood diminishes it (Kavanagh & Bower, 1985).
2.2.5 Self Efficacy Construct and Working of Human Agency

(Bandura, 1989) discusses that the working of human agency has been conceptualized in three different ways: Autonomous agency i.e. the notion that humans serve as entirely independent agents of their own actions; Mechanical agency i.e. internal instrumentality of the self through which external influences operate mechanistically on action, but it does not itself have any motivative, self-reflective, self-reactive, creative, or self-directive properties; Emergent interactive agency i.e. the concept which is midway between Autonomous agency and Mechanical agency. It posits that people are neither autonomous agents nor simply mechanical conveyers of environmental influences. They make causal contribution to their own motivation and action within a system of triadic reciprocal causation.

Social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986) subscribes to the model of Emergent interactive agency. Among the mechanisms of personal agency, most influential is the people's beliefs about their capabilities to exercise control over events that affect their
lives or in other words their Self Efficacy. Self-efficacy beliefs function as an important set of proximal determinants of human motivation, affect, and action. They operate on action through motivational, cognitive, and affective intervening processes.

2.2.5.1 Self Efficacy and Cognitive Processes

Self Efficacy affects the performance through the Cognitive processes or thought patterns that may be self-aiding or self-hindering. Human behavior is regulated by self set goals. Personal goal setting is influenced by self-appraisal of capabilities. The stronger their perceived self-efficacy, the higher the goals people set for themselves and the firmer their commitment to them (Locke, et al., 1984; Taylor, Locke, Lee, & Gist, 1984). People who believe strongly in their problem solving capabilities remain highly efficient in their analytic thinking in complex decision-making situations, whereas those who are plagued by self-doubts are erratic in their analytic thinking (Bandura & Wood, 1989; Wood & Bandura, 1989). Quality of analytic thinking, in turn, affects performance accomplishments.

The mechanism for transforming cognition into action operates through a conception-matching process. Performances are perfected by corrective adjustments during behavior production until a close match is eventually achieved between conception and action (Carroll & Bandura, 1985, 1987). People with higher Self Efficacy will persist longer and will not be demotivated by negative feedback rather it will aid them in taking corrective actions and therefore improving performance.

2.2.5.2 Self Efficacy and Motivational Processes

Self Efficacy also affects the Motivational processes. People's self-efficacy beliefs determine their level of motivation, which is reflected in the level of effort they exert in an endeavor and their level of perseverance in the face of obstacles. The stronger the belief in their capabilities, the greater and more persistent are their efforts (Bandura, 1988a). When faced with difficulties, people who are beset by self-doubts
about their capabilities slacken their efforts or abort their attempts prematurely and quickly settle for mediocre solutions, whereas those who have a strong belief in their capabilities exert greater effort to master the challenge (Bandura & Cervone, 1983, 1986; Cervone & Peake, 1986; Jacobs, Prentice-Dunn, & Rogers, 1984; Weinberg, Gould, & Jackson, 1979). Strong perseverance usually pays off in performance accomplishments.

Looking forward to likely outcomes of prospective actions is another way in which anticipatory mechanisms regulate human motivation and action. People strive to gain anticipated beneficial outcomes and to forestall aversive ones. However, the effects of outcome expectancies on performance motivation are partly governed by self-beliefs of efficacy. There are many activities that, if performed well, guarantee valued outcomes, but they are not pursued if people doubt that they can do what it takes to succeed (Beck & Lund, 1981; Betz & Hackett, 1986; Wheeler, 1983). Self-perceived inefficacy can thus nullify the motivating potential of alluring outcome expectations.

2.2.5.3 Self Efficacy and Affective Processes

Self Efficacy also modulates performance by influencing affective processes. People's beliefs in their capabilities determine the level of stress and depression they experience in threatening or taxing situations, as well as their level of motivation. Such emotional reactions can affect action both directly and indirectly by altering the nature and course of thinking. People base their actions on self-perceptions of coping efficacy in situations that they consider risky. The stronger the perceived coping efficacy, the more venturesome the behavior, regardless of whether self-perceptions of efficacy are enhanced through mastery experiences, modeling influences, or cognitive simulations (Bandura, 1988b). Self-doubts in coping efficacy produce substantial increases in subjective distress and physiological arousal. Inefficacious thoughts distress people. They constrain and impair the level of functioning (Bandura, 1988b, 1988c; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Meichenbaum, 1977; Sarason, 1975) thus having a negative impact on performance.
2.2.6 Role of Self Efficacy in human behavior

Meta-analyses across different spheres of functioning confirm the influential role of perceived self-efficacy in human self-development, adaptation, and change (Boyer, et al., 2000; G Holden, 1991; GW Holden, Moncher, Schinke, & Barker, 1990; Moritz, Feltz, Fahrbach, & Mack, 2000; Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991; Sadri & Robertson, 1993; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998a). Perceived efficacy plays a key role in human functioning because it affects behavior not only directly, but by its impact on other determinants such as goals and aspirations, outcome expectations, affective proclivities, and perception of impediments and opportunities in the social environment (Bandura, 1995; Bandura, 1997).
Efficacy beliefs influence whether people think erratically or strategically, optimistically or pessimistically. They also influence the courses of action people choose to pursue, the challenges and goals they set for themselves and their commitment to them, how much effort they put forth in given endeavors, the outcomes they expect their efforts to produce, how long they persevere in the face of obstacles, their resilience to adversity, the quality of their emotional life and how much stress and depression they experience in coping with taxing environmental demands, and the life choices they make and the accomplishments they realize (Bandura, 2006).

2.2.7 Role of Self Efficacy in Organizations

Organizations increasingly need capable employees who can take on broader and more proactive work roles (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Dean Jr & Snell, 1991). For instance, it has been suggested that employees who conduct activities that go beyond the technical core of their particular job (e.g. exhibit organizational citizenship behavior) help to ensure that organizations function smoothly (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Organ, 1988b). With the high level of change in modern organizations, such as downsizing, delayering and empowerment, employees also need to be more flexible, self-directed and proactive than in the past (Crant, 2000). In short, the performance expectations for employees in today’s flexible organizations can be substantial.

Contextual performance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) include dimensions that have been considered rather passive or reactive in their orientation, such as complying with organizational procedures (George & Brief, 1992; Speier & Frese, 1997). To promote proactivity in the workplace, we need to understand what motivational or cognitive processes underpin this change. A very important motivational concept to draw on in this endeavor is self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986). In discussing the positive impact of efficacy, (Bandura, 1998, p. 62) notes, "Success usually comes through renewed effort after failed attempts. It is resiliency of personal efficacy that counts."
2.3 Growth Need Strength and Its Construct

2.3.1 Introduction to Growth Need Strength

Growth Need Strength describes an individual’s need to constantly grow and evolve. This variable was introduced by (Hackman & Oldham, 1980) when they proposed their Job Characteristics Theory. It was based on Higher order needs concept of (Maslow, 1943, 1954). They presented Growth Need Strength as one of the moderating factors along with two other i.e. Context Satisfiers (pay, security, coworker and supervisor) and Knowledge & Skill. It can be considered as an individual differences variable; (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 85) referred to it as a trait when they wrote, “Not all individuals appreciate such opportunities (growth, learning, or challenge within the job), even among employees who would be able to perform the work competently.”

According to Job Characteristics Model by (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Hackman & Oldham, 1976, 1980), high levels of job performance and job satisfaction are predicted when there is a match between the growth needs of an individual, and the motivating characteristics of the job being performed. Growth Need Strength is defined as a measure of an employee’s desire to obtain growth satisfaction from his/her work (Bhuian, Al-Shammari, & Jefri, 1996; Fried & Ferris, 1987; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Pierce, Durham, & Blackburn, 1979). (Das, 1991) defined Growth Need Strength as the level of higher order need for personal growth and development in the work situation.

2.3.2 Supporting Reasons for Choosing Growth Need Strength as a Variable for this Study

Within the Job Characteristics Theory, the moderating role of Growth Need Strength has generally received affirming results (Fried & Ferris, 1987; Loher, Noe, Moeller, & Fitzgerald, 1985; Medcof, 1991; Parker, Ohly, & Series, 2008; Parker, Wall, & Cordery, 2001; Spector, 1985). However interestingly, Growth Need Strength has not been explored much outside the framework of the Job Characteristics Theory. Despite the demonstration of construct related validity of Growth Need Strength measures, this
Considering the modern work environment including rapidity of change and ambiguity of structure (Cascio, 1997), it is highly likely that Growth Need Strength serves more as a driving force behind motivation and work performance than simply as a moderating influence. This study therefore sought to investigate the potential relationship between Growth Need Strength and multidimensional construct of work performance. Moreover, examining the role of Growth Need Strength on multidimensional performance domain is a novel empirical undertaking while the research based on Growth Need Strength is typically focused only on task performance.

2.3.3 Job Characteristic Model

The Job Characteristics Model JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1976) is a widely studied model of motivational job design that has explained important work outcomes for workers in a wide variety of jobs. JCM is underpinned by the humanistic management approach which purports to preserve, maintain and develop the human factor in the workplace (Boonzaier, Ficker, & Rust, 2001). (Johns, Xie, & Fang, 1992; Kelly, 1992) refer to this model as the most widely discussed and influential model guiding research on characteristics of jobs. A review based on 2616 research articles on employee motivation and performance by (Perry, Mesch, & Paarlberg, 2006) states that most recent developments in work design have centered on the Job Characteristics Model.

According to the model, certain core features of jobs as seen by the worker, impact psychological reactions to the job and the outcomes that follow from those reactions. In other words, as shown in Figure 2.3, the JCM posits that Perceived Core Job
Characteristics impact work outcomes through their effects on psychological reactions to the job (i.e. Critical Psychological States).

The five core job characteristics are: “skill variety” (i.e., the perceived variety and complexity of skills and talents required to perform the job); “task identity” (i.e., the extent the job is seen as involving a whole, identifiable task); “task significance” (i.e., the extent that the job affects the well being of others); “autonomy” (i.e., the extent the job is seen as allowing for personal initiative in performing the work); and “feedback from the job” (i.e., the extent that the job, itself, provides information about job performance).

The JCM posits that the way jobs are perceived in terms of these five core job characteristics impact three psychological reactions to the job. These reactions are referred to as “Critical Psychological States”. They include “experienced meaningfulness of work” (i.e., the extent that the work is seen as making a difference to others), “felt responsibility” (i.e., the extent that the worker assumes responsibility for his/her work), and “knowledge of results” (i.e., the extent to which the worker is aware of the quality of his/her work). Jobs that are perceived as high in the five core job characteristics are expected to be seen as more meaningful by workers, generate higher feelings of responsibility, and are expected to provide clear cues to workers about the quality of work.

Critical psychological states explain the variability in the proposed four Individual and Organizational work outcomes which include: Internal work Motivation (i.e., the extent to which the employee is self motivated to perform effectively on the job); General job satisfaction (i.e. the degree to which an employee is satisfied and happy with the job); Growth satisfaction (i.e. the degree to which an employee is satisfied with the opportunities for growth in the job); High work effectiveness - this factor was not defined as according to the authors, it was unique to the work settings.

In addition, the linkages shown in the model (Figure 2.3) are expected to be moderated by three variables identified by the researchers namely Growth Need Strength (i.e. the worker’s need for accomplishment, learning and developing themselves beyond where
they are at present); Knowledge and skill (this factor was also not defined as it was considered unique to the work settings); and Context Satisfiers. The context satisfiers were Pay satisfaction (i.e. the degree of satisfaction with the compensation and benefits), Security satisfaction (i.e. the degree of satisfaction with the amount of general security experienced as well as with the prospects of security), Co-worker satisfaction (i.e. the degree of satisfaction with the peer / co-workers) and Supervisor satisfaction (i.e. the degree of satisfaction with the treatment, support and guidance received from the supervisors).

However there is a major limitation in the JCM that it considers only job related factors that can be changed to increase the positive work behaviors and outcomes (such as higher performance and less absenteeism). It doesn't look at how relationships and other interpersonal issues affect job satisfaction and performance. It doesn't take into account that an individual's reaction to his or her job may be influenced not only by the properties of the job and his or her needs but also by the nature of the work context or organizational "milieu" surrounding the job.

**Figure 2.3 Job Characteristic Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Job Characteristics</th>
<th>Critical Psychological States</th>
<th>Individual &amp; Organizational Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>Experienced meaningfulness of work</td>
<td>High Internal Work Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>Experienced responsibility for outcomes of work</td>
<td>High General Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Significance</td>
<td>Knowledge of the results</td>
<td>High Growth Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Work Effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moderators

* Growth Need Strength
* Knowledge and Skill
* Context Satisfiers

Source: Hackman and Oldham, 1976
2.3.4 Research on Job Characteristic Model

The JCM has generated a great deal of research. Overall, this research supports the prediction that worker satisfaction, motivation and performance are higher among individuals who see their jobs as high in the five core job characteristics. Most of this research also supports the notion that the effects of perceived job characteristics on outcomes are partly or fully mediated by the critical psychological states (Fried & Ferris, 1987). (Loher, et al., 1985) conducted a meta-analysis of JCM research on the relation of job characteristics to job satisfaction. They estimated the correlation between job characteristics and job satisfaction to be $r = .39$ ($p < .05$) and concluded that employees who have a high need for growth and who see their jobs as being high on the five core job characteristics have the most positive work outcomes.

There have also been some studies which indicate that limited or no significant relationship exists between job characteristics-personality fit and performance of an individual. (Algera, 1990, p. 96) points out that research on the model is more focused on personal outcomes than on work outcomes. (Kelly, 1992) posits that this is probably because the work outcomes (i.e. the productivity and performance) are more difficult to measure.

The individual-job congruence association with both performance and satisfaction has received some support (Fried & Ferris, 1987; Goris, Vaught, & Pettit, 2000; Spector, 1985). However, other studies have shown results that are inconsistent with the JCM. For instance, a literature review conducted by (Graen, et al., 1986) revealed that ten out of twenty one tests concerning the association between individual-job congruence and job satisfaction were statistically insignificant. They further state that of the thirteen studies, of the relationship between individual-job congruence and job performance, only three showed significance.
2.4 Performance and Its Construct

2.4.1 Introduction to Performance

Job performance is the most widely studied criterion variable in the organisational behavior and human resource management literature (Bommer, Johnson, Rich, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 1995). Work Performance is a well researched area because of its practical importance and different authors have given their own constructs for performance constituting different dimensions.

Work performance is an abstract, latent construct i.e. it cannot be explained with a single dimension(S. Wallace, 1965). The work environment is becoming more turbulent, complex and uncertain. Therefore the performance is no longer only the task performance and the purely rational model of a job as compendium of tasks is no longer adequate (Sulsky & Keown, 1998). The performance has to take into account various contextual factors and exclusive preoccupation with the task domain may no longer serve the best interests of organizations wishing to achieve sustainability and competitiveness (Goleman, 1998).

Although the performance constructs proposed by different authors differ in the dimensions that are considered as part of the Performance construct, work related performance is generally acknowledged to be multidimensional (Campbell, McCloy, Oppler, & Sager, 1993; Hough & Oswald, 2000). Performance is mostly considered as combination of task performance (i.e. in-role behavior) and contextual performance (i.e. extra-role behavior) (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997; Gellatly & Irving, 2001). The conceptualization of job performance has been expanded in recent years to include core task behaviors, citizenship behaviors, and counterproductive behaviors (Ng & Feldman, 2009).

(Rotundo & Sackett, 2002) compared the relative importance of these three groups of performance behaviors in managerial ratings of subordinates’ overall job performance. They found that each of these three categories of performance behaviors contributed to overall performance rating, with core task performance being given the highest weight, followed by counterproductive performance and citizenship performance.
Task performance generally consists of job specific activities, such as core job duties, and is more likely to be affected by cognitive ability and experience (Borman, Hanson, & Hedge, 1997). Borman & Motowidlo (1993) define it as the effective execution of activities that contribute to the organization’s technical core. Wong & Snell (2003) elaborate that Task performance entails the successful execution of specific tasks listed in job descriptions, or otherwise formally recognized as part of the job, and depending on job specific technical skills or knowledge. It contributes to the production of goods or services either directly by implementing a part of the organization’s core technological processes, or indirectly by providing necessary materials or services.

In addition, the task performance domain has been conceptually broken-out into two different components called procedural knowledge and declarative knowledge (Campbell, et al., 1993). Declarative knowledge refers to the application of knowledge and skills about the facts of a job (i.e., “knowing the job”), whereas procedural knowledge consists of knowledge and skills about performing the job (i.e., “doing the job”) (McCloy, Campbell, & Cudeck, 1994).

The concept of Organizational Citizenship Behavior was given by (C. Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Citizenship performance refers to those extra behaviors engaged in by employees, over and above their core task requirements, which actively promote and strengthen the organization’s effectiveness e.g. helping coworkers (Hunt, 1996; Organ, 1988a). Wong & Snell (2003) define Citizenship performance as a set of active and voluntary behaviors that contribute positively to job performance and that facilitate the achievement of organizational goals through enhancing the social and psychological climates of the organization.

Similar behaviors are referred to as ‘contextual performance’ (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993); ‘contextual spontaneity’ (George & Brief, 1992); and ‘pro-social behavior’ (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). “Personal Initiative” (Fay & Frese, 2001) also closely matches the concept of organization citizenship behavior since both go beyond employees' role requirements, and both are considered to contribute to organizational effectiveness.
(Coleman & Borman, 2000) describe three categories of citizenship performance: personal support (benefits other employees), organizational support (benefits organization), and conscientious initiative (benefits work itself). It has been proposed that citizenship performance is more likely than task performance to be influenced by personality (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; S. J. Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). Importantly, it has been argued that organizations consistently require both task and citizenship performance (Kiker & Motowidlo, 1999) and it has been shown that both performance dimensions exert effects upon overall ratings of performance (Conway, 1999; S. J. Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994).

Contextual performance helps shape the organizational, social, and psychological conditions that support task activities (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Counterproductive performance refers to voluntary behaviors that harm the well-being of the organization e.g. theft (Bennett & Robinson, 2000).

2.4.2 Performance Dimensions – A Chronicle:

(Viswesvaran, Salgado, Ones, Anderson, & Sinangil, 2001), in their meta-analysis have defined how the construct of performance has evolved over time.

(Toops, 1944) made one of the earliest attempts to hypothesize the dimensions comprising the construct of job performance. He made a distinction between accuracy (quality or lack of errors) and volume of output (quantity). The dimensions of individual job performance defined by him were: units of production, quality of work, tenure, supervisory and leadership abilities.

(Wherry, 1957) listed six dimensions: output, quality, lost time, turnover, training time or promotability, and satisfaction.

(Bernardin & Beatty, 1984) define performance as the record of outcomes produced on a specified job function or activity during a specified time period. Every job function could be assessed in terms of six dimensions (Kane, 1986): quality, quantity,
timeliness, cost-effectiveness, need for supervision, and interpersonal impact. Some of these dimensions may not be relevant to all job activities.

(K. Murphy & Kroeker, 1988) describes the construct of job performance as comprising of four dimensions: downtime behaviors, task performance, interpersonal, and destructive behaviors.

(Campbell, 1990) describes the latent structure of job performance in terms of eight dimensions namely: job-specific task proficiency, non-job-specific task proficiency, written and oral communication, demonstrating effort, maintaining personal discipline, facilitating peer & team performance, supervision, and management/administration.

(Rush Jr, 1953) was one of the first to employ factor analytic techniques for explaining the underlying dimensions and factor structure of the individual job performance construct. He identified four factors: objective achievement, learning aptitude, general reputation, and proficiency of sales techniques. (Baier & Dugan, 1957) Factor analysis resulted in one general factor. In contrast, (Prien & Kult, 1968) found evidence for seven distinct dimensions. Study by conducted by (Ronan, 1963) resulted in a four-factor solution: Safe work habits of the individual; Acceptance of authority; Adjustment; the fourth factor was un-interpretable. (Gunderson & Ryman, 1971) identified three factors: task efficiency, emotional stability, and interpersonal relations. (Klimoski & London, 1974) reported evidence for the presence of a general factor.

Later Factor analytic studies with refined techniques of factor analysis, and the use of confirmatory factor analysis have enabled researchers to combine rational synthesis and empirical partitioning of variance.

(Borman, Motowidlo, Rose, & Hansen, 1985) developed a model of soldier effectiveness and noted that in addition to task performance, there were three other performance dimensions: allegiance, teamwork, and determination. Each of these three dimensions could be further subdivided. Allegiance involved following orders, following regulations, respect for authority, military bearing, and commitment. Teamwork comprised of cooperation, camaraderie, concern for unit morale, boosting
unit morale, and leadership. Determination involved perseverance, endurance, conscientiousness, initiative, and discipline.

(Hunt, 1996) developed a model of generic work behavior applicable to entry-level jobs especially in the service industry. Using performance data from over 18,000 employees primarily from the retail sector, Hunt identified nine dimensions of job performance that do not depend on job-specific knowledge. The nine dimensions were: adherence to confrontational rules, industriousness, thoroughness, schedule flexibility, attendance, off-task behavior, unruliness, theft, and drug misuse.

(Viswesvaran, 1993) listed job performance measures used in published articles over the years and derived ten dimensions by grouping conceptually similar measures. The 10 dimensions were: overall job performance, job performance or productivity, effort, job knowledge, interpersonal competence, administrative competence, quality, communication competence, leadership, and compliance with rules.

(C. Smith, et al., 1983) gave the concept of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. It was defined as 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, 1988b). Factor analytic studies have identified distinct sub-dimensions of organization citizenship behavior: altruism, courtesy, cheerleading, sportsmanship, civic virtue, and conscientiousness. (Ng & Feldman, 2009) in their meta-analysis, identified a set of studies that examined organization citizenship behavior targeted at three specific beneficiaries: other people on the job, the employer organization as a whole, and the tasks themselves. These behaviors are equivalent to the citizenship performance dimension in (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002) framework and have been identified by previous researchers as reasonable groupings of behaviors in this domain (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002).
(George & Brief, 1992) introduced the concept of ‘organizational spontaneity’, defined as voluntarily performed extra-role behavior that contributes to organizational effectiveness. They gave five dimensions for Organizational Spontaneity: helping co-workers, protecting the organization, making constructive suggestions, developing oneself, and spreading goodwill.

Organizational spontaneity closely matches the concept of Organization citizenship behavior but the slight difference arises where Organizational spontaneity is recognized by the organizational reward systems but Organization citizenship behavior is not recognized by the formal reward system.

(Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995) gave the term ‘Extra-Role Behavior’ and said that it contributes to organizational effectiveness. Concept of Extra-Role Behavior is based on role theory concepts developed by (D. Katz, 1964).

(Brief & Motowidlo, 1986) introduced the related concept of Prosocial Organizational Behavior, defined as behavior performed with the intention of promoting the welfare of individuals or groups towards whom the behavior has been directed. It can be either role-prescribed or extra-role, and it can be negative towards organizations although positive towards individuals.

(Borman, 1991; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993) have described the construct of job performance as comprising of task and contextual performance. According to their theory, task performance focuses on performing role-prescribed activities whereas contextual performance involves all other helping and productive behaviors. They also postulated that cognitive ability will predict task performance more strongly than individual differences in personality.

(McCloy, et al., 1994) argued that all individual differences variables affect performance in any dimension by their effects on either procedural knowledge or declarative knowledge or motivation.
(Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996) stated that that the link between individual differences in personality variables and individual differences in contextual performance is stronger than the link between individual differences in cognitive abilities and individual differences in contextual performance. Thus they supported the idea posited by (Borman, 1991; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993) by saying that Cognitive ability was more predictive of task performance than contextual performance.

Drawing on the work done by (Hunter, 1986) and (Costa Jr, 1996), (S. Motowidlo, et al., 1997) developed a theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. Performance model proposed by them depicted contextual performance as dependent on contextual habits, contextual skills, and contextual knowledge. Although contextual habits and contextual skills were linked to personality; contextual knowledge was influenced both by personality and cognitive ability. Similarly, task performance is influenced by task habits, task skill and task knowledge. Whereas task skill and task knowledge are influenced solely by cognitive ability, task habits are affected by both cognitive ability and personality variables. Thus, this model implies that both ability and personality have a role in explaining task and contextual performance. (Please refer to figure 2.4)

The bottom line appears to be that each performance dimension is complexly determined so that it is impossible to specify different individual differences variables as sole cause or antecedent of a particular dimension of job performance. This is also to be expected given the positive correlations across the various dimensions.

There is strong empirical support for cognitive ability as a predictor of job performance, as well as evidence that cognitive ability increases job knowledge, which directly influences performance (Borman, White, Pulakos, & Oppler, 1991; Ghiselli, 1973; Hunter, 1983; Hunter & Hunter, 1984; F. Schmidt, Hunter, & Pearlman, 1981). (Guion, 1987) suggested that non cognitive orientations might explain the criterion variance that cognitive ability does not account for. (Hunter, 1986; S. Motowidlo, et al., 1997) addressed the theoretical underpinnings for cognitive and non-cognitive predictors, respectively. Figure 2.4 summarizes (Hunter, 1986) and (S. Motowidlo, et al., 1997) models of Task and Contextual Performance.
Source: Bergman, Donovan, Drasgow, Overton, & Henning, 2008

(Bergman, Donovan, Drasgow, Overton, & Henning, 2008) tested (S. Motowidlo, et al., 1997) Theory of Individual Differences in Task and Contextual Performance and provided support for the same. Their research incorporated two studies; First study was conducted on 196 support staff employees of a large American mid-western company selling financial products and the Second study was conducted on 181 managers from a large mid-western university. They used LISREL VIII (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993) to test their framework and found support for (S. Motowidlo, et al., 1997) findings that Contextual performance is an important part of the performance domain.

(Fay & Frese, 2001, p. 133) identified a dimension of performance and called it personal initiative. They defined it as "work behavior characterized by its self-starting nature, its proactive approach, and by being persistent in overcoming difficulties that arise in the pursuit of a goal". It is concept similar to organization citizenship behavior since both go beyond employees' role requirements, and both are considered to contribute to organizational effectiveness (Organ, 1997).
Research on personal initiative and related constructs has mostly relied on Likert-type self-report scales (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Frese, Teng, & Wijnen, 1999; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). According to (Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007), this aspect of performance has been neglected in traditional approaches to work performance, and there is a misfit between the theoretical concept and how it is measured in organizational research (Frese, Fay, Hilburger, & Leng, 1997). (Bledow & Frese, 2009) studied the role of Personal initiative in performance.

(Wong & Snell, 2003) identified three broad performance domains that contribute towards workplace effectiveness namely: Citizenship; Emotions; and Ethics. Emotional Performance was defined as employee’s contribution to the development of interpersonal relationships with stakeholders and to an atmosphere of community and mutual understanding. Ethical performance is described as being at the heart of good management. Organizations whose employees operate ethically develop reputation for being reliable, trustworthy and conscientious (Friedman & Friedman, 1988).

Figure 2.5 represents the interrelationship between all these four performance domains. Figure 2.6 describes this further by examining the drivers of employee workplace effectiveness.

*Figure 2.5: A Holistic Model of Employee Workplace Effectiveness*

Source: Wong and Snell, 2003
Source: Wong and Snell 2003

(Ng & Feldman, 2009) conducted a meta-analysis study and identified nine specific groups of behaviors: core task performance, performance in training programs, citizenship behavior, creativity, counterproductive work behaviors, workplace aggression, substance use, tardiness, and absenteeism. Performance in training programs can be viewed as an additional indicator of core task performance because the purpose of most organizational training programs is to enhance the skill levels of employees on core tasks (Tracey, Tannenbaum, & Kavanagh, 1995).

Negative behaviors have also been researched as independent dimensions of job performance. (Clark & Hollinger, 1983) have discussed the antecedents of employee theft on organizations. (Kidwell Jr & Bennett, 1993) have explored the antecedents
and consequences of social loafing, shirking or the propensity to withhold effort. (Ones, Viswesvaran, & Schmidt, 1993; Sackett & Wanek, 1996) have researched on Integrity and have identified different forms of counterproductive behaviors such as property damage, substance abuse, violence on the job. Withdrawal behaviors have also been studied in terms of lateness, absenteeism, and turnover.

2.4.3 Summary of Practitioner Attempts To Describe Domains of Employee Performance

(Wong & Snell, 2003) summarize the recent research and practitioner literature. Their findings are presented in Table 2.1

Table 2.1: A Summary of Some Practitioner Attempts To Describe Domains of Employee Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source (Business Practices)</th>
<th>Performance Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritz-Carlton</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Go beyond the routines to serve customers uniquely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Seasons Hotel Chain</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Go beyond the call of duty, conscientiousness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleman</td>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>The ability to see life as somebody else sees it is the fundamental management skill. Self-awareness, Self-regulation, Self-motivation and Empathy are social skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IKEA</td>
<td>Ethical Behavior</td>
<td>Adhere to code of ethics, refrains from bribery, passes ethical audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Of Montreal</td>
<td>Ethical Behavior</td>
<td>Dispels stereotypes, impartial and unbiased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum Health Group</td>
<td>Unethical Behavior</td>
<td>Sexual harassment, over billing and fraud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Employers</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>Language proficiency, numerical capacity, computing and technology literacy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.4 Rational Synthesis of Job Performance Dimensions

In their Meta-analysis, (Viswesvaran, et al., 2001) explain that researchers have basically defined the construct domain of individual job performance in their studies through the following approaches:

1. They reviewed job performance measures used in different contexts and then tried to synthesize the dimensions make up the construct.
2. Some researchers have adopted the empirical approach by developing measures of hypothesized dimensions, collected data on these measures, and factor analyzed the data.
3. Third approach used by some researchers e.g., (Welbourne, et al., 1998) is that they have used organizational theories to define what the content of the job performance construct should be. They have used role theory and identity theory to explicate the construct of job performance.

To study various aspects of Performance, this research study has adopted the model of Job performance proposed by (Welbourne, et al., 1998) because it is based on sound theory and incorporates all the performance dimensions proposed by previous researchers as described above. It also addresses and rectifies several weaknesses in performance measurement research such as providing a theoretical framework; provisioning a multidimensional measure; reducing deficiency error associated with typical performance measures that only focus on the job role; facilitating generalizable measurement that can be compared across organizations.

(J. C. Wallace, Arnold, Edwards, Frazier, & Finch, 2009) state that recent research has urged researchers to go beyond typical task performance when evaluating performance. One means of achieving this is by using role-based performance theory. Theories of role-based performance (Griffin, et al., 2007; Welbourne, et al., 1998) have been a means to address this problem. (P. Murphy & Jackson, 1999, p. 335) defined work roles as “the total set of performance responsibilities associated with one’s employment”. These researchers posited that roles considered vital for
organizational effectiveness should be measured through a comprehensive assessment of employee performance.

This study therefore seeks to utilise Role-based performance theory to uncover vital performance dimensions and their linkage with chosen two personality dimensions namely Self Efficacy & Growth Need Strength. The next section describes this Role Based Performance Scale developed by (Welbourne, et al., 1998) and provides the theory behind the development of this scale.

2.4.5 Role Based Performance Theory

According to (Milkovich & Boudreau, 1997, p. 87), “organizations are replacing the notion of jobs with considering what 'roles' or 'competencies' will be required for the 21st century” . This trend has led to development of competency based appraisal systems (Lawler III, 1994). Many researchers have drawn attention towards the importance of non job components of performance (Austin & Villanova, 1992). Although multidimensional models of performance have been introduced including both job and non job dimensions but they lack a unifying theoretical framework (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997; Campbell, 1990; S. J. Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994).

Without a theoretical underpinning, there is little guidance for choosing which dimensions of performance to include or exclude from a model. Thus the researchers and organizations tend to use customized performance measures which does not allow for comparisons among jobs or across organizations. This lack of generalizability of the performance criterion hinders the validity of many predictors of performance (Austin & Villanova, 1992).

(Welbourne, et al., 1998) used Role theory and Identity theory to develop a theory-based, generalizable measure of performance. Role theory provided an explanation for why work performance should be multidimensional, and identity theory suggested how to determine which dimensions to include in a model of work performance.
2.4.5.1 Role Theory

Roles have been recognized as central to understanding employee behavior in organizations (D Katz & Kahn, 1978). Roles are positions within a social framework however, they are also defined by the individuals who occupy them (Oeser & Harary, 1962). According to the role theory, individuals' role expectations are influenced by both their personal attributes and the context in which they exist. Thus, role theory suggests that employee performance will be a function of both the individual and the organization. In previous attempts to theoretically explain performance, researchers sought either individual predictors or environmental predictors, neglecting to recognize that both can contribute simultaneously.

Although not using role theory specifically, researchers have suggested using roles as the basis for job descriptions as well as for specifying organizational expectations and performance requirements (Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1991; Van Dyne, et al., 1995). Despite this recognition of the importance of roles and the fact that employees choose to enact multiple roles in their organizations, research has continued to measure employee performance as if only one role i.e. that of a jobholder existed.

Role theory however does not ensure complete understanding because it only suggests roles as a way to conceptualize multiple behaviors at work but it does not provide a way to define which dimensions of performance (or roles) should be included in a multidimensional measure of performance. (Welbourne, et al., 1998) therefore additionally utilized Identity theory to substantiate the Role theory by understanding which roles should be measured in an instrument that focuses on behavior at work.

2.4.5.2 Identity Theory

According to identity theory, it is not the existence of roles, but their saliency, that affects behavior (Burke, 1991; Thoits, 1992). Therefore the roles that are most important to people provide them with strongest meaning or purpose and ultimately get translated into behaviors associated with that role. The role saliency is
communicated to the employees through various rewarding / punishing actions of the organization.

The role saliency will differ across organization because each organization will have different expectations from its employees. This poses problems in creating a generalizable performance measure applicable to all firms. (Welbourne, et al., 1998) worked around this problem with a two pronged solution; first they reviewed different compensation systems to understand the roles that they were expected to elicit and secondly they studied the roles that previous researches had indicated as important for organizational success.

Based on the above they developed a tool for comprehensive assessment of the employee performance. It was a robust tool that was based on data collected from employees at six different companies. The companies belonged to various industries and the employees were working at different hierarchical positions. The Role Based Performance Scale was thoroughly tested for reliability, discriminant validity and construct validity. The authors proved that the explanatory power of their performance measurement scale was better than that of traditional appraisal instruments.

This Role Based Performance Scale measured performance in five different roles: Job, Career, Innovator, Team Member, and Organization Citizen. The next section elaborates these roles and the rationale for their inclusion in the Role Based Performance Scale.

2.4.5.3 Role Based Performance Scale - Roles comprising the construct

The Job Role: The job holder role represents the traditionally held view of employee performance i.e. the effective execution of activities that contribute to the organization’s technical core (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Task performance includes behaviors that contribute to the core transformation and maintenance activities in an organization, such as producing products, selling merchandise,
acquiring inventory, managing subordinates, or delivering services (S. Motowidlo & Schmit, 1999).

The Career Role: The career role includes the performance in terms of the growth shown by the employee in his/her career by adding new skill sets or developing themselves for vertical movement in the organization. (Welbourne, et al., 1998) argue that Career role should be incorporated in the performance models for several reasons. The most obvious one is that different compensation plans indicate that organizations desire this role from the employees e.g. promotion systems reward individuals for career accomplishment (Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart, & Wright, 1994); skill-based pay is another pay system that emphasizes the career role is (Ledford, 1991) because it provides employees with increases in their pay when they acquire new skills.

Another reason provided is that of a new psychological contract developing between employees and employers in which both share responsibility for career planning (Miner, 1986). Since companies no longer can offer job security and promotion opportunities hence the new psychological contract implies that employers will provide a well developed career program and that employees should attempt to increase their value by taking responsibility for career planning (Noe, et al., 1994). This increased recognition and emphasis on the joint career responsibility of employers and employees makes the career role an important one to consider in a model of performance.

The Innovator Role: The innovator role includes the creative performance shown by the employee. It has a broad based interpretation by seeking creativity not only in their respective jobs but being creative from an organizational perspective. (Schein, 1980) argued that if firms intend to remain competitive in a complex and changing environment, they must have employees who are creative on behalf of an entire organization, not just creative in their jobs. Thus the employees are required to contribute to the effectiveness and adaptability of their organization as a whole (Schein, 1970, 1980; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).
Many companies provide compensation incentives, such as gain sharing and cash rewards for suggestions that promote this entrepreneurial role. The innovator role is important in both large and small organizations (Gomez-Mejia & Balkin, 1992).

The Team Role: Performance in the team role is gauged by the contribution of the employee towards team work and how well he/she fits into a role of a constructive contributing team player. (M. Stevens & Campion, 1994) propose that teamwork has been considered a component of organizational performance for years however recently there is an increase in the recognition of the importance of the team role as well as the use of teams in organizations. Many of the new performance models have included teamwork as a vital component (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Campbell, 1990).

The compensation literature also provides evidence of the increasing reliance on teams in organizations and the importance being accorded to the aspect of being a positive team member. Both Gain sharing plans and team based incentives support behaviors associated with being a team member. These pay systems also encourage cooperation among team members and between teams (Welbourne & Mejia, 1995).

The Organization Role: The Organization role is similar in concept to the organization citizenship behavior concept proposed by (Organ, 1988b). Numerous studies have investigated the importance of organizational or non required work roles (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997; Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; S. J. Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994).

It has been demonstrated that employees enact both roles in the workplace. Moreover, the job role is clearly supported by compensation systems e.g., merit pay, individual bonus plans etc. (Welbourne & Cable, 1995) in their study found that organization member role was influenced by the existence of group based incentive plans, such as profit sharing, gain sharing, and stock options or grants.
2.4.6 Collection of Performance Data

Employee work performance assessment methods can be broadly classified into two categories i.e. Organizational records and Subjective evaluations. Subjective evaluations depend on human judgment therefore Organizational records are considered to be more objective compared to the Subjective evaluation (Viswesvaran, et al., 2001). Thus performance data can be collected through either objective measures (e.g., sales volume) or subjective measures (e.g., ratings). Subjective measures are more frequently used (Dierdorff & Surface, 2007; Pulakos, Schmitt, & Chan, 1996) and mostly the organizations rely on subjective measures for performance assessment (Arvey & Murphy, 1998; Cleveland, Murphy, & Williams, 1989).

The distinction between organizational records and subjective evaluations has a long history (Viswesvaran, et al., 2001). (Burtt & Murphy, 1926; Viteles, 1932) grouped criterion measures into objective and subjective classes. (Farmer, 1933) grouped criteria into objective measures, judgments of performance (judgments based on objective performance), and judgments of ability (judgments based on traits). (P. C. Smith, 1976) distinguished between hard criteria (i.e., organizational records) and soft criteria (i.e., subjective evaluations).

Subjective evaluations raise the question of “who should rate”. Typically, in traditional organizations the supervisors of the employees provide the ratings. Recent years have seen an increase in the use of 360 degree feedback systems (Church & Bracken, 1997) where rating assessments can be made by self, subordinates, peers, and customers or clients.

In this study the performance data was collected through self evaluation of the employees. The next chapter “Research Methodology” gives exhaustive details of the methodology chosen for conducting the study.
2.5 Relationships between the Variables under Study

2.5.1 Self Efficacy and Performance

One of the basic tenets of efficacy-performance relationship is that positive efficacy views induce strong motivational tendencies towards the targeted performance (Bandura, 1977, 1986).

(McCloy, et al., 1994) argued that all individual differences variables affect performance in any dimension by their effects on either procedural knowledge or declarative knowledge or motivation. (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996) stated that the link between individual differences in personality variables and individual differences in contextual performance is stronger than the link between individual differences in cognitive abilities and individual differences in contextual performance.

Task-related self-efficacy increases the effort and persistence towards challenging tasks, and therefore increases the likelihood that they will be completed (Barling & Beattie, 1983). Self-efficacy enhances employees' willingness to exert effort and master a challenge and, thus, plays an important role in increasing work effectiveness, job satisfaction, and productivity (Staples, Hulland, & Higgins, 1999). This is further supported by results from a comprehensive meta-analysis of 114 studies, Self Efficacy was found to have a strong positive relationship with work-related performance. Relationships between self-efficacy and contextual performance have also been found (Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000). (Tsai, Chen, & Liu, 2007) state that past research findings have confirmed the positive relationship between self-efficacy and task performance (Gist, Schwoerer, & Rosen, 1989; Wood, et al., 1990).

(Shea & Howell, 2000) examined the pattern of the relationships between Self Efficacy and Performance in an experiment involving 148 students who worked on a manufacturing task over four trials. Results indicate strong support for a significant relationship between Self Efficacy and Performance over time. (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998a) conducted a meta-analysis of 114 studies (N=21,616) and found the weighted average correlation between Self Efficacy and Performance to be $r = 0.34$ (p < 0.01).
Thus Self Efficacy is posited to be related to both Task performance and Contextual performance.

The power of self-efficacy beliefs to affect the course of life paths through selection processes is clearly revealed in studies of career decision-making and career development (Betz & Hackett, 1986; Lent & Hackett, 1987). People with higher levels of Self Efficacy consider a wider the range of career options and prepare themselves better educationally for different occupational pursuits. People with higher self-efficacy believe in their ability to handle their work well (Sujan, Weitz, & Kumar, 1994) and are more likely to become successful in their careers (Sherer, et al., 1982). Self-limitation of career development arises more from perceived self-inefficacy than from actual inability. Thus Self Efficacy is posited to be related to Career performance.

Strong efficacy beliefs enhance the persistence level and the coping efforts individuals will demonstrate when encountering challenging situations (Bandura, 1977). Elevated Self Efficacy leads to certain cognitive components e.g. broader information searches, greater memory recall (Cervone, Jiwani, & Wood, 1991), sustaining of effort (Bandura, 1997). These components can be linked to creative performance (Amabile, 1988). Thus Self Efficacy is posited to be related to Innovative performance.

2.5.2 Growth Need Strength and Performance

(McCloy, et al., 1994) argued that all individual differences variables affect performance in any dimension by their effects on either procedural knowledge or declarative knowledge or motivation. (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996) stated that that the link between individual differences in personality variables and individual differences in contextual performance is stronger than the link between individual differences in cognitive abilities and individual differences in contextual performance.

Therefore in this study we seek to check the role of Growth Need Strength on performance and the correlation between the two variables. So far most of the research
that has been done on Growth Need Strength is in the context of Job Characteristic Model. Its role has been mostly explored as a moderating variable influencing the performance. There are mixed results from the past research on the moderating role of Growth Need Strength.

Initial analysis of (Ivancevich & McMahon, 1977) found little consistent relationship between task-goal attributes and performance measures. However when Higher order need strength was introduced as a moderator variable, the relations between the task-goal attributes and performance measures became clearer.

(Schuler, 1977) examined Growth Need Strength as an individual differences moderating variable of task characteristics and stated that the results were inconsistent. This study also reviewed previous research on growth need strength as a moderator of the relationships between task characteristics and satisfaction, motivation, and performance. The inconsistencies in the results suggested a need for a possible reconciliation of the findings. Job involvement, in conjunction with growth need strength, was a variable hypothesized in this study to reconcile previous results. Job involvement and growth need strength jointly moderated the effects of task design. The results suggest that an individual difference approach to task design should be maintained.

(Abdel-Halim, 1980) examine the moderating effects of employee higher order need strength (HONS) on the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. Moderated regression and subgroup analyses were performed on the data, and the results provide support for the moderating role of HONS. Specifically, job performance is positively related to intrinsic as well as extrinsic sources of job satisfaction for strong HONS individuals while no such relation is found for individuals with weak HONS.

(Pokorney, Gilmore, & Beehr, 1980) in their research studied the moderating effect of Growth Need Strength on the relationships between job characteristic indices and job satisfaction measures Inconsistent results were obtained in the attempt to establish the moderating role of GNS.
(Champoux, 1991) reported the results of a multivariate test of the Job Characteristics Theory of Work Motivation using data from employees of a state agency in the United States. A canonical correlation analysis was done first to determine whether there was a statistically significant multivariate relationship among the variables. A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was then done to test main effects and interactions. The results of the study were mostly supportive of predictions from the theory.

Applying univariate and multivariate hierarchical moderated multiple regression analyses, (Tiegs, Tetrick, & Fried, 1992) have found no support for growth need strength as a moderator of the JCM. Their finding appears consistent with the conclusion made by (Graen, et al., 1986). (Pollock, Whitbred, & Contractor, 2000) tested growth need strength as a moderator of the effects of job characteristics upon job satisfaction and found no support for the same.

(K. Schmidt & Daume, 1993) examined JCM in predicting the voluntary employee turnover. Using a sample of 120 production workers, the study provided some support for the model’s most demanding assumption of a moderating effect of Growth Need Strength on job characteristics – turnover relationship.

(Boonzaier, et al., 2001) conducted an exhaustive review on the JCM and concluded that research literature questions the influence of Growth Need Strength as a moderator variable in the JCM. Studies of (Graen, Novak, & Sommerkamp, 1982b; Orpen, 1979; Umstot, Bell, & Mitchell, 1976) indicate that Growth Need Strength did not moderate the relationship between job characteristics and job performance. (O brien, 1982) found weak moderating relationship.

On the contrary (Goris, et al., 2000) found that high levels of job performance and job satisfaction occur when congruence of individual needs (growth need strength) and job characteristics (job scope) exists. (De Jong, Van der Velde, & Jansen, 2001) examined the role of Growth Need Strength and a general Big Five Personality Factor Openness to Experience as moderators between job characteristics and job satisfaction. They found support for the moderating role and further explained that the moderating effect
of Growth Need Strength on the relation between skill variety and job satisfaction was explained by the moderating effect of openness to experience.

(Boonzaier, et al., 2001) further states that strongest empirical evidence is provided by three meta-analyses of the moderating effect of Growth Need Strength on relationships between job characteristics and various outcome variables. The three mentioned meta-analysis studies are (Fried & Ferris, 1987; Loher, et al., 1985; Spector, 1985). All these studies provide inconsistent conclusions regarding the moderating influence of Growth Need Strength.

(Shalley, et al., 2009) propose that Growth Need Strength is an important individual factor for employees' creative performance. Using an interactionist perspective, they examine the relationship between Growth Need Strength and a supportive work context on self-reported creativity across a wide range of jobs that vary in complexity. Controlling for the effects of individual factors that have been previously linked to creativity (i.e., creative personality, intrinsic motivation, and cognitive style), they report finding that Growth Need Strength has both a positive main effect on creativity and an interactive effect with context.

Therefore based on the above discussion, there is serious question mark on the Growth Need Strength as a moderating variable on the performance. This leads to the original point raised in the study and supported by findings of (Shalley, et al., 2009), whether Growth Need Strength is better explained as an independent variable influencing multidimensional construct of performance rather than having only a moderating influence.

2.5.3 Education Level and Performance

Human capital theory suggests that the abilities and knowledge acquired by individuals are likely to be rewarded with higher earnings in the labor market (Becker, 1964). Education and work experience are the two forms of human capital individuals are most likely to acquire during their careers (Myers, Griffith, Daugherty, & Lusch,
2004; Singer & Bruhns, 1991; Strober, 1990). Education level refers to the academic credentials or degrees an individual has obtained (Ng & Feldman, 2009).

Individuals with higher levels of education are posited to have both greater fluid and crystallized intelligence (Ceci, 1991; Neisser, et al., 1996). Education may promote core task performance by providing individuals with more knowledge, declarative and procedural, utilizing whom they can complete their tasks successfully. Knowledge typically refers to the understanding of information related to job duties (McCloy, et al., 1994). Declarative knowledge refers to expertise regarding facts, rules, and principles, whereas procedural knowledge refers to the application of declarative knowledge in practice (Ree, Earles, & Teachout, 1994). Educational level can enhance cognitive ability, increase job-relevant knowledge, and promote the development of a strong work ethic, all of which can strengthen job performance in turn. (Ng & Feldman, 2009)

Educational experiences are also basic to the development of creative tendencies and processes (Nickerson, 1999). This development may entail cognitive enhancement including an orientation towards use of diverse multiple perspectives and increasingly complicated schema (Perkins, 1986). Education provides exposure to a variety of experiences, viewpoints, and knowledge bases, reinforces the use of divergent problem solving skills and experimentation critical to innovative work (Amabile, 1988).

Education not only has an impact on the task performance; rather it inculcates various other values such as following rules, respecting discipline, maintain moral standards, and exercising mature judgment (Bear, Manning, & Izard, 2003; C. Ford & Gioia, 2000; Rest, 1987; Swenson-Lepper, 2005). Workers with more years of education are also less likely to impose danger on coworkers or customers by ignoring safety instructions (Oh & Shin, 2003; Taylor & Thompson, 1976). Highly educated workers are therefore likely to contribute more effectively to noncore activities at work as well (Pennings, Lee, & Van Witteloostuijn, 1998).
(Brenner, 1982) compared individuals with different levels of education and found that their achievement orientation increased as the level of education increased. It also promotes self confidence and provides the ability and motivation for setting future personal goals (Di Vesta & Thompson, 1970; Howard, 1986).

Most organizations use education as an indicator of a person’s skill levels or productivity (Benson, Finegold, & Mohrman, 2004). Some organizations also subsidize the higher education for their current employees but they may not assess the improvement in performance rigorously assuming the tacit link between education level and performance. (Ng & Feldman, 2008) found that years of work experience did not moderate the education performance relationship.

There has been very little research directly examining the relationship between educational level and various components of work performance. Previous research in this area has mostly explored the effects of Educational level on core task performance (Karatepe, Uludag, Menevis, Hadzimehmedagic, & Baddar, 2006; Kaufman, 1978; Maglen, 1990). However there are other work related behaviors that also qualify as part of job performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Hunt, 1996; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). These aspects constituting performance have been described earlier in the section. Thus, it is important to examine the impact of educational level on multiple dimensions of performance and Education level therefore has been chosen as a demographic variable in this study to gauge its role in performance.

Although Education level is a continuous variable, it is frequently measured categorically in research studies (Ng & Feldman, 2009). In this study the Education level is measured in four categories namely: Diploma, Bachelor Degree, Master Degree, and PHD.
2.5.4 Work Experience and Performance

Job tenure is generally used as a measure of work experience because it is the most frequently used time based operationalization of the work experience construct (Quiones, Ford, & Teachout, 1995).

Previous research has shown that level of work experience is positively related to job performance (McDaniel, Schmidt, & Hunter, 1988; McEnrue, 1988). As the individuals spend more time in their work place, they tend to develop greater knowledge about how to perform their jobs more effectively and more quickly (Tesluk & Jacobs, 1998). (Schmidt, et al., 1986) tested a causal model of work performance that included the length of work experience as a factor in the prediction of performance and reported that work experience had a direct causal effect on the degree of job knowledge which in turn positively affected work experience.

(Avolio, Waldman, & McDaniel, 1990) propose that an important theoretical possibility previous research has often overlooked is that experience may be non-linearly related to performance. (F. Schmidt, Hunter, Outerbridge, & Goff, 1988) predicted that experience beyond the level needed to perform the job maximally would not benefit performance and might actually be detrimental. Their reasoning was that most important gains in performance attributable to experience are typically realized early in the career, with returns diminishing over time.

(Avolio, et al., 1990) also argue that most previous research has measured experience with respect to number of years an individual worker has performed in a job within a particular organization (e.g. McEnrue, 1988; F. Schmidt, Hunter, & Outerbridge, 1986). With a few exceptions (e.g. McDaniel, et al., 1988), studies have typically not defined experience as total number of years an individual has accumulated over a period of time with different employers.

In this study, Job Tenure measured the overall work experience of the employees and not only the work experience in their current organization. This was considered a crucial differentiation because the people may accumulate relevant knowledge and
skills across jobs in different organizational settings that can have an impact on their work performance.

There is mixed opinions in the past research about the relationship between job tenure and Innovative performance in particular. On one hand research shows that extant experience in a particular field is necessary for creative success (Amabile, 1988) because immersion in a domain over time leads to the level of familiarity requisite for creative work (Weisberg, 1999). On the other hand it is also proposed that task familiarity could lead to more habitual performance (C. Ford, 1996). This is rebutted by the argument put forward by (Ericsson, Krampe, & Clemens, 1993) that work experience provides ample opportunities to prepare for creativity through deliberate practice of task-domain skills and activities. (Bailyn, 1988) also supports by saying that creativity requires some sense of what has been done in the past within a domain and therefore job tenure promotes creativity. As employees come to understand the nuances of their job, they are more likely to feel confident that they can be creative in their work roles.

In many cases Educational level and number of years of Work experience are likely to be negatively correlated. This is due to the fact that the people who spend more years in school will have less time available to accumulate work experience, whereas those who start working earlier may not have very high formal education.

Formal education and work experience on the other hand may also be complementary to each other. Work experience is likely to provide tacit, practical knowledge that is less frequently provided by formal education. When coupled with the in-depth, analytical knowledge provided by formal education, work experience may enhance job performance. In addition, the knowledge and skills necessary for effective job performance are likely to be consolidated and sharpened over a period of time spent in service and indulging in learning by trial and error (F. Schmidt, et al., 1986). However (Ng & Feldman, 2008) found that years of work experience did not moderate the education performance relationship.
2.5.5 Age and Performance

(Avolio, et al., 1990) conducted a study to examine the relative explanatory power of age and total work experience for predicting work performance. Their results indicated that work experience was a better predictor of performance as compared to age with correlation 0.18.

(Ng & Feldman, 2008) put forward that previous reviews of the literature on the relationship between age and job performance have largely focused on core task performance but have paid much less attention to other job behaviors that also contribute to productivity. Their study provides an expanded meta-analysis on the relationship between age and job performance that includes 10 dimensions of job performance: core task performance, creativity, performance in training programs, organizational citizenship behaviors, safety performance, general counterproductive work behaviors, workplace aggression, on-the-job substance use, tardiness, and absenteeism. The results of their study indicate that although age was largely unrelated to core task performance, creativity, and performance in training programs, it demonstrated stronger relationships with the other seven performance dimensions. Their results also highlight that the relationships of age with core task performance and with counterproductive work behaviors are curvilinear in nature and that several sample characteristics and data collection characteristics moderate age-performance relationships.

(Slocum Jr, Cron, Hansen, & Rawlings, 1985) suggested that the deadwood phenomenon often associated with older employees is at least partially attributable to the prevalence of low work motivation among them.

2.5.6 Management Level and Performance

Senior Managerial jobs are usually less structured and more ambiguous in nature (Staw & Barsade, 1993). Therefore their knowledge, and work values become even stronger determinants of job performance (Pavett & Lau, 1983). It is particularly
critical for managers to be persistent in their efforts and to seek out more responsibility (Rose, 2005).

As discussed earlier, although education facilitates performance in most jobs (Hunter, Schmidt, & Le, 2006; Kuncel, Hezlett, & Ones, 2004), its effects are likely to be more pronounced as the managerial level increases. Therefore it is expected that the relationship between Educational level and Performance will be stronger for Senior Manager than First Line Managers.

Beginning managers typically focused on technical knowledge and corporate procedural guidelines in the earliest stages of their careers. Novice managers are likely to be assigned well-structured tasks with narrow-reaching consequences, and they are usually more closely supervised than managers with greater experience (Mumford, Marks, Connelly, Zaccaro, & Reiter-Palmon, 2000; Yukl, 2002). A focus on the tasks performed by oneself and others would, therefore, seem common among inexperienced managers (Befort & Hattrup, 2003). With increased experience, however, managers are typically assigned more complex problems and are given responsibility for solutions that have potentially far reaching consequences. Thus, higher levels of creative problem solving and an increased need to be aware of the social context within which plans are implemented become increasingly important as leaders acquire experience and gain responsibility (Mumford, Marks, et al., 2000; Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs, & Fleishman, 2000; Yukl, 2002).

2.5.7 Gender and Performance

There is a plethora of research in the area of Performance and the gender differences. The focus of research is on areas which are stereotyped as mainly male domains and the reasons why females underperform in those areas or why they are represented less. According to (Beyer, 1990) prior research has established that gender differences in self-perceptions exist. They found that females are more likely to underestimate their performance. (Gneezy, Niederle, & Rustichini, 2003) used experimental design to prove that females are less competitive as compared to males when both the genders
are performing together on a competitive task. (Niederle & Vesterlund, 2007) also supported the above findings through experimental design where they tested the gender difference in the preference for competition. (Duckworth & Seligman, 2006) however posit that females have more self discipline and this would therefore give them an edge when it comes to performance. This study aims to explore further the mixed results of prior research by considering Gender as a demographic variable to be studied.

This chapter has provided the theoretical framework for studying the research problem. The constructs for Self Efficacy, Growth Need Strength and Performance were examined and relevant past studies on these research variables were discussed. Next chapter i.e. “Chapter 3 – Research Methodology” will provide details on the research hypotheses, research design and the procedures followed for conducting the study. It will also detail the instrument development process, pilot study, data collection and data analysis procedures.