Construct of Employee Job Performance: Conceptual discussion

on definitions and dimensions

Rathnaweera R.R.N.T
Department of Human Resource Management,
Faculty of Management and Finance,
University of Ruhuna, Sri Lanka.
rthanuja@badm.ruh.ac.lk
+94 712308543

Jayatilake L.V.K
Department of Commerce & Financial Management,
Faculty of Commerce & Management Studies,
University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka.
lakminij@kln.ac.lk
+94 718228677.

Abstract

Job performance is one of the most important dependent variable and is associated with both employee and organisational-level outcomes. The study aims to review existing studies to discuss the conceptualization of employee job performance including diverse definitions of the construct, to describe the frameworks that are developed for specific occupations and applicable across all jobs, to describe the frameworks that are developed for specific occupations and are applicable across all jobs, to determine the most widely used dimensions of job performance in the literature. There is still no consensus and universally accepted definition of what performance is. Scholars have conceptualized job performance in different angles. Even though some scholars have attempted to model the entire domain of job performance, several scholars have focused on specific performance. Extensive literature review shows that employee performance is multidimensional construct and the most frequently used dimensions of job performance are task performance, contextual performance, adaptive performance and counterproductive performance.

Key words: Job Performance, Task performance, Contextual Performance, Adaptive performance, Counterproductive performance.

Sahyadri SJOM
Journal of Management

1. Introduction

Individual job performance is one of the most central constructs in Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology and Human Resource Management (Campbell & Wiernik, 2015; Harari, et al. 2016). Job performance is one of the most important dependent variable (Jankingthong & Rukkhum, 2012, p.116). It is associated with both employee and organisational-level outcomes (Pandy, 2019). Employee job performance refers to "scalable actions, behaviour, and outcomes that employees engage in or bring about that are linked with and contribute to organizational goals" (Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000, p. 216). Similar terminology that has been used interchangeably with employee job performance are "employee performance" (Motowidlo, et al., 1997; Porter & Lawler, 1974), "work performance" (Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000), and "individual work performance" (Koopmans et al., 2011). Task and contextual performance are two types of employee behaviour that are necessary for organizational effectiveness (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). As job performance is a central construct in industrial/ work/ organizational psychology (Campbell 1990; Schmidt & Hunter 1992), it is important to know what that construct entails (Viswesvaran & Ones, 2002).

This paper is aimed to discuss the conceptualization of job performance including diverse definitions of the construct, to describe the job performance frameworks that are developed for specific occupations, to describe employee performance models that are applicable across all jobs, to determine the most widely used dimensions of job performance in the literature and to describe frequently used dimensions of job performance by the prior researchers.

2. Method

This paper is based on a review and analysis of research from the literature. Relevant books and refereed journals over the past years was utilized for reviewing literature. Researchers searched for articles in the databases such as Sage Journals Online, Taylor and Francis Online, Science Direct (Elsevier), Business Source Complete (EBSCO), JSTOR, Wiley Online Library and Emerald insight.

3. Literature Review: Job Performance

3.1 Conceptualization of Job Performance

Scholars have conceptualized job performance in different angles. Some scholars have conceptualised it as a unidimensional construct. "Job performance is often treated as a unidimensional construct despite a variety of theories and empirical evidence suggesting that it is multidimensional (Austin & Villanova, 1992; Campbell, 1990; Campbell et al., 1993; Ghiselli, 1956, as cited in Hunt (1996, p.51). However, others consider it as a multidimensional construct. Campbell (1990) as cited in Johnson and Meade (2010), mentioned that majority of researchers noted that job performance is inherently multidimensional. Campbell (1990) as cited in Johnson and Meade (2010, p.1) stated that job performance is inherently multidimensional construct. Many researchers have also shared this view. (for example: Murphy, 1989; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Campbell et al., 1996; Motowidlo et al., 1997; Viswesvaran & Ones 2000; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Stokes, 2008; Koopmans et al. 2011). In contrast, some researchers (e.g. Campbell, 1990) have understood it as a generic concept (construct applicable across jobs) while others view it as a job specific construct (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). Moreover, some of prior researchers looks at "what" employees do at work while others looks into the "results" of such behaviours. "These differing conceptualisations result in differing measurement parameters for job performance in terms of "how" and "whom" to measure" (Pandy, 2019, p. 264).

3.1.1 Review of employee job performance definitions

Definitions of employee job performance have evolved over decades. However, there is still no consensus and universally accepted definition of what performance is (Mensah, 2015). As shown in the tale 1, it has differently been defined by scholars over decades. Lebas and Euske (2002, p.67) stated that "performance is one of those 'suitcase words' in which everyone places the concepts that suit them, letting the context take care of the definition".

Table 1: Evolution of Employee Performance definitions

Author	Year	Definition
Porter & Lawler	1974	"A function of individual ability, skills and effort in a given situation".
Bernandin & Beatty	1984	"The record of outcomes produced by a specified job function or activity during a specified time period"

Hunter	1986	"The single result of an employee's work"
Campbell	1990	"Behaviours or actions that are relevant to the goals of the organization"
Campbell et al	1990	"Observable things people do that are relevant for the goals of the organisation".
Lance et al	1992	"Aggregated financial or non- financial added value by the employees in contribution to the fulfilment both directly and indirectly to the targeted organisational goals"
Campbell et al	1993	"what the organization hires one to do, and do well"
Borman & otowidlo	1993	"Aggregated value to an organization of the set of behaviors that an employee contributes both directly and indirectly to organizational goals".
Borman & Motowidlo	1997	"Effectiveness with which job occupants execute their assigned tasks, that realizes the fulfilment of organization's vision while rewarding organization and individual proportionately."
Motowidlo et al	1997	"Aggregated value to the organization of the discrete behavioural episodes that an individual performs over a standard period of time".
Ferris et al	1998	"A consequence of some combination of ability, effort and opportunity".
Bernardin & Russell	1998	"The record of outcomes produced on a specified job function or activity during a specified time period".
Babin & Boles	1998	"The level of productivity of an individual employee, relative to his or her peers, on several job-related behaviours and outcomes".
Viswesvaran & Ones	2000	"Scalable actions, behavior and outcomes that employees engage in or bring about that are linked with and contribute to organizational goals."
Mathis & Jackson	2002	"Contribution of employees to the organization"
Rotundo & Sackett,	2002	"Actions and behaviors that are under the control of the individual and contribute to the goals of the organization"
Griffin	2007	"The sum of behaviours of employees"
Stewardt & Brown	2009	"The contribution that individuals make to the organization that employs them"
Mangkunegara	2009	"Employee's performance is the work result base on quality and quantity achieved by an employee in doing his/her job given to them"
Rubel & Kee	2013	the aggregated value to an organization of the entire behavior of an employee contributing to the organization directly and indirectly
Mensah	2015	"Positive contribution of an employee to the performance of the organisation".
Opatha	2015	"An employee's job performance is the extent to which duties and responsibilities have been carried out".

Sahyadri SJOM
Journal of Management

| Ramawickrama et al | 2017 | Job performance is the extent to which the employee has shown his or her traits, engaged in behaviours and produced results which are appropriate to task performance, and has engaged in citizenship performance and counterproductive performance during a particular period of time". |
| Sobaiha & Gabry | 2019 | the extent to which an individual is able to successfully accomplish job tasks under the normal constraints of the job with the utilization of available resources identified which includes both task or in-role performance and contextual or extra-role performance" |

Source: literature review.

Scholars in later 1970s have defined job performance in terms of actions and behaviors rather than the results of these actions (Campbell, 1990; Murphy, 1989; Smith, 1976). Moreover, they focused on behaviours that affect the goals of the organization and are under the control of the individual. Porter & Lawler (1974) defined employee performance as a function of individual ability, skills and effort in a given situation. As Murphy (1989) explained, job performance should be defined in terms of behaviour rather than results. Campbell (1990) defined work performance as "behaviors or actions that are relevant to the goals of the organization". Motowidlo et al. (1997) defined employee performance as an "aggregated value to the organization of the discrete behavioural episodes that an individual performs over a standard period of time". Viswesvaran and Ones (2000) proposed work performance as "scalable actions, behaviour and outcomes that employees engage in or bring about that are linked with and contribute to organizational goals". They have included results in their definition of work performance as distinguishing between behaviour and results are difficult. Based on these ideas, Rotundo & Sackett (2002, p. 66) conceptualized job performance as "those actions and behaviors that are under the control of the individual and contribute to the goals of the organization". This broad definition of job performance comprises a number of behaviours. Mensah (2015) preferred to define performance as the 'positive contribution of an employee to the performance of the organisation'. More recently, Sobaiha and Gabry (2019) focus on in-role and extra-role performance in defining job performance. As above explanation, scholars have no agreed precise definition about employee performance. However, Campbell (1990) has provided a clear conceptualization of the construct. He defined work performance as "behaviours or actions that are relevant to the goals of the organization". It has been widely endorsed definition of work performance (Koopmans, 2011).

3.2 Dimensions of employee Performance

There does not seem to be a common understanding of what constitutes '*job performance*' (Campbell et al., 1993). Research on the dimensions of job performance has widely agreed that performance is multidimensional concept (Campbell et al., 1990; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Borman & Brush, 1993; Viswesvaran & Ones 2000; Sonnentag & Frese, 2002; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Stokes, 2008; Koopmans et al., 2011).

Work performance is "an abstract, latent construct that cannot be measured directly" (Viswesvaran, 2000). To conceptualize and operationalize work performance, it is needed to clarify the construct domain of work performance and identify its dimensions and indicators (Campbell, 1990; Viswesvaran, 2000; Fay & Sonnentag, 2010). Although the dimensions may generalize across jobs, the exact indicators can differ between jobs (Viswesvaran, 2000). Scholars listed in table 2 attempted to model the entire domain of job performance.

Table 2: Various efforts to describe the domain of job performance.

Reference	Components	Description
Katz & Kahn (1978)	• Role performance in system • Innovative or spontaneous behaviours • Joining and staying with the organization	• Meeting or exceeding the quantitative and qualitative standards of performance. • Facilitate the achievement of organizational goals, cooperating, protecting the organization. • Low turnover and absenteeism.
Murphy (1989)	• Task performance • Interpersonal relations • Destructive or hazardous behaviours • Downtime behaviours	• Accomplishment of duties and responsibilities. • Cooperating, communicating, and exchanging job-related information. • Violating security and safety, destroying equipment, accidents. • Substance abuse, illegal activities.
Campbell (1990)	• Job-specific task proficiency • Non-job-specific task proficiency • Written and oral communication proficiency • Demonstrating effort • Maintaining personal discipline • Facilitatin g peer and	• Core technical tasks • Tasks not specific to a given job • Preparing written materials or giving oral presentations • Exerting extra effort, willing to work under adverse conditions • Avoid negative or adverse behaviours (e.g., substance abuse). • Support and assist peers, reinforce participation.

Sahyadri SJOM
Journal of Management

	team performance • Supervision and leadership • Management and administration	• Influence, setting goals, rewarding and punishing. • Organize people and resources, monitor progress, problem solve.
Borman & Motowidlo (1993)	• Task performance • Contextual performance	• Formally recognized as part of the job and contribute to the organization's technical core. • Discretionary, not necessarily role-prescribed, contribute to social and psychological environment.
Borman & Brush (1993)	• Technical activities • Leadership and supervision • Interpersonal dealings • Useful personal behaviour	• Planning, demonstrating technical proficiency, administration • Guiding, directing, motivating, coordinating • Communicating, maintaining a good organizational image and working relationships • Working within the guidelines and boundaries of the organization
Welbourne et al. (1998)	• Job • Career • Innovator • Team • Organization	• Doing things specifically related to one's job description • Obtaining the necessary skills to progress through one's organization • Creativity and innovation in one's job and the organization as a whole • Working with co-workers and team members, toward success of the firm • Going above the call of duty in one's concern for the firm

Source: Rotundo & Sackett, 2002, p. 67.

Katz & Kahn (1978) first attempted to model the entire domain of job performance. Murphy (1989) and Campbell (1990) were among the first to define the domain of individual work performance by specifying the major dimensions of generic work performance. According to Murphy (1989), the work performance domain could be modelled using the following four dimensions:(1) *task behaviours*, (2) *interpersonal behaviours* (communicating and cooperating with others), (3) *downtime behaviours* (work-avoidance behaviours), and (4) *destructive/hazardous behaviours* (behaviours that lead to a clear risk of productivity losses, damage, or other setbacks). The eight work performance dimensions included in Campbell's (1990) work performance framework are described in table 3. According to Campbell (1990), these eight dimensions are sufficient to describe the latent structure of performance at a general level. "However, the eight factors are not of the same form. They have different patterns of sub general factors, and their content varies differentially across jobs. Further, any particular job might not incorporate all eight components" (Campbell, 1990, p. 708).

Table 3: Campbell's eight work performance dimensions

Dimension	Description
1. Job-specific task proficiency	How well someone can do tasks that make up the core technical requirements of a job and that differentiate one job from another.
2. Non-job-specific task proficiency	How well someone can perform tasks that are not unique to the job but that are required by most or all jobs in an organization.
3. Written and oral communications	How well someone can write or speak to an audience of any size.
4. Demonstrating effort	How much someone commits to job tasks and how persistently and intensely someone works at job tasks.
5. Maintaining personal discipline	How much someone avoids negative behavior such as alcohol abuse, rule breaking, and absenteeism.
6. Facilitating team and peer performance	How well someone supports, helps, and develops peers and helps the group function as an effective unit.
7. Supervision	How well someone influences subordinates through face-to-face interaction.
8. Management and administration	How well someone performs other, nonsupervisory functions of management such as setting organizational goals, organizing people and resources, monitoring progress, controlling expenses, and finding additional resources.

Source: Rotundo & Sackett, 2002, p. 68.

Even though some scholars have attempted to model the entire domain of job performance, several scholars have focused on specific performance. These efforts are summarized in Table 4 which is related to the specific performance components of citizenship behaviour and counterproductive Performance.

Table 4: Various efforts to conceptualize specific performance components

Reference	Component	Behavioural Category
Brief & Motowidlo (1986)	Prosocial organizational behaviour	Assisting co-workers with job-related matters, Showing leniency, Providing services or products to consumers in organizationally consistent ways, Helping consumers with personal matters unrelated to organizational services or products, Complying with organizational values, policies, and regulations, Suggesting procedural, administrative, or organizational improvements, Objecting to improper directives, procedures, or policies, Putting forth extra effort on the job, Volunteering for additional

		assignments, Staying with the organization despite temporary hardships, Representing the organization favourably, Assisting co-workers with personal matters
Organ (1988)	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)	Altruism, Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship, Courtesy, Civic, Virtue.
George & Brief (1992)	Organizational Spontaneity	Helping co-workers, Protecting the organization, Making constructive suggestions, Developing oneself, Spreading goodwill.
Raelin (1994)	Professional deviant-adaptive	Work scale (e.g., unethical practices, absenteeism, work-to-rule, bootlegging), Self-scale (e.g., flaunting of external offers, rationalization, alienation, apathy), Career scale (e.g., premature external search, external performance emphasis)
Van Dyne et al. (1995)	Extra-role behaviour	Affiliative–promotive (e.g., helping and cooperative behaviours), Challenging–promotive (e.g., constructive expression of challenge), Challenging–prohibitive (e.g., criticism of situation to stop inappropriate behaviour), Affiliative–prohibitive (e.g., unequal power or authority)
Robinson & Bennett (1995)	Employee Deviance	Property deviance , Production deviance, Political deviance, Personal aggression
Hunt (1996)	Generic work behaviours	Adherence to confrontational rules, Industriousness, Thoroughness, Schedule flexibility, Attendance, Off-task behaviour, Unruliness, Theft, Drug misuse
Gulza, et al. (2014)	Counterproductive behaviour	Theft and Related Behavior; Destruction of Property; Misuse of Information; Misuse of Time and Resources; Unsafe Behavior; Poor Attendance; Poor Quality Work; Alcohol Use; Drug Use; Inappropriate Verbal Actions; Inappropriate Physical Actions.
Pivi & Hassan (2015)	Organizational Citizenship behaviour	Altruism, Conscientiousness, Civic virtue
Vatankhah et al. (2017)	Counterproductive work behaviour	Taken property without permission, Spent too much time fantasizing, Having longer break, Littered work environment, Intentionally worked slower , revealing confidential company information, Used an illegal drug or consumed alcohol on the job, little effort into work, insubordinations, Made fun of someone at work, Said something hurtful to someone at work,

		Made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark at work, Cursed someone at work, Played a mean prank on someone at work, Acted rudely toward someone at work, Publicly embarrassed someone at work.
Kura et al. (2019)	Counterproductive work behaviour	Counterproductive work behaviour checklist (CWB-C) Late attendance, insult someone, insult someone about their job performance, ignoring someone at work, arguing with someone, Purposely wasting materials/supplies, Telling harming goodwill of the organization, irrelevant Complaining, staying at home mentioning as sick
Miharja et al. (2020)	Counterproductive work behaviour	Damaging an organisation's property , intentionally doing improper work, unofficial leaves, abusing and beating employees or insulting them

Source: literature review

3.3 Models of Job Performance

Literature review reveals several models that have been proposed to explicate the construct of job performance. Different approaches of studying individual work performance circulate in today's literature. Binning & Barrett (1989), as cited in Viswesvaran & Ones (2000, p. 217), stated that "models of performance that aim to uncover dimensions can be at different levels of breadth or generality". Generic frameworks used more broad dimensions to describe work performance, while job-specific frameworks used more narrow dimensions to describe elements of work performance. The models of job performance can be classified into two.

(1) Models that are developed for specific occupations

(2) Models that are applicable across all jobs.

A review of the literature indicates that "job performance can be described by three broad performance components" (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002, p.67). They are task performance, citizenship performance and counterproductive performance. Koopmans et al. (2011) conducted a systematic review on conceptual frameworks of individual work performance. 17 generic frameworks and 18 job specific frameworks were identified by them in their review. They concluded that frequently used dimensions to describe individual work performance are task performance, contextual performance, counterproductive work behaviour, and adaptive performance. On the basis of the literature, Koopmans et al (2011) proposed a heuristic

conceptual framework of individual work performance. Identified models in their review and other models developed by the researchers since 2010 are presented in table 5.

Table 5: Frameworks of individual work performance and classification of their dimensions

Generic Framework	Dimensions			
	Task performance	Contextual performance	Counterproductive work behaviour	Other
Arvey and Mussio (1973)	Working accurately Showing concern for time Detail and planning	Cooperating and extra time Dealing with others in organization Dealing with public Showing responsibility and initiative		
Jimbalvo (1979)	Understanding Planning Revising	Promoting Providing training Recognizing problems Suggesting solutions Reviewing work Cooperation Respect Special competence		
Murphy (1989)	Task behaviour	Interpersonal behaviours	Downtime behaviours Destructive /hazardous behaviours	
Campbell (1990)	Job specific task proficiency Non-job specific task proficiency	Written and oral communications Demonstrating efforts Maintaining personal discipline Facilitating peer and team performance Supervision and leadership Management / administration		
C.H Campbell et al (1990)	Job specific proficiency	Non-Job specific proficiency		
J.P Campbell et al (1990)	Core technical proficiency	General soldiering proficiency Effort and leadership Personal discipline Physical fitness and military bearing		

Lance et al (1992)	Technical proficiency	Interpersonal proficiency		
Rollins & Fruge (1992)	Task proficiency	Action Teamwork Creativity Communication Decision making Leadership Accountability Adaptability Development		
Borman & Brush (1993)	Technical activities and mechanics of management	Interpersonal dealings and communication Leadership and supervision Useful personal behaviour and skills		
Borman & Motowidlo (1993)	Task performance	Contextual performance		
Viswesvaran (1993)	Productivity Quality Job knowledge	Communication competence Effort Leadership Administrative competence Interpersonal competence Compliance with and acceptance of authority		Overall work performance
Engelbresht & Fischer (1995)	Action orientation Task structuring Probing, synthesis and judgement	Empathy Development Managing information		
Hunt (1996)		Adherence to rules Industriousness Thoroughness Schedule flexibility Attendance	Off task behaviour Unruliness theft Theft Drug misuse	
Allworth & Hesketh (1999)	Task performance	Contextual performance		Adaptive performance
Viswesvaran & Ones (2000)	Task performance	Organizational citizenship behaviour	counterproductive behaviour	
Pulakos et al (2000)	Task performance	Contextual performance		Adaptive performa

				nce
Tett et al (2000)	Traditional functions Occupational acumen and concerns	Task orientation Person orientation Dependability Open mindedness Emotional control Communication Developing self and others		
Renn & Fedor (2001)	Work quantity Work quality			
Rotundo & Sackett (2002)	Task performance	Organizational citizenship behaviour	Counterproductive behaviour	
Van Dyne et al (2002)	Sales performance Creativity			
Bakker et al (2004)	In-role performance	Extra-role performance		
Burton et al (2004)			Absenteeism Presenteeism	
Hedge et al (2004)	Resource Stewardship	Coaching and mentoring Professionalism and integrity Communication skills Leading change Organizational savvy Personal and professional development		
Michel (2006)	Task performance	Interpersonal performance Civic performance		
Chan (2006)		Communication skills Interpersonal skills Customer service Analytical skills		
Sinclair & Tucker (2006)	Task performance	Contextual performance	Counterproductive behaviour	Adaptive performance
Greenslade & Jimmison (2007)	Task performance	Contextual performance		
Griffin et al (2007)	Task proficiency			Adaptability Proactivity

13

Wisecarver et al (2007)	Job specific task proficiency Interpersonal Job specific task proficiency	Non-Job specific task proficiency Management Peer-team interaction Discipline Effort		
Allen (2008)			Absenteeism Presenteeism	
Luo et al (2008)	Military training Task accomplishme nt Work capability	Helping others Love of learning Promoting organizational benefit Self-discipline		
Maxham et al (2008)	In-role performance	Extra-role performance toward customers Extra-role performance toward organization		
Escorpizo (2008)			Absenteeism Presenteeism	
Fluegge (2009)	Task performance	Organizational citizenship behaviour		Creative performa nce
Mael et al (2010)	Providing clinical services Clinical support	Employee citizenship behaviour Managerial Behaviour		
Koopmans et al (2011)	Task performance	Contextual performance	counterproduct ive work behaviour	Adaptive performa nce
Muindi et al (2015)	Task Performance	Contextual performance		
Pradhan & Jena (2017)	Task Performance	Contextual performance		Adaptive performa nce
Guan & Frenkel (2018)	Task performance	Organizational citizenship behaviour		

Source: Adapted from Koopman et al. (2011, p. 859-861) including those published after 2010.

3.3.1. Identify the dimensions of job performance related to specific jobs

Frameworks of individual work performance developed for specific jobs are presented in the table 6.

Table 6: Models of individual work performance developed for specific occupations and their Dimensions

Author	Sample / Job	Dimensions of job performance
Conway (2000)	2110 Managers of Variety of industries	Interpersonal effectiveness Willingness to handle different situations Team work and personal adjustment Adaptability Leadership and development
Rothman & Coetzer (2003)	159 Employees of a pharmaceutical company	Task performance Creativity Managerial skills
Vandaele & Gemmel (2006)	1174 employees of front retail service employees	In- role performance Extra-role performance towards customers Extra-role performance towards the organization
Griffin et al. (2007)	491 Supervisors from 32 organizations	**Individual task behaviours** Task Proficiency, Task adaptability and Task proactivity **Team member behaviours** Team member proficiency, Team member adaptability and Team member proactivity **Organization member behaviours** Organizational member proficiency, Organizational member adaptability and Organizational member proactivity
Usop et al. (2013)	200 Teachers, division of Cotabato city, Philippines	Diversity of learners Curriculum content and pedagogy Planning, assessing and reporting Learning environment Social regards for learning Community linkages Personal, social growth and professional development
Karatepe (2013)	Full-time frontline hotel employees and their managers	Job performance extra-role customer service
Shekari et al (2014)	150 staff members of water and waste water office	Annual performance indicators
Hettiarachchi & Jayarathna (2014)	323 employees of the technical education and vocational training	Trait based, Behaviour based, Results based
Muindi et al (2015)	365 academic staff in Kenyan public	Task performance *Job–specific task performance, Non-job specific task*

	universities *performan*	*e* Contextual performance *Effort, Personal discipline, Team work*
Rai & Tripathi (2015)	253 IT professionals from middle level cadre	Knowledge, Skills, Quality, Accountability
Hafeez & Akbar (2015)	Officers of pharmaticulatic companies	Demonstrating team work, Communication skills, Customer service, Interpersonal relationship, Absenteeism
Philippaers et al (2016)	791 Flemish employees	Task behaviour, Helping behaviour, Creative behaviour
Karatepe & Olugbade (2016)	287 Front line hotel employees of 2 Five-Star and 9 Four-Star hotels	Absence Intentions, Service recovery performance, Creative performance
Akhtar et al. (2016)	200 bank employees	Job Performance, Extra-Role Customer services, Organizational citizenship behavior
Aima et al. (2017)	127 bank employees	Work quality, productivity: Quantity, Cooperation, Initiative, Responsibility
Guan & Frenkel (2018)	473 manufacturing manual workers and their supervisors in SMEs	Task performance Organizational citizenship behaviour
Sendawula et al. (2018)	150 respondents from four Catholic founded hospitals in Uganda's health sector	Availability, responsiveness, productivity and competence.
Elahi et al (2019)	221 white-collar employees working in Bank	In-role job performance

Source: Adapted from Ramawickrama et al. (2017, p.76) including those published since
2015.

3.4 Widely used job performance dimensions

Dimensions of employee performance used by researchers from 1990 to date is illustrated in the table 7. As shown in the table 6, task performance is the most widely used dimension of measuring job performance (52%). Contextual performance is the second frequently used dimension of employee performance as 40% of researchers has used it in their study. In addition, adaptive work behaviour (28%), counterproductive performance (20%) and organizational citizenship behaviour (20%) could be identified as important dimensions of employee performance respectively.

Table 7: Dimensions of job performance used by researchers from 1990 to date.

Dimensions of Job Performance	Researcher(s) in Chronological Order (Year)*																									Frequency	%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25		
Generic work behaviour					√																					01	4
In role work performance		√														√								√		03	12
Extra-role behaviour		√		√												√										03	12
Contextual performance			√	√		√		√				√	√			√		√				√	√			10	40
Adaptive work behaviour						√		√		√		√			√		√				√					07	28
Counterproductive behaviour								√			√	√				√								√		05	20
OCB								√			√			√			√		√							05	20
Task performance		√				√	√		√	√	√	√			√	√	√	√		√	√					13	52
Job specific task behaviour	√											√		√												03	12
Non job specific behaviour	√											√		√												03	12
Written/oral communication	√															√										02	8
Demonstrating effort	√											√		√												03	12
Personal discipline	√											√		√												03	12
Peer and team performance	√															√										02	8
Supervision or leadership	√															√										02	8
Management/ Administration	√											√		√												03	12
Peer team interaction												√														01	4
Creative performance																	√									01	4

Source: Literature review

* **1.** Campbell et al. (1990); **2.** Borman & Brush (1993); **3.** Borman & Motowidlo (1993); **4.** Motowidlo & Van Scotter (1994); 5. Van Dyne et al. (1995); **6.** Borman & Motowidlo (1997); **7.** Hunt (1996); **8**. Allworth & Hesketh (1999); **9.** Viswesvaran & Ones (2000); **10.** Pulakos et al. (2000); **11.** Rotundo & Sackett (2002); **12.** Sinclair & Tucker (2006); **13.** Greenslade & Jimmison (2007); **14.** Griffin et al (2007); **15.**Wisecarver et al (2007); **16**. Maxham et al (2008); **17**. Stokes (2008); **18.** Fluegge (2009); **19**. Koopmans et al. (2011); **20.**

Muindi et al (2015); **21**. Pivi & Hassan (2015); **22.** Pradhan & Jena (2017); **23.** Guan & Frenkel (2018); **24.** Kura et al. (2019); **25**. Cooper et al. (2019).

3.4.1. Task Performance

Extensive literature review reveal that task performance has been included as an important dimension of individual work performance in almost all frameworks developed by scholars. Alternative labels, they used for task performance are *job-specific task proficiency*, (Rollins & Fruge, 1992; Campbell et al., 2001; Griffin, et al., 2007; Wisecarver, et al., 2007), *technical proficiency* (Campbell, et al., 1990; Lance, et al., 1992; Campbell et al., 2001) and *in-role performance* (Bakker, et al., 2004; Maxham, et al., 2008).

Murphy (1989) defined task performance as "the accomplishment of tasks within an incumbent's job description. Borman & Motowidlo (1993, 73) defined it as "the proficiency with which incumbents perform activities that are formally recognized as part of their jobs; activities that contribute to the organization's technical core either directly by implementing a part of its technical process, or indirectly by providing it with needed materials or services". Task performance involves patterns of behaviour that provide direct support for the organisation's core technical processes (Van Scotter et al., 2000). It includes work quantity, work quality, and job knowledge. At a general level, task performance consists of activities that transform materials into the goods and services produced by the organization or to allow for efficient functioning of the organization (Motowidlo et al., 1997). Most of the developed individual work performance frameworks included one dimension to describe task performance (for example: Murphy, 1989; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Allworth & Hesketh (1999); Pulakos, et al., 2000; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Bakker et al, 2004; Sinclair & Tucker, 2006; Michel, 2006; Sinclair & Tucker, 2006; Greenslade & Jimmison, 2007; Griffin et al, 2007; Maxham et al, 2008; Fluegge, 2009; Mael et al, 2010; Koopmans et al, 2011).

Task performance in itself can be described as a *multi-dimensional* construct. Campbell (1990), as cited in Viswesvaran & Ones (2000), himself stated that his first two dimensions, *job-specific task proficiency* (core job tasks) and *non–job-specific task proficiency* (tasks not specific to a given job, but expected of all employees), represent task performance. Viswesvaran's (1993) first three dimensions, *productivity*, *quality*, and *job knowledge*, could be considered as task performance.

3.4.1.1. Dimensions of task performance: Job-Specific Frameworks

As Tett et al (2000) mentioned what constitutes core job tasks can differ from job to job. In contrast to generic frameworks, job-specific frameworks often used multiple, specific dimensions to describe task performance. For example, Arvey & Mussio (1973) described task performance of clerical workers, using the dimensions of *working accurately*, *showing concern for time* and *detail and planning*. Jiambalvo (1979) described task performance for public accountants as *understanding*, *planning*, and *revising work*. Engelbresht and Fischer (1995) divided task performance for managers into *action orientation* (eg, getting things done, decisiveness), *task structuring* (eg, leadership, planning), and *probing, synthesis, and judgment* (problem resolution). Furthermore, Tett et al (2004) divided task performance for managers into **traditional functions** (eg, decision making, planning) and **occupational acumen and concerns** *(*eg, job knowledge, concern for quantity and quality)

3.4.2 Contextual Performance

According to the fact that the concept of contextual performance has several related constructs in other names. Labels such as *interpersonal relations* (Murphy, 1989), *non–job-specific task proficiency* (Campbell et al., 1990; Wisecarver, et al., 2007), *extra-role performance* (Bakker, et al., 2004; Maxham, et al., 2008) and *organizational citizenship behaviour* (Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Fluegge, 2009) have also been used in the literature to denote the contextual performance.

Borman & Motowidlo (1993) defined contextual performance as "individual behaviours that support the organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function". Moreover, they described it as "the degree with which incumbents engage in activities that contribute to organizational effectiveness in ways that shape the organizational, social, and psychological context that serves as the catalyst for task activities". Borman & Motowidlo (1993) borrowed this description of contextual performance heavily from three streams of research: (1) prosocial organizational behaviour (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986); (2) organizational citizenship behaviour (Organ, 1988); and (3) the model of soldier effectiveness (Campbell, 1990).

3.4.2.1 Models of Contextual Performance

Borman & Motowidlo was the first scholar who distinct task and contextual performance by presenting dimensional model about contextual performance in 1993. They distinguish task performance from contextual performance in three ways. *First*, task behaviors vary considerably across jobs, whereas contextual behaviors are typically consistent across jobs. *Second*, it follows that task behaviors are role-prescribed, and contextual behaviors typically are not. That is, performing job tasks is very specific to the type of job. *Third*, the antecedents of task performance more likely have to do with cognitive ability, whereas antecedents of contextual performance are more likely to involve personality variables (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Further, their taxonomy of contextual activities summarizes organizational citizenship behaviour, Pro-social organizational behaviour, and other concepts into five contextual performance categories.

The second dimensional model was proposed by Van Scotter and Motowidlo in 1996. They divided contextual performance into two dimensions: ***Interpersonal facilitation*** and ***Job dedication.*** Interpersonal facilitation includes "cooperative, considerate, and helpful acts that assist co-workers' performance" (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996: p.525). Job dedication, includes "self-disciplined, motivated acts such as working hard, taking initiative, and following rules to support organizational objectives" (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996: p.525).

In 1998, Organ classified contextual performance behaviours into two. They are organizational citizenship behaviour and pro-social behaviour. He identified five widely accepted components of *organizational citizenship behaviour* including altruism, conscientiousness, civic virtue, courtesy, and sportsmanship. Coleman & Borman (2000) combine 27 kinds of contextual performance behaviour into a three dimensional model of contextual performance: interpersonal citizenship performance, organizational citizenship performance and job task responsibility performance.

Several generic frameworks used one broad dimension to describe contextual performance (e.g. Murphy, 1989; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Allworth & Hesketh, 1999; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Bakker et al, 2004; Sinclair & Tucker, 2006; Greenslade & Jimmison, 2007; Fluegge, 2009; Koopmans et al. 2011). However, some

generic frameworks used multiple dimensions to describe contextual performance (e.g. Campbell (1990); Viswesvaran (1993)). Six of eight dimensions of Campbell's framework (*written and oral communications, demonstrating effort, maintaining personal discipline, facilitating peer and team performance, supervision and leadership,* and *management and administration*) could be regarded as contextual performance. Also, six dimensions of the Viswesvaran's framework could be considered as contextual performance (*communication competence, effort, leadership, administrative competence, interpersonal competence,* and *compliance with/acceptance of authority*).

3.4.2.2. Dimensions of Contextual Performance: Job-Specific Frameworks

Job-specific frameworks often used multiple, more specific dimensions to describe contextual performance. Arvey & Mussio (1973) described contextual performance of clerical workers. They used dimensions of *cooperating and taking on extra load, showing responsibility and initiative, dealing with others in the organization,* and *dealing with public.* Jiambalvo (1979) described contextual performance for public accountants as *promoting, providing training, recognizing problems, suggesting solutions, reviewing work, cooperation, respect,* and *special competence.* Further, Campbell et al (1990) identified *general soldiering proficiency, effort and leadership, personal discipline,* and *physical fitness and military bearing* as dimensions of contextual performance in the army. Moreover, Borman & Brush (1993) named *leadership and supervision, interpersonal dealings and communication,* and *useful personal behaviour and skills* as dimensions of managerial contextual performance. In addition, Rollins and Fruge (1992) described contextual performance using the dimensions of *action, teamwork, creativity, communication, decision making, leadership, accountability, adaptability* and *development.* As well as, Engelbrecht and Fischer (1995) divided contextual performance for managers into empathy, development, and managing information. Furthermore, Tett et al (2000) described contextual performance of managers, using the dimensions of *task orientation, person orientation, dependability, open mindedness, emotional control, communication,* and *developing self and others.* Hedge et al in 2004 described dimensions of contextual performance using *coaching and mentoring, professionalism and integrity, communication skills, leading change, leading people, organizational savvy,* and *personal and professional development.* Also, in 2008, Luo et al divided contextual performance in to *helping others, love of learning, promoting*

organizational benefit and *self-discipline.* Similarly Muindi et al. (2015) used effort, personal discipline and team work as the dimensions of contextual performance for academic staff.

In light of the above explanation, dimensions frequently considered under contextual performance are communication, effort, discipline, interpersonal behaviour, and leading and developing others. Less frequently named dimensions are planning, solving problems, administration, and showing responsibility.

3.4.3. Counterproductive work behaviour

Rotundo & Sackett (2002, p.69) defined counterproductive behaviour as "voluntary behaviour that harms the well-being of the organization". Counterproductive behaviour encompasses a broad number of domains (Sackett, 2002). Seminal work of Hollinger & Clark (1983) developed a broad list of counterproductive behaviours and provided a conceptual framework for integrating those behaviours by examining three industries. According to them, counterproductive behaviours could be grouped into two broad categories. *Property deviance* is the first category. It involves misuse of employer assets including theft, property damage, and misuse of discount privileges. The second category is *production deviance*. It involves violating norms about how work is to be accomplished. This includes *not being on the job as scheduled* and *behaviours that detract from production when on the job* (absence, tardiness, long breaks, drug and alcohol use, intentional slow or sloppy work)

Most of the generic individual work performance frameworks incorporated one or more dimensions of counterproductive work behavior. Murphy (1989) used the dimensions of *destructive/ hazardous behaviors* and *downtime behaviors* to describe counterproductive work behaviour. Campbell's (1990) eight performance components framework is the most prominent contemporary framework for viewing job performance (Sackett, 2002). The *maintaining personal discipline* dimension of Campbell's framework reflects the counterproductive behaviour domain of job performance (Sackett, 2002).

Robinson & Bennett (1995) have four types of counterproductive behaviours. They labelled them as property deviance (Organizational-Serious), production deviance (Organizational-Minor), personal aggression (Interpersonal-Serious), and political deviance (Interpersonal-

Minor). Personal aggression includes behaviours such as harassment, and theft from co-workers while political deviance includes behaviours such as favouritism, gossip, and blaming others for one's mistakes. Moreover, Hunt (1996) incorporated five dimensions into counterproductive behaviour. Five dimensions of Hunt's framework are attendance, *off-task behaviour*, *unruliness*, *theft,* and *drug misuse*.

Gruys (1999) identified 87 separate counterproductive behaviours appearing in the literature. He produced 11 categories of counterproductive behaviours based on them. Gruys's 11 categories of counterproductive behaviours are 'theft and related behaviour, destruction of property, misuse of information, misuse of time and resources, unsafe behaviour, poor attendance, poor quality work, alcohol use, drug use, inappropriate verbal actions, and inappropriate physical actions' (Gruys, 1999 as cited in Sackett, 2002).

In addition, Viswesvaran & Ones (2000) and Rotundo & Sackett (2002) included counterproductive work behaviour as a third broad dimension of individual work performance. Individual work performance frameworks of Burton et al (2004), Allen (2008) & Escorpizo (2008) focused only on counterproductive work behaviour. They neglected other dimensions of job performance. They divided the work performance domain into *absenteeism* (not attending work) and *presenteeism* (attending work while ill).

In addition to general counterproductive work behaviours, four specific forms of counterproductive work behaviour have been discussed separately and extensively in the literature. They are ***Workplace aggression*** (Lapierre, et al., 2005); ***On-the-job substance use*** (Frone, 2003); ***Tardiness*** (Koslowsky et al., 1997); ***Absenteeism*** (Bennett & Robinson, 2000).

In light of the above explanations , behaviours such as working on personal matters instead of assigned tasks, neglecting supervisors' instructions, stealing property, starting or repeating rumours and gossip, and using unprofessional language, absenteeism, unruliness, drug misuse, presenteeism, being late for work, engaging in off-task behaviour, theft, and substance abuse can be regarded as counterproductive work behaviours (Murphy, 1989; Campbell, 1990; Hunt, 1996, Viswesvaran & Ones (2000); Rotundo & Sackett (2002); Burton et al. 2004).

3.4.4 Adaptive performance (AP)

There is no universally accepted definition of adaptive performance to date (Ployhart & Bliese, 2006). It is an individual's ability to adapt to dynamic work situations (Hesketh & Neal, 1999). Griffin et al (2007) defined adaptive performance as "the extent to which an individual adapts to changes in a work system or work roles". Jundt et al (2015) defined adaptive performance as "task-performance-directed behaviors individuals enact in response to or anticipation of changes relevant to job-related tasks" (p. 2). Moreover, scholars has referred different names for adaptability. Some of the terms frequently used include adaptive performance (Hesketh & Neal, 1999), adaptability, adaptation, adaptive expertise, adaptive transfer, performance adaptation, role flexibility (Murphy & Iackson, 1999); and proficiency of integrating new learning experiences (London & Mone, 1999).

Research has conceptually and empirically distinguished adaptive performance from other performance dimensions (Allworth & Hesketh, 1999; Griffin et al., 2007; Shoss, et al., 2012). The term adaptive performance received the substantial attention of scholars such as Pulakos et al. (2000); Sinclair & Tucker (2006); Griffin et al (2007); Koopmans et al (2011). Many researchers have highlighted the importance of a variety of adaptive behaviours (Allworth & Hesketh, 1996; Hesketh & Neal, 1999; Hollenbeck, et al., 1996; Ilgen, 1994; London & Mone, 1999; Murphy & Jackson, 1999). Many scholars have recognized that traditional models of performance are static and "it need to be augmented to include '*responsiveness to changing job requirements*'- labelled adaptive performance" (Allworth & Hesketh, 1999, p.98; Pulakos et al., 2000; Griffin et al, 2007).

3.4.4.1. Dimensions of Adaptive Performance

Generally, adaptive performance includes solving problems creatively, dealing with uncertain or unpredictable work situations, learning new tasks, technologies, and procedures, and adapting to other individuals, cultures, or physical surroundings. Baard et al. (2014) presented two main domains that AP research typically falls. They described them as "domain-general" and "domain-specific". D*omain-general* approach views adaptive abilities (individual differences) as relatively stable traits/performance constructs. Baard et al (2014) stated that adaptive abilities are supposed to be generalizable across various jobs. On the other hand, the

domain-specific approach views adaptation as 'a capability that can be learned and applied within specific contexts' (Baard et al., 2014).

Pulakos et al. (2000) were the first to propose a global model of adaptive performance. It is the most frequently reviewed model of AP. Pulakos et al. (2000, p.617) described eight sub-dimensions of adaptive performance including (a) handling emergency or crisis situations; (b) handling work stress; (c) solving problems creatively; (d) dealing with uncertain and unpredictable work situations; (e) learning work tasks, technologies, and procedures; (f) demonstrating interpersonal adaptability; (g) demonstrating cultural adaptability; and (h) demonstrating physically oriented adaptability.

Moreover, job-specific framework of Sinclair & Tucker (2006) considered *adaptive performance* as a separate dimension of individual work performance. However, adaptive performance was not included as a separate dimension in several other frameworks. But it is included as a part of contextual performance in their framework. For example, Hunt's (1996) dimension of *schedule flexibility,* Rollins and Fruge's (1992) dimension of *adaptability*, and Hedge et als' (2004) dimension of *leading change* reflected an employee's ability to adapt to new job conditions or requirements.

4. Conclusion

Scholars have conceptualized the construct of employee job performance in different angles. The construct of employee job performance has differently been defined by the scholars over decades. However, there is still no consensus and universally accepted definition of what performance is. As well, there is no consensus among researchers on the dimensions of the job performance. The most common dimensions used for measuring job performance are task performance, contextual performance, counterproductive performance and adaptive performance.

References

Adeel, A., Kashif, N.M., Zeeshan, M., & Sadiq, S.M. (2016). Impact of high performance work practices on employees' performance in Pakistan: Mediating role of employee engagement. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences, 10*(3), 708-724.

Aima, H., Adam, R., & Ali, H. (2017). Model of Employee Performance: Competence Analysis and Motivation (Case Study at PT Bank Bukopin, Tbk Center). *Journal of Research in Business and Management, 4*(11), 49-59.

Akhtar, A., Kashif, N.M., Zeeshan, M., & Sadiq, S.M. (2016). Impact of high performance work practices on employees' performance in Pakistan: Mediating role of employee engagement. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS), 10*(3), 708-724.

Allen, H. (2008). Using routinely collected data to augment the management of health and productivity loss. *Journal of Occupation Environment Medicine, 50*, 615– 632.

Allworth, E. A., & Hesketh, B. (1996). Construct-based biodata and the prediction of adaptive performance. *Twelfth Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology.* St. Louis, MO

Arvey, R.D., & Mussio, S.J. (1973). A test of expectancy theory in a field setting using female clerical employees. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 3*, 421–432.

Baard et al. (2014). Performance Adaptation: A Theoretical Integration and Review. *Journal of Management, 40*(1), 48-99. DOI: 10.1177/0149206313488210

Babin, B. J., & Boles, J. B. (1998). Employee Behavior in a Service Environment: A Model and Test of Potential Differences between Men and Women. *Journal of Marketing, 62*, 77-91.

Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management, 43*, 83– 104.

Benardin, H. J., & Russell, J. E. (1993). Human Resource management: An Experiential Approach. (2nded.).

Bennett, R.J., & Robinson, S.L. (2000). Development of a Measure of Workplace Deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology 2000, 85*(3), 349-360. DOI: 10.I037//0021-9010.85.3.349

Bernardin, H. J., & Beatty, R. W. (1984). Performance appraisal: Assessing human behavior at work. Boston: Kent.

Borman, W. C., & Brush, D. H. (1993). More progress toward a taxonomy of managerial performance requirements. Human performance, 6(1), 1-21.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human performance, 10*(2), 99-109. doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_3

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. M. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. Personnel Selection in Organizations, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of management Review, 11*(4), 710-725.

Burton W.N., Pransky, G., Conti, D.J., Chen, C.Y., & Edington, D.W. (2004). The association of medical conditions and presenteeism. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine. 46*(suppl), 38–45.

Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In: Dunnette MD, Hough LM, eds.

Campbell, J. P., McHenry, J. J., & Wise, L. L. (1990). Modelling job performance in a population of jobs. *Personnel Psychology, 43*(2), 313-575.

Campbell, J., & Wiernik, B. (2015). The Modelling and Assessment of Work Performance. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior. 2* (1). 47-74. Doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111427.

Campbell, J.P., Gasser, M.B. & Oswald, F.L. (1996). The substantive nature of performance variability. In K.R. Murphy (ed.), Individual differences and behavior in organizations. San Fancisco: Jossey-Bass.

Campbell, J.P., Hanson, M.A., Oppler, S.H. (2001). Modeling performance in a population of jobs. In: Campbell JP, Knapp DJ, eds. Exploring the Limits in Personnel Selection and Classification. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Campbell, J.P., McCloy, R.A., Oppler, S.H., & Sager, C.E. (1993). A Theory of Performance. In: Schmitt, N. and Borman, W.C., (eds), Personnel Selection in Organizations, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Chan, D.C. (2006). Core competencies and performance management in Canadian public libraries. *Library Management, 27(3),* 144-153.

Coleman, V. I., & Borman, W. C. (2000). Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain. *Human Resource Management Review, 10*(1), 25 - 44.

Cooper, B., Wang, J., Bartram, T., & Cooke, F.L. (2019). Well-being-oriented human resource management practices and employee performance in the Chinese banking sector: The role of social climate and resilience. *Human Resource Management, 58*, 85–97. DOI: 10.1002/hrm.21934. Doi: org/10.1207/s15327043hup0601_1

Elahi, N.C., Abid, G., Arya, B., & Farooqi, S. (2019). Workplace behavioral antecedents of job performance: mediating role of thriving. *The Service Industries Journal*, DOI: 10.1080/02642069.2019.1638369

Engelbresht, A.S., & Fischer, A.H. (1995). The managerial performance implications of a developmental a Developmental Assessment Center Process. *Human Relations. 48*(4), 387-404.

Escorpizo R. (2008). Understanding work productivity and its application to work-related musculoskeletal disorders. *International Journal of Industrial Journal of Industrial Ergonomics, 38*(3), 291–297. DOI: 10.1016/j.ergon.2007.10.018

Fay, D., & Sonnentag, S. (2010). A look back to move ahead: new directions for research on proactive performance and other discretionary work behaviours. *Applied Psychology, 59*, 1–20. Doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2009.00413.x.

Ferris, G. R., Arthur, M. M., Berkson, H. M., Harrel-Cook, G., & Fink, G. (1998). Toward a social context theory of the human resource management-organizational effectiveness relationship. *Human resource management Review, 8*, 235-264.

Fluegge, E.R. (2009). Who put the fun in functional? Fun at work and its effects on job performance. *Dissertation Abstr Int Sect A Hum Soc Sci.*, 69, 2781.

Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), Handbook of occupational health psychology: Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

George, J.M., & Brief, A.P. (1992). Feeling Good-Doing Good: A Conceptual Analysis of the Mood at Work-Organizational Spontaneity Relationship. *Psychological Bulletin, 112* (2), 310-329.

Greenslade, J. H., & Jimmieson, N. L. (2007). Distinguishing between task and contextual performance for nurses: development of a job performance scale. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *58*(6), 602-611.

Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of management journal, 50*(2), 327-347. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2007.24634438

Gruys, M. L. (1999). The dimensionality of deviant employee behavior in the workplace. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Minnesota University Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota.

Guan, X., & Frenkel, S. (2018). How HR practice, work engagement and job crafting influence employee performance. Chinese Management Studies, 12(3), 591-607. https://doi.org/10.1108/CMS-11-2017-0328

Gulza, Sumaira; Moon, Moin Ahmed; Attiq, Saman; Azam, Rauf I. (2014) : The darker side of high performance work systems: Examining employee psychological outcomes and counterproductive work behavior, Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS), ISSN 2309-8619, Johar Education Society, Pakistan (JESPK), Lahore, Vol. 8, Iss. 3, pp. 715-732

Hafeez, U., & Akbar, W. (2015). Impact of Training on Employees Performance (Evidence from Pharmaceutical Companies in Karachi, Pakistan). *Business Management and Strategy, 6*(1), 49-64. https://doi.org/10.5296/bms.v6i1.7804

Harari, M.B., Reaves, A.C., & Viswesvaran, C. (2016). Creative and innovative performance: a meta-analysis of relationships with task, citizenship, and counterproductive job performance dimensions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 25*(4), 495-511, DOI: 10.1080/1359432X.2015.1134491

Hedge, J.W., Borman, W.C., Bruskiewicz, K.T., & Bourne, M.J. (2004). The development of an integrated performance category system for supervisory jobs in the US Navy. *Military Psychology. 16*, 231–243. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1990.tb01561.x

Hunt, S. T. (1996). Generic work behavior: An investigation into the dimensions of entry-level, hourly job performance. *Personnel Psychology, 49*(1), 51-83. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01791.x

Hunter, J. E. (1986). Cognitive ability, cognitive aptitudes, job knowledge, and job performance. *Journal of vocational behaviour, 29*(3), 340-362. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(86)90013-8

Ilgen, D. R., & Pulakos, E. D. (1999). The changing nature of performance: Implication for staffing, motivation and development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jankingthong, K., & Rukkhum, S. (2012). Factors Affecting Job Performance: A Review of Literature. *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts, 12*(2), 115-127.

Jiambalvo J. (1979). Performance evaluation and directed job effort: Model development and analysis in a CPA firm setting. *Journal of Accounting Research. 17*(2), 436-455. DOI: 10.2307/2490512

Johnson, E. C., & Meade, A. W. (2010). A Multi-Level Investigation of Overall Job Performance Ratings. Paper presented at the 25th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.

Karatepe, O.M., & Olugbade, O.A. (2016). The mediating role of work engagement in the relationship between high-performance work practices and job outcomes of employees in Nigeria. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 28(10),* 2350-2371.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1966). The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: Wiley.

Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C.M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Schaufeli, W. B., De Vet, H. C. W., & Vander Beek, A. J. (2011). Conceptual frameworks of individual work performance : A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 53*(8), 856-866. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0b013e318226a763

Koslowsky, M., Sagie, A., Krausz, M., & Singer, A. D. (1997). Correlates of employee lateness: Some theoretical considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*: 79 – 88

Kura, K.M., Shamsudin, F.M., Umrani, W.A., & Salleh, N.M (2019). Linking Human Resource Development Practices to Counterproductive Work Behaviour: Does Employee Engagement Matter. *Journal of African Business, 20*(4), 472-488. DOI: 10.1080/15228916.2019.1583974

Lance, C.E., Teachout, M.S., Donnelly, T.M. (1992). Specification of the criterion construct space: an application of hierarchical confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77,*437–452.

Lapierre, L. M., Spector, P. E., & Leck, J. D. (2005). Sexual versus nonsexual workplace aggression and victims' overall job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*, 155-169.

Lebas, M. & Euske, K. (2007). Business Performance Measurement: Unifying Theories and Integration Practice. Cambridge University Press, (2nd A conceptual and operational delineation of performance.)

London, M., & Mone, E. M. (1999). Continuous Learning. The changing nature of performance: Implications for staffing, motivation and development (pp. 119–153). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Luo, Z., Shi, K., Li, W., & Miao, D. (2008). Construct of job performance: evidence from Chinese military soldiers. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 1*,222–231.

Mael, F.A., O'Shea, P.G., Smith, M.A., et al. (2010). Development of a model and measure of process-oriented quality of care for substance abuse treatment. *Journal of Behaviour Health Service Research*, 7, 4–24.

Mangkunegara, A. P. (2009). Human Resources Management of the Company. Bandung: Teen Rosdakarya.

Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2002). Human Resource Management (10th ed.) USA: Thomson Learning.

Maxham, J.G.I., Netemeyer, R.G., Lichtenstein, D.R. (2008). The retail value chain: linking employee perceptions to employee performance, customer evaluations, and store performance. Market Science. 27, 147–167.

Mensah, J.K. (2015). A 'coalesced framework' of talent management and employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 64*(4), 544–566.

Michel, R.P. (2000). A model of entry-level job performance. *Dissertation Abstr Int Sect B Sci Eng. 61*(6-B), 3313.

Miharja, M., Sacipto, R., Thuy To Nguyen, Q. L. H., Nguyen, P. T., & Usanti, T. P. (2020). How interactional justice within organisations impacts counterproductive work behaviours and self-efficacy in the presence of performance appraisal satisfaction. International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change, 10(11), 459-477.

Mindy K. Shoss, L.A.W., & Dusya V. (2012). When does adaptive performance lead to higher task performance? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*, 910–924. DOI: 10.1002/job.780

Motowidlo, S., & Van Scotter, J. (1994). Evidence That Task Performance Should Be Distinguished From Contextual Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology. 79* (4). 475-480. Doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.79.4.475.

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

Muchhal, D.S. (2014). HR Practices and Job Performance. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 19*(4), 55-61.

Muindi, F., & K'Obonyo, P. (2015). Quality of Work Life, Personality, Job Satisfaction, Competance, and Job Performance: A Critical review of Literature. *European Scientific Journal, 11*(26).

Murphy, K. R. (1989). *Dimensions of job performance.* In R. F. Dillon & J. W. Pellegrino (Eds.), *Testing: Theoretical and applied perspectives*, 218–247, Praeger Publishers.

Murphy, P. R., & Jackson, S. E. (1999). Managing work role performance: Challenges for twenty-first century organizations and their employees. Pulakos (Eds.), The changing

nature of performance: Implications for staffing, motivation, and development, 325-365.

Opatha, H. H. D. N. P. (2015). Organizational Behavior: The Human Side of Work, Department of Human Resource Management, University of Sri Jayewardenapura, Sri Lanka.

Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.

Pandey, J. (2019). Factors affecting job performance: an integrative review of literature. *Management Research Review*, *42*(2), 263-289. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-02-2018-0051.

Philippaers, K., De Cuyper, N., Forrier, A., Vander E, T., & De Witte, H. (2016). Perceived employability in relation to job performance: A cross-lagged study accounting for a negative path via reduced commitment. *Scandinavian Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 1*(1).

Pivi, F., & Hassan, Z. (2015). The Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour on Employee's job satisfaction, commitment and turnover intention in Dining Restaurants Malaysia. *International Journal of Accounting and Business Management. 4*. 108-125. Doi: 10.24924/ijabm/2015.04/v3.iss1/108.125.

Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. (1974).The effect of performance on job satisfaction. Studies in Personal and Industrial Psychology. Third Edition, Illinois.

Pradhan, R.K., & Jena, L.K. (2017). Employee Performance at Workplace: Conceptual Model and Empirical Validation. *Business Perspectives and Research, 5*(1), 69-85.

Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of applied psychology*, *85*(4), 612. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.4.612

Raelin, J. (1994). Three scales of professional deviance within organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior. 15*. 483 - 501. Doi: 10.1002/job.4030150602.

Rai, R., & Tripathi, S. (2015). A Study on QWL and its effects on Job Performance. *Journal of Management Sciences and Technology, 2*(2), 33-42.

Ramawickrama, J., Opatha, H. H. D. N. P., & PushpaKumari, M. D. (2017). A Synthesis towards the Construct of Job Performance. *International Business Research, 10*(1), 66-81. doi:10.5539/ibr.v10n10p66

Rollins, T., Fruge, M. (1992). Performance dimensions: competencies with a twist. *Training*, 29, 47–51.

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. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.66

Rubel, M. R., & Kee, D. M. (2013). Perceived support and employee performance: The mediating role of employee engagement. *Life Science Journal, 10*(4), 2557-2567.

Sackett, P.R. (2002). The structure of counterproductive work behaviors: dimensionality and relationships with facets of job performance. *International Journal Select Assess, 10*, 5–11.

Sandra L. R., Rebecca J. B. (1995). A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multidimensional Scaling Study. *The Academy of Management Journal, 38*(2), 555-572.

Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1992). Development of a causal model of processes determining job performance. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 1*(3), 89-92. doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep10768758

Sendawula, K., Kimuli, N. S., Bananuka, J., & Muganga, N. G. (2018). Training, employee engagement and employee performance: Evidence from Uganda's health sector. *Business and Management, 5*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2018.1470891

Sinclair, R. R., & Tucker, J. S. (2006). *Stress-CARE: An Integrated Model of Individual Differences in Soldier Performance under Stress.* In T. W. Britt, C. A. Castro, & A. B. Adler (Eds.), *Military Performance. Military life: The psychology of serving in peace and combat: Military performance* (202–231). Praeger Security International.

Smith, P. C. (1976). Behaviors, results, and organizational effectiveness: The problem of criteria. *Handbook of Industrial and organizational psychology,* 745-775.

Sobaih, A. E. E., Ibrahim, Y., & Gabry, G. (2019). Unlocking the black box: Psychological contract fulfillment as a mediator between HRM practices and job performance. *Tourism Management Perspectives, 30*(February), 171–181. doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2019.03.001

Sonnentag, S., & Frese, M. (2001). Performance Concepts and Performance Theory: Chapter 01, Psychological Management and Individual Performance, John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 781–790.

Stewardt, G. L., & Brown, K. G. (2009). HRM: Linking Strategy to Practice, John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Stokes, C. K. (2008). Adaptive performance: An examination of convergent and predictive validity (Doctoral dissertation, Wright State University).

Tett, R.P., Guterman, H.A., Bleier, A., Murphy, P.J. (2000). Development and content validation of a "hyperdimensional" taxonomy of managerial competence. Human Performance, 13, 205–251.

Van D. L., Cummings, L. L., &Parks, J. M. (1995). Extra-role behaviours: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). In Research in Organizational Behaviour (L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw, eds), 215-285. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Vatankhah, S., Javid, E., & Raoofi, A. (2017). Perceived organizational support as the mediator of the relationships between high-performance work practices and counter-

productive work behavior: Evidence from airline industry. Journal of Air Transport Management, 59, 107–115. doi:10.1016/j. jairtraman.2016.12.001

Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000).Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 8*(4), 216-226. doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00151

Viswesvaran, C., (1993). Modeling Job Performance: Is There a General Factor? [PhD dissertation]. Iowa City: The University of Iowa.

Wisecarver, M.M., Carpenter, T.D, Kilcullen, R.N. (2007). Capturing interpersonal performance in a latent performance model. *Military Psychology*, 19, 83–101.