

## An Assessment of the Reliability and Validity of Job Performance Measurement

*(Satu Penilaian terhadap Kebolehpercayaan dan Kesahan Pengukuran Prestasi Kerja)*

Johanim Johari  
Khulida Kirana Yahya  
(College of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia)

### ABSTRACT

*This study examines the psychometric properties of the job performance construct by espousing task performance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) items. The latter comprises of sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, altruism, conscientiousness, and innovative behavior. An a priori proposition is made that the job performance measurement could be explained by two factors: task performance and OCB. The findings support the hypothesis that job performance can be measured by the two hypothesized factors. However, four factors of OCB, i.e. civic virtue, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and courtesy, load on the task performance factor, while altruism and innovative behavior load on the OCB construct. The results provide evidence of construct reliability and validity of the job performance items, indicating that the instrument is suitable for Malaysian studies. Implications of the findings and recommendations are also discussed.*

### ABSTRAK

*Kajian ini menganalisis ciri psikometrik konstruk prestasi kerja dengan menggabungkan prestasi tugas dan gelagat kewarganegaraan organisasi (GKO), yang terdiri dari sivik kuasa, kesukanan, sifat mendengarkan kata hati, budi bahasa, altruisme, dan gelagat inovatif. Cadangan utama telah dibuat dengan mengandaikan bahawa pengukuran prestasi kerja boleh dijelaskan oleh dua faktor, iaitu prestasi tugas and GKO. Walau bagaimanapun, empat faktor dalam GKO iaitu sivik kuasa, kesukanan, sifat mendengar kata hati, dan budi bahasa termuat dalam faktor prestasi tugas manakala altruisme dan gelagat inovatif termasuk dalam konstruk GKO. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bukti kebolehpercayaan dan kesahan konstruk prestasi kerja. Ini menunjukkan pengukuran tersebut boleh digunakan dalam kajian di Malaysia. Implikasi kajian dan cadangan juga dibincangkan.*

*Keywords: Job Performance Measurement; Organizational Citizenship Behavior; Sportsmanship, Civic Virtue; Courtesy; Altruism; Conscientiousness; Innovative Behavior*

### INTRODUCTION

Job performance is the most important variable considered in industrial and organizational psychology research (Borman 2004a; Borman & Motowidlo 1997; Organ 1997). This is based on the fact that job performance has always been reported as a significant indicator of organizational performance regardless of how it is conceptualized (Organ 1997). According to Jex and Britt (2008) and Motowidlo (2003), performance is oftentimes assessed in terms of financial figures, as well as through the combination of expected behavior and task-related aspects. Additionally, Schmitt and Chan (1998) categorize employee job performance into 'can-do' and 'will-do'. 'Can-do' refers to knowledge, skill, ability, and other characteristics (KSAOs) that an individual must have to perform a certain job. 'Will-do' reflects the motivation level of an employee in performing his/her work. Further, Cardy and Dobbins, in Williams (2002), conceptualize job performance as work outcomes and job relevant behaviors. Work outcomes deal with task performance, such as quality or quality of work done, while job relevant behavior

refers to the behavioral aspects useful in achieving task performance (Williams 2002). In other words, job relevant behaviors provide support in performing task-related matters. Most importantly, job performance measures, which may be based on an absolute value or a relative judgment, can be generalized in relation to the overall organizational performance because such measures are reflected in organizational performance to a certain extent (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin, & Cardy 2007; Jex & Britt 2008; Sackett et al. 2006; Wall et al. 2004). An absolute value of performance is based upon objective results, such as total points from sales or productivity, whereas relative judgments are performance evaluations made based on behavioral related criterion and are very subjective in nature (Gomez-Mejia et al. 2007).

In relation to the different conceptualizations of job performance, the main issue addressed by scholars (e.g. Borman 2004a; Campbell, McHenry & Wise 1990) is which employee behaviors at work constitute job performance. Traditionally, job performance is limited to the core task activities that are based solely on job analysis (Campbell 1990; Jex & Britt 2008). The construct,

however, has been expanded into behavioral aspects relating directly to the core tasks and other behaviors that support the core task performance. This is in accordance with assertions put forward by Borman (2004), Borman and Motowidlo (1993), Campbell (1990), Jex and Britt (2008) and Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994), who argue that job performance should be measured in terms of task performance and contextual performance in order to fully grasp a holistic concept of the latent construct. Contextual performance consists of behaviors that help support incumbents in delivering their task performance and such behaviors are important to ensure organizational effectiveness in the long run. Task performance is defined in terms of role-prescribed behaviors (Katz & Kahn 1978), core-tasks (Campbell et al. 1990) or tasks that involve the maintenance of the technical core of the organization (Luo et al. 2008).

Like task performance, contextual performance has been coined as extra-role behaviors, i.e., discretionary behaviors related to the assistance of other individuals in the organization (Becker & Kernan 2006; Katz & Kahn 1978); pro-social organizational behavior, i.e., behaviors related to improving the wellbeing of individuals or groups in the organization (Podsakoff et al. 2000); organizational spontaneity, i.e., voluntary behaviors that help contribute towards organizational effectiveness (George & Jones 1997); and organizational citizenship behavior, i.e., behavior that, across time and across people, contributes to organizational effectiveness (Bateman & Organ 1983; Borman & Motowidlo 1993; Gwynne 2000). Contextual performance is conceptualized as the behaviors that support the core task performance in enhancing organizational effectiveness (Motowidlo & Van Scotter 1994). Both aspects of performance are crucial to achieve organizational objectives because task performance is concerned with behaviors that are required to complete job tasks, while contextual performance is needed to safeguard and upgrade the organizational, social, and psychological environment in the organization (Jex & Britt 2008; LePine et al. 2000; Van Dyne et al. 1994; Van Scotter & Motowidlo 1996). This means that contextual performance complements task performance in helping an organization to achieve its goals (Black & Porter 1991; Jahangir, Akbar & Haq 2004; Luo et al. 2008; Spitzmuller et al. 2008).

Borman (2004b) delineate four reasons for OCB to continuously be an important construct that will be scrutinized in the future. Employees are expected to exhibit OCB, to a certain degree, due to increased global competition in the current market; increased teamwork and inter-dependability among employees; the increase in merging and downsizing activities that require employees to adapt to the new work environment; and the expanding service industry that mainly focuses on customer service and client satisfaction. Employees must engage in OCB to achieve organizational sustainability and effectiveness (Borman 2004a; Podsakoff & MacKenzie 1997; Van Dyne, Graham & Dienesch 1994). In other words, the job

performance domain has been expanded by incorporating OCB in order to meet the requirements of today's external and internal environments, which are constantly changing and becoming more challenging.

To a certain extent, the distinction between task performance and contextual performance is evident because each dimension has different predictors. Theoretically, task performance is determined by procedural knowledge (i.e. knowledge about facts and things), declarative knowledge (i.e. knowledge on how to do something and what to do), ability and job experience, while contextual performance is closely associated with an individual's personality type (Jex & Britt 2008; Motowidlo & Van Scotter 1994). However, Vey and Campbell (2004) assert that, in measuring job performance, it is important to integrate the items on the basis of task performance as well as contextual performance, or specifically OCB. This is because these constructs are strongly related and difficult to differentiate, as behavioral aspects of job performance are very subjective. In fact, Vey and Campbell (2004) and Fisher and Hartel (2004) strongly suggest that OCB items be included in job performance measures because some of the items may contain task performance items. In a meta-analysis by Podsakoff et al. (2000), it is noted that task performance and OCB account for merely 9.3 percent and 12 percent of variance of variance in performance evaluations, respectively. However, the combination of both aspects of performance account for 42 percent of the variance in performance evaluations. This is in line with Johnson's (2001) findings that task and contextual performance contribute substantially in predicting the overall job performance ratings. In other words, both dimensions contribute a unique variance to the job performance domain because supervisors evaluate and combine items relating to task and contextual performance when appraising subordinates' overall performance.

Borman and Motowidlo (1997) report that, when making overall job performance ratings, supervisors evaluate task performance and OCB equally and that the correlation between task performance and OCB with overall job performance ratings are significant (i.e.  $r = 0.43$ ,  $p < 0.05$  and  $r = 0.41$ ,  $p < 0.05$ , respectively). This suggests that supervisory ratings are a function of task performance and OCB (Bolino, Turnley & Bloodgood 2002; Borman & Motowidlo 1997; Bowler 2006). Given the literature on the significant role of task performance and OCB in elucidating the overall job performance construct, this study incorporates items from both dimensions of task performance and OCB as indicators in the measure of overall job performance.

Studies on job performance have adopted various measures in capturing the performance construct. The inconsistencies of these measures may not reflect the actual predictors of employees' job performance. Accordingly, there is a need to develop a more comprehensive instrument that can clearly capture the job performance construct. Therefore, this study examines the construct validity of task performance and OCB items in the setting

of Malaysia Public Service agencies. We examine the construct validity of the job performance instrument, which also serves as a preliminary investigation of the psychometric properties of the Malay language version of the job performance instrument, with a sample of respondents from the Malaysia Public Service agencies.

The specific objectives of this study are twofold: firstly, to assess the internal consistency reliability of the job performance dimensions and the total score, and secondly, to assess the construct validity of the job performance instrument utilizing exploratory and confirmatory factor analytic procedures. The items and dimensions of job performance are developed and adapted based upon existing instruments.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND OF TASK PERFORMANCE AND OCB

As has been noted in a number of previous studies, task performance has been operationalized in many different ways. This is consistent with Motowidlo's (2003) assertion that scholars have not paid enough attention to the most appropriate concepts of task performance. This is evident in human resource management studies based upon the fact that task performance has been measured using a wide array of criterion measures. Among other criterion utilized are productivity indexes, promotability ratings, sales and turnover rate. Although these indicators might be presumed to reflect performance at various degrees, Gomez-Mejia et al. (2007) state that task performance can be distinguished into the quality of work done, the quantity of work performed, and interpersonal effectiveness. Another perspective on performance is given by Motowidlo (2003), who defines task performance as the total expected value of an individual's behavior over a standard period of time for the production of goods and services. In other words, task performance relates closely to the proficiency of an employee in performing his/her job. Motowidlo (2003) defines contextual performance as the total expected value of an individual's behavior over a standard period of time for maintaining and enhancing the psychological, social, and organizational context of work. In other words, contextual performance provides support to the performance of tasks in different organizational work environments. At a glance, both definitions may be perceived as an objective measure of performance because of the word 'total'. However, it is important to note that the word 'total expected value' is used instead of 'total absolute value' because the former refers to the possible outcome of the behaviors performed by an employee. Importantly, both performance measures focus on behaviors that could only predict the possible outcome of such behaviors, as opposed to results that can guarantee absolute outcomes (Motowidlo 2003). Therefore, behaviors are considered and have been empirically proven to be a valid and reliable

measure of individual job performance (Motowidlo et al. 1997; Podsakoff et al. 2000; Wall et al. 2004).

Besides performing core tasks, employees are also expected to maximize their efforts to sustain competitive advantage, keep abreast with changes, and promote innovation (Organ 1997). These expectations demand organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) to be exhibited by all employees in an organization. Organ (1997) and Podsakoff et al. (2000) propose that OCB, which is also known as the contextual performance or extra-role performance, is a prominent contributing factor to the organizational effectiveness. According to Organ (1988: 4), OCB is:

An individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization. By discretionary, we mean that the behavior is not an enforceable requirement of the role or job description that is the clearly specifiable terms of the person's employment contract with the organization; the behavior is rather a matter of personal choice, such that the omission is not generally understood as punishable.

The definition implies that OCB relates to positive behavioral traits that are neither stated in the job description, nor enforced by the employment contract. Besides contextual performance, OCB has also been coined as extra-role behaviors or discretionary behaviors (Organ et al. 2006). Bateman and Organ (1983) disaggregate the OCB concept into two dimensions: (1) a general compliance which concerns with what employees should do, and (2) altruism which focuses on employees' willingness in helping others (Organ et al. 2006). Organ (1988) later expands OCB into five distinct dimensions: altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy, and sportsmanship.

OCB continues to be conceptualized in different manners. For instance, Williams and Anderson (1991) divide OCB into OCB-I, which focuses on behaviors at the individual level, and OCB-O, which deals with employee behaviors at the organizational level. Then, Organ (1997) categorizes OCB into three dimensions: helping, courtesy, and conscientiousness. According to Koster and Sanders (2006), OCB has also been defined as customer-service behavior or pro-social behavior. However, Chiaburu and Baker (2006) argue that OCB and pro-social behavior or customer-service behavior differ markedly based on the context of the behavior being performed by the employees. This is because OCB is about reciprocity, whereby employees would engage in OCB if they perceive that their supervisors or colleagues exhibit OCB, whereas pro-social behavior and customer service behavior are the types of behavior that should be exhibited by employees when attending to the customers' needs (Bowler 2006; Chiaburu & Baker 2006; Organ 1997).

A more recent definition advanced by Moon, Van Dyne and Wrobel (2005) is based on the Circumplex Model of OCB. They divide each dimension of OCB based on focus (i.e. organizational or interpersonal) and nature (i.e. "promotive" or prohibitive). According to Moon et

al. (2005), OCB can be directed at the individual or the organizational level. This concept is very much similar to Williams and Anderson's (1991) idea of OCB-I and OCB-O. In the seminal works of Van Dyne et al. (1995) and Moon et al. (2005), OCB is considered in terms of its prohibitive or promotive nature. Prohibitive behaviors are concerned with protecting organizational values, norms and rules, whilst preventing undesirable and unethical behaviors. On the contrary, promotive behaviors deal with employees being proactive, adaptive, and moving the organization towards new objectives (Moon et al. 2005; Van Dyne et al. 1995). In other words, OCB can be categorized into protective (i.e. preserve and sustain the organization) and promotive (i.e. change and adaptability of oneself in improving the organization) characteristics. As such, helping behavior is considered as an interpersonal and promotive OCB because this behavior is directed at the individual level that helps to promote the efficiency of the organization (Organ 1988; Van Dyne et al. 1995). According to Moon et al. (2005), sportsmanship is an interpersonal behavior that is protective in nature. Employees who engage in this act do not complain or criticize because they focus on positive, rather than negative, elements at work. This type of individual behavior also tends to protect the organization by performing a peacemaking function when disagreements arise among co-workers (Organ 1988; Van Dyne et al. 1995).

The Circumplex model of OCB also includes innovative or voice behavior that is organizationally focused on acts to promote general change in the organization (Moon et al. 2005). This behavior is also concerned with the efforts taken by employees to improve products, services, relationships, and the like (Organ 1988; Van Dyne et al. 1995). Voice or innovative behavior is different from other definitions of innovativeness because such behavior relates to the frequency of ideas and engagement levels of employees when giving ideas for the overall improvement of the department or organization as a whole (Moon et al. 2005). Finally, compliance is categorized by Moon et al. (2005) and Van Dyne et al. (1995) as an organizational and protective OCB. This is based on the fact that compliance is an organizationally-focused behavior to pursue and obey the stipulated rules and regulations. Having delineated the OCB construct based on the Circumplex model, it can be summed up that helping and voice behaviors are promotive-types of OCB, while sportsmanship and compliance are protective-types of OCB. Moon et al. (2005) and Van Dyne et al. (1995) also suggest that the utility of the Circumplex model of OCB is not limited to the hypothesized domains because the model can be improved in the future by adding further dimensions to better explain and understand the OCB construct.

Despite numerous conceptualizations of OCB, this study employs Organ's (1997) definition, which refers to OCB as behaviors that in aggregate, across time and across persons, contribute to organizational effectiveness. These are the behaviors that can help to support and

maintain the psychological environment in which task performance takes place. Organ (1997) argues that the word 'discretionary' in his earlier definition of OCB is no longer appropriate, given the fact that OCB items have been considered by respondents as task performance or part of the job in most cases (e.g., Borman & Motowidlo 1997; Van Scotter & Motowidlo 1996; Vey & Campbell 2004; Wilson 2005). Furthermore, although OCB has not been associated with rewards because of its discretionary or voluntary nature, it is inevitable that supervisors, and even employees themselves, would take OCB into consideration in making appraisal and reward decisions regarding their subordinates (Organ 1997). Hence, the conceptualization of OCB as 'not directly or explicitly recognized by the reward system' seems not quite applicable given the possible influence of OCB on supervisors' appraisals. Additionally, this study intends to assess six dimensions of OCB developed by Organ (1988a) and Van Dyne and LePine (1998), which are developed from Organ's (1997) definition of OCB. The dimensions – altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship, and voice behavior – provide a comprehensive definition of the OCB construct adopted in this study.

While most previous studies examine each dimension of OCB separately, this study measures OCB in aggregate. This approach is in accordance with Organ's (1988: 6) assertion that "most OCB actions, taken singly, would not make a dent in the overall performance of an organization...that is in the nature of OCB in which any single occurrence of it usually is modest and trivial". It is the composite or aggregate of all OCB dimensions that "promote effective functioning of the organization" (Organ 1988: 4). Furthermore, Law, Wong and Chen (2005) state that using composite measures of OCB is justified if the hypotheses about OCB are drawn at the overall construct level instead of the dimensional level. Studies by Law et al. (2005) and Luo et al. (2008) have empirically validated the use of composite measures of OCB. Most importantly, Podsakoff et al. (2000) report that OCB can be measured in aggregate since no individual dimension has unique effects on organizational success or different antecedents. In other words, OCB dimensions are essentially equivalent constructs that in composite would have impacted organizational performance. According to Wong, Law and Huang (2008), OCB may be assessed at the construct level based on the conceptual and empirical assertions in the literature. This is consistent with earlier suggestions by Law and Wong (1999) that the decision to use dimensional or construct level analysis should be made based on theory. However, it is also important to note that the use of different levels of construct (i.e. first-order or second-order measurement models) would result in the plausible countervailing influence of predictors on the respective construct and dimensions (Wong et al. 2008). Based on the literature, quite a number of studies have treated OCB as a uni-dimensional construct, which is in accordance to the objectives of the respective

researches (Hoofman et al. 2002). For the same reason, this study measures OCB at the construct level instead of the dimensional level.

The distinction between task performance and OCB is not clear. One possible reason is that supervisors tend to perceive OCB as task performance instead of contextual performance (Vey & Campbell 2004). In fact, in most instances, task performance and OCB items appear on the performance appraisal form (Borman & Motowidlo 1997). Furthermore, in evaluating the overall performance, supervisors assess task performance and OCB in equivocal terms because the beta values for both variables are significant and equal in magnitude (Borman & Motowidlo 1997; Bowler 2006). Hoffman et al. (2002) report that task performance and OCB are highly correlated (i.e.  $\rho = 0.74$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), but the correlation is not orthogonal. This means that each dimension measures different aspects of performance, but both have to be integrated for a more holistic measure of the job performance construct. Johnson (2001) notes that, in most cases, dimensions in contextual performance or OCB receive a relatively large weight, indicating the great importance of OCB in explaining the overall job performance. In a similar vein, Tett and Burnett (2003) assert that the important aspects of job performance that are valued during the hiring process may not be the same as those that are valued during the performance appraisal process. For instance, during selection, supervisors are more focused on the ability of the employee based on his/her procedural knowledge (i.e. knowledge about facts and things) and declarative knowledge (i.e. knowledge on how to do things and what to do). However, after the employee is hired, he/she is expected to show some forms of citizenship behavior in order to develop a 'person-job' and 'person-organization' fit (Bogler & Somech 2005; Heneman & Judge 2005; Tett & Burnett 2003). This is crucial to ensure long-term employment retention (Heneman & Judge 2005). Podsakoff et al. (2000) find that task performance and OCB account for only 9.3 percent and 12 percent of variance in performance evaluations, respectively. Nevertheless, the combination of both aspects of job performance measures account for 42 percent of the variance in job performance appraisals. This suggests that task performance and OCB factors are of substantial value in representing the job performance construct. Hence, it is important to ensure that all relevant factors related to the aforesaid constructs are captured in the job performance evaluation so as to establish the validity of the measure.

Empirical studies (e.g. Bergeron 2007; Borman & Motowidlo 1997; Van Scotter & Motowidlo 1996; Vey & Campbell 2004; Wilson 2005) point out that supervisors would tend to perceive and evaluate task performance and OCB items as being of equal importance when making overall job performance ratings. This is supported by Bergeron (2007), who reports that the correlation between task performance and OCB; and overall job performance ratings are 0.43 and 0.41, respectively. Based on the assertions and empirical results of Borman and Motowidlo

(1997), Bergeron (2007), Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996), Wilson (2005) and Vey and Campbell (2004), task performance and OCB have contributed a unique variance to the job performance domain because supervisors evaluate and combine task and OCB items in evaluating the overall performance of their subordinates.

#### JOB PERFORMANCE MEASURE AND SOURCE OF RATING

Job performance has been measured via several methods. For instance, dimensions of the job analysis can also be used in developing performance standards required for each employee (Heneman & Judge 2005). This is because job analysis specifically spells out work behaviors required for job incumbents and KSAOs needed in exhibiting those behaviors. The use of job analysis in measuring performance is accomplished by employing task inventories and critical incident techniques (Motowidlo 2003). Another method is through performance appraisal forms (Borman & Motowidlo 1997). Wiedower (2001) and Pincus (1986) assert that a performance measure that is based upon performance appraisal items offers a more reliable and accurate performance evaluation. Furthermore, Pulakos, Schmitt and Chan (1996) note that performance rating scales are, by far, the most frequently used criteria in measuring job performance of an employee. Most importantly, researchers should take into account what practitioners incorporate in conceptualizing job performance so as to enhance the validity of the measure (Organ 1988b).

Gomez-Mejia et al. (2007) and Wall et al. (2004) note that job performance can be measured in terms of the absolute value or relative judgment. Absolute value is based on figures or financial indicators, such as productivity and profitability, while relative judgment focuses on the overall performance of an employee or organization, which is based on task-related and behavioral elements. According to Wall et al. (2004) and Williams (2002), most human resource management research adopts subjective measures of job performance because the studies focus on an individual's performance, which is most appropriately measured in terms of the task-related and behavioral elements. Most importantly, subjective measures allow researchers to generalize the findings to a larger performance construct (Wall et al. 2004). This is in accordance with Motowidlo's (2003) argument that job performance is best construed as a behavioral construct because it involves psychological processes that are related to the selection, training, motivation, and facilitation of different situational processes. By examining behavior as a performance measure, appropriate intervention can be made to improve the overall job performance.

It has also been reported that performance should be measured broadly to enhance its reliability (Kim 2006; Tubre 2000; Viswesvaran 1993; Viswesvaran, Schmidt & Ones 1996), but the scope of measurement should be more specific, e.g. based on performance appraisal or job analysis, in order to increase its validity

(Ashton 1998; Pincus 1986; Wiedower 2001). As such, this study measures job performance subjectively, using items adapted from Morrison and Phelps (1999), Organ (1990), Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997), Van Dyne and Le Pine (1998), and William and Anderson (1990). Next, the approach utilized by Borman and Motowidlo (1997), Pincus (1986), and Wiedower (2001) to validate the job performance measure is applied. This is facilitated by utilizing the performance appraisal form of the public servants as another source of input regarding how job performance is measured in the public sector.

There have been voluminous studies exploring various predictors, antecedents, and outcomes of job performance (Campbell et al. 1990; LePine et al. 2002; Podsakoff et al. 2000; Scandura & Williams 2000). However, there is still a lack of attention given to the validity of the job performance measure. On this note, Campbell et al. (1990), LePine et al. (2002), Podsakoff et al. (2000) and Spitzmuller et al. (2008) strongly suggest that the area of personnel psychology is on the verge of publishing an abundance of job performance literature that will be of little value in the performance domain if research is limited to its empirical links with different constructs. In the Malaysian context, very limited evidence on the construct validity of the job performance measure has been reported to date. To fill the gap, this study assesses the construct validity of job performance that incorporates task performance and OCB. This is in congruent to the assertion by Podsakoff et al. (2000) that there is a need to examine the psychometric properties of the job performance construct by assessing its convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity. Researchers should provide additional attention on a more comprehensive theoretical elucidation of the construct and its measure (Campbell 1990; Podsakoff et al. 2000; Organ 1997; Spitzmuller et al. 2008; Van Dyne et al. 1995; Van Dyne & LePine 1998). Hence, the construct validity of the job performance measure is examined with variance extracted estimates (VE) and standardized factor loadings in the measurement model for convergent validity, the average variance extracted (AVE) for discriminant validity, and the correlation matrix for nomological validity (Hair et al. 2006).

This study adopts an immediate-supervisory rating approach in evaluating job performance items of public servants. Supervisory-rating is chosen over self-rating of performance-related construct because the latter is believed to lead to a spuriously high or low correlation due to self-bias, which in turn may inflate or deflate the observed correlations (Danaeefard, Balutbazeh & Kashi 2010; Donaldson & Grant-Vallone 2002; Netemeyer & Maxham 2006; Organ & Ryan 1995; Organ et al. 2006; Radhakrishnan, Arrow & Sniezek 1996; Suliman 2003; Tubre 2000; Wall et al. 2004). Furthermore, Bohlander and Snell (2007), Johnson (2001), Moideenkutty et al. (2006), Morrison (1994) and Viswesvaran et al. (1996) assert that immediate supervisors are considered as the most appropriate individuals to give feedback on job performance because they have the first-hand experience

with job-related aspects of the respective employees as compared to other individuals in the organization. Importantly, according to Van Dyne and Le Pine (1998), the supervisory rating is deemed as a reliable source of information because supervisors evaluate employee behavior and appraise employee performance on a regular basis as part of their managerial responsibilities. That being said, supervisory-rating is chosen over other source of ratings to evaluate job performance of the respondents in this study.

In their longitudinal study, Van Dyne and LePine (1998) also report that supervisory rating of job performance has a better predictive validity of 0.73 as compared to self and peer ratings, which have a predictive validity of 0.04 and 0.08, respectively. In a similar vein, the findings by Pulakos et al. (1996) reveal that their model shows a significantly better fit for supervisory rating with an  $R^2$  value of 0.11 compared to 0.05 for peer rating. Studies by Podsakoff et al. (2000), Viswesvaran (1993), and Viswesvaran et al. (1996) have reported that the variance in job performance that is explained by the supervisory rating is much higher than self-rating or peer-rating. This result indicates that job performance is best explained by immediate supervisors compared to other individuals in the organization. Based on the aforementioned empirical evidences, supervisory rating is considered as the best source of rating because it plays a significant role in explaining job performance.

A subjective measure of job performance is used in this study. This type of measure is considered acceptable for studies conducted in a public sector setting where there is a general lack of appropriate financial records, while individual performance appraisal results are considered confidential information (Wall et al. 2004). Furthermore, Gomez-Mejia et al. (2007), Mwita (2000), and Wall et al. (2004) have contended that a subjective measure of job performance is appropriate in organizational behavior studies because it allows generalizability to a larger performance construct, such as organizational performance. Motowidlo et al. (1997) note that, in most instances, performance results, as opposed to behaviors, are the main indicators of performance, but performance results may not reflect the contributions of the employees towards organizational goals. This is because the results may be affected by other extraneous factors that are beyond the control of the employees. In fact, behavioral aspects, in the measurement of performance, are necessary to develop a psychological understanding in the staffing process, as well as training and development activities (Motowidlo et al. 1997; Mwita 2000; Sarminah 2005). Most importantly, Podsakoff et al. (2000) report that objective measures of performance uniquely account for only 9.5 percent of the variance in performance evaluations. In comparison, subjective measures of job performance (using task and OCB items) account for 42.9 percent of the variance in performance evaluations. This suggests that subjective measures of job performance, as opposed to objective measures of job performance, play a substantially greater

role in explaining performance evaluations. As such, the present study gathers responses through the subjective measures of the job performance construct from the immediate supervisors of the public servants.

## METHODOLOGY

### JOB PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT DEVELOPMENT

A total of 37 items have been used to measure the job performance construct. The items are adopted and adapted from seminal works by prominent scholars in the job performance field, such as Morrison and Phelps (1999), Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1990), Van Dyne and Le Pine (1998), and William and Anderson (1991). The internal consistency reliability value for the instrument is observed based on the results in the preceding studies. The measurement for the construct is above the acceptable limit of internal consistency value ( $> 0.6$ ) and is therefore considered reliable.

The content validity for all measures is also examined by assessing the suitability of items in representing the operational definition of each dimension. The content validity of the items is also gauged by referring to previous studies. We identify observed variables that have been used to measure the hypothesized latent construct in seminal works by Morrison and Phelps (1999), Podsakoff et al. (1990), Van Dyne and Le Pine (1998) and William and Anderson (1991).

Next, decentering is conducted. In this process, the original measurement is changed before it is adapted and back-translated. The purpose is to improve the translatability of the measurement, whereby items that are likely to be specific to the original culture or context are removed or altered (Brislin 1980; Geisinger 2003). The assistance of two bilingual experts and a public service officer has been used to identify items in the measurement that need to be refined to suit the Malaysian culture and public service context. Then, the measurement is assessed to ensure that there is no culture-specific language or content. Next, the measurement is translated using a back-translation procedure. Following Brislin (1970), Werner and Campbell (1970), and Geisinger (2003), the service of two different bilingual language experts is used in the back-translation process. One of the experts translates the original items to the Malay language, which is then re-translated into English by another expert who must not have seen the original English version of the items. The quality of the language translation is evaluated based upon how accurately the back-translated version matches with the original version (Geisinger 2003).

To determine the suitability of all items in the public sector context, the back-translated items are discussed and verified with the officers and clerical staff from the public service departments and agencies. The researchers also refer to the public servant performance appraisal form to identify how job performance is measured in the public

sector. Upon scrutiny, it is noted that the performance appraisal form consists of items that measure both task performance and OCB. Another discussion is conducted with two human resource officers in one of the public service departments to get feedback on the appropriateness of the items that are adapted and translated in measuring the job performance of public servants. This stage is crucial to guarantee the content and face validity of all items. Based on the feedback, several improvements have been made to the items.

Finally, a cover letter from the researchers is attached to each questionnaire, which also contains detailed instructions for the respondents. The respondents are asked to answer the items by indicating their level of agreement using a seven point Likert's scale. Once the questionnaire is complete, the respondent is asked to insert it in an envelope that has been provided by the researchers and seal it to ensure the confidentiality of the information.

### MEASUREMENT OF THE JOB PERFORMANCE CONSTRUCT

The job performance construct is measured in terms of task performance and OCB. Task performance is measured by seven items adapted from Williams and Anderson (1991). As for OCB, a total of 30 items are used to measure the dimensions. Five different questions are used to measure each of the following dimensions of OCB: sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, and altruism. Four items are then used to measure conscientiousness, while six items are used to measure innovative citizenship behavior.

### UNIT OF ANALYSIS, SAMPLING, AND DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

The unit of analysis in this study is the individual and the target population is public servants. Based on the sampling frame, there are a total of 5,473 public servants in all public service departments and agencies in the Northern region of Peninsular Malaysia (Public Service Department 2011). According to the generalized scientific guidelines for sample size (Krejcie & Morgan (1970) in Cavana, Delahaye & Sekaran 2001; Sekaran 2003; Veal 2005), the appropriate sample size for the respective population size is 381. A letter of intention for data collection has been sent to each of the public service departments and agencies in the region, but only nine departments have agreed to participate in the study. Hence, a total of 500 self-administered questionnaires are distributed to the respondents in those nine public service agencies. The respondents are required to evaluate one of their immediate subordinates on task performance and OCB items.

The supervisory rating method is chosen over self-rating to avoid common method variance, as suggested by many performance-related researchers (e.g. Castro, Armario & Ruiz 2004; Kim 2006; Koster & Sanders 2006; Yousef 1998). More importantly, Wall et al. (2004), Tubre (2000), Organ et al. (2006), and Organ and Ryan (2001) have strongly contended that self-rating performance-related construct will lead to a spuriously high or low

correlation that is confounded by the common method variance. Further, Bohlander and Snell (2007) and Moideenkutty, Blau, Kumar and Nalakath (2005) assert that immediate supervisors are the most appropriate source of information with regards to job performance. As such, immediate supervisors are chosen to evaluate their subordinates in relation to task performance and OCB items.

## ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES

The reliability and initial evidence of validity are reported based on results from Cronbach's alpha reliability, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Following Cavana et al. (2001), Hair et al. (2006), Sekaran (2003), and Veal (2005), EFA on each latent construct is carried out to determine if the responses gathered can be grouped according to the items in each variable similar to previous studies. Specifically, EFA using principal axis factoring, which has a direct oblique rotation with *a priori* criteria of factors, is conducted to analyze the factor structure of the variables (Byrne 2005; Hair et al. 2006; Kim & Mueller 1978; Tabachnick & Fidell 2007; Worthington & Whittaker 2006). The cutoff point of 0.5 is used as the threshold for further analysis (Hair et al. 2006; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). The measurement model or CFA for each latent factor is examined by observing the model fit level.

Furthermore, the construct validity indicated by convergent validity is examined based upon the methods utilized by Hair et al. (2007) and Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). Convergent validity is assessed by calculating the variance extracted estimates (VE) and composite reliability of each latent construct. Additionally, the value of standardized loadings for each observed variable are also examined to assess the convergent validity of the instrument.

## FINDINGS

### PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

The final sample consists of 61.70 percent male and 38.30 percent female. The majority of respondents (55.08%) are less than 30 years old, while 7.42 percent are above 50 years old. Given the fact that Malaysian public service departments and agencies are predominantly Malay-populated, 98.4 percent of the respondents are Malays. Only 1.2 percent and 0.4 percent are Chinese and Indian, respectively. Regarding education level, 34 percent of the respondents are SPM holders, 22.70 percent are STPM holders and 29.30 percent are diploma holders. The rest (13.7 percent) are Bachelor's and Master's degree holders. The majority (72.2%) of the respondents have worked

in the organization for less than 10 years, while 27.80 percent have worked for more than 10 years. A total of 210 respondents (83%) have held the same job position for less than 10 years, while the rest have held the same job position for more than 10 years. Finally, 94.90 percent of the respondents are eligible taxpayers, while only 5.10 percent are tax-exempt.

### RELIABILITY AND EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS (EFA)

This study assesses the internal consistency reliability and initial validity of the instruments, which are depicted in Table 1. The Cronbach's alpha values range from 0.821 to 0.937. Next, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is also carried out to examine the factorial validity of the instruments. Note that the cutoff point for factor loadings in this study are 0.50 or greater because this threshold value is considered crucial in ensuring practical significance for sample size of 150 and above (Hair et al. 2006; Worthington & Whittaker 2006). As shown in Table 2, EFA results indicate that four dimensions of OCB – sportsmanship, courtesy, civic virtue, and conscientiousness – load on the task performance factor. Only items on altruism and innovative behavior load on the OCB factor. Based on the results, items that load on factor 1 are categorized as task performance items, while items load on factor 2 are labeled as OCB items.

TABLE 1. Reliability of the job performance dimensions

Constructs	Items	Mean	SD	Cronbach's alpha
Task performance	7	5.949	0.082	0.821
OCB	30	5.260	0.219	0.924
Overall job performance	37	5.390	0.265	0.937

Based on these results, task performance is operationally defined as the behavioral dimensions of performance encompassing job-specific task proficiency, sportsmanship, courtesy, civic virtue, and conscientiousness, while OCB is operationally defined as altruism and innovative behaviors. The remaining 25 items are then subjected to EFA with principal axis factoring extraction and direct oblique rotation. Based on the EFA results in Table 2, the Eigen value for factor 1 is 10.648, while the Eigen value for factor 2 is 3.439. The total variance explained for this construct is 50.712. As indicated in Table 3, a total of 12 items are dropped from further analysis because of cross or low factor loading. Items with factor loadings above 0.5 are retained for further analysis. This is crucial, given that values greater than 0.50 are generally considered necessary for practical significance (Hair et al. 2006).

TABLE 2. Factor loadings for exploratory factor analysis

Items and Descriptions		Factor 1	Factor 2
TP 1	He/she performs tasks that are expected of him/her.	0.600	
TP 2	He/she meets formal performance requirements of the job.	0.782	
TP 3	He/she is involved in activities that are relevant to his/her yearly performance assessment.	0.703	
TP 4	He/she fails to perform essential duties. ®	0.619	
CON 2	He/she adequately completes assigned duties.	0.515	
CON 3	He/she does not take extra time for breaks.	0.544	
CON 4	He/she often work beyond office hours even though not being asked to.	0.682	
CTY 1	He/she always complains about things that are not important. ®	0.784	
CV 1	He/she always finds fault with what the organization is doing. ®	0.718	
SPT 3	He/she always pays attention to matters that are negative rather than on matters that are positive. ®	0.583	
SPT 4	He/she is always complaining about work. ®	0.506	
CTY 4	He/she tries to prevent himself/herself from creating problems for his/her coworkers.	0.544	
CTY 3	He/she is aware of how his/her behavior affects other people's jobs.	0.712	
CTY 4	He/she reads and follows all announcements, memos, and others given out by the organization.	0.629	
CTY 5	He/she keeps up to date with changes in the organization.	0.590	
TP 7	He/she attend meetings that are not compulsory but are considered important.	0.695	
ALT 1	He/she helps others who have problems with their work.		0.685
ALT 2	He/she helps others who have heavy workload.		0.822
ALT 3	He/she always ready to offer help to those around him or her.		0.832
ALT 4	He/she tries to make innovative suggestions to improve the department/organization.		0.777
IB 1	He/she tries to adopt improved procedures for the department/organization.		0.851
IB 3	He/she tries to institute new more effective work methods for the department/organization.		0.785
IB 4	He/she tries to make constructive suggestions for improving how things operate in this department/organization.		0.889
IB 5	He/she makes recommendations on issues that affect the department/organization.		0.815
IB 6	He/she speaks up for new changes in this department/organization.		0.606
Eigen Value		10.648	3.439
Variance Explained		39.129	11.583
KMO		0.912	
Total Variance Explained		50.712	

Notes: Item abbreviations TP refers to task performance, CON refers to conscientiousness, ALT refers to altruism, CTY refers to courtesy, SPT refers to sportsmanship, CV refers to civic virtue, and IB refers to innovative behavior.

TABLE 3. Composite reliability of the job performance construct

Observed Variables	Standardized loadings	(Sum of standardized loadings) <sup>2</sup>	Error	Number of items	Composite reliability
Task performance	0.910		0.060		
Conscientiousness	0.700		0.360		
Courtesy	0.800		0.230		
Civic virtue	0.670		0.380		
Sportsmanship	0.670		0.290		
Total	1.610	2.592	1.320	5	0.663
Altruism	0.800		0.390		
Innovative behavior	0.880		0.180		
Total	1.680	2.822	0.570	2	0.832

ITEM PARCELING AND MEASUREMENT MODEL OF THE JOB PERFORMANCE CONSTRUCT

Item parceling is done to reduce the number of parameters estimated in the job performance measurement model. A total of 25 items remain after data reduction and EFA is used to measure job performance. These items are bundled into five parcels based on the dimensions in job performance (task performance, conscientiousness, courtesy, civic virtue, sportsmanship, altruism, and innovative behavior). Parcels are indexes computed by averaging two or more items of the same dimension. Item parceling is suggested in structural equation modeling to enhance the stability of the instrument. Item parceling is more reliable because it provides better fit and higher loadings, while posing fewer problems with model identification (Bagozzi & Edwards 1998; Bandalos 2002; Bandalos 2008; Holt 2004; Worthington & Whittaker 2006).

According to Byrne (2001), Kline (2005), Schumacker and Lomax (2004), a measurement model is important to examine whether or not the measurements used fit the data. Although the traditional chi-square goodness of fit statistics is reported, this criterion is overly strict and very sensitive to a large sample size, i.e. 200 or above (Byrne 2001; Kline 2005; Schumacker & Lomax 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell 2007). As an alternative, Byrne (2001) and Kline (2005) suggest using other fit indices, such as normed chi-square or chi-square/degree of freedom. The acceptable range for normed chi-square is 1 to 5 (Schumacker & Lomax 2005).

The measurement model is also observed for overall fitness by referring to other fit indices as suggested by Byrne (2001), Kline (2005), Schumacker and Lomax (2005), and Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). Based on Byrne, (2001), Hair et al. (2007), Schumacker and Lomax (2005), Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), the fit indices reported in this study are the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and the root mean square residual (RMR) for model fit; the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) and the Comparative index (CFI) for model comparison; and the Normed Chi-Square (NC) for model parsimony. To indicate that the model is adequately fit, the cutoff values are set at 0.90 or higher for CFI and TLI (Byrne 2001; Kline 2005;

Schumacker & Lomax 2005) and 0.08 or lower for RMSEA (Byrne 2001; Kline 2005; Schumacker & Lomax 2005).

CONSTRUCT VALIDITY OF THE JOB PERFORMANCE MEASURE

According to Hair et al. (2007), construct validity is crucial to ensure that the observed variables actually represent the theoretical latent construct that these variables are designed to measure. In addition to factor loadings in the confirmatory factor analysis, convergent validity is examined by observing the values of composite reliability and variance extracted (VE).

As noted by Hair et al. (2007), composite reliability values should be greater than 0.6, while VE should exceed 0.5. A composite reliability value less than 0.6 indicates that the items do not consistently measure the same latent construct (Hair et al. 2007). VE is computed by dividing the total of all squared standardized factor loadings (squared multiple correlations) by the number of items. A value of VE smaller than 0.5 indicates that variance is caused by the existence of measurement error in the items, rather than being explained by the latent factor structure imposed on the measure.

Table 3 shows the calculated composite reliability for each latent construct. Composite or construct reliability is an indicator of convergent validity. The rule of thumb for a good reliability estimate is 0.7 or higher, which means that all observed variables consistently represent the same latent construct. However, Hair et al. (2007) also assert that a reliability value between 0.6 and 0.7 may be acceptable given than other indicators of construct validity are good. In this case, task performance shows a composite reliability value of 0.663. However, as suggested by Hair et al. (2007), these values are considered acceptable as it fulfills the lower limit of acceptability.

Table 4 shows the result of the calculated VE to further support the convergent validity of each construct. A VE of 0.5 or higher is a good rule of thumb suggesting adequate convergence (Hair et al. 2006). The VE for task performance and OCB are 0.501 and 0.713, respectively, lending support for the convergent validity of the instrument in measuring job performance.

TABLE 4. Variance extracted estimates for job performance dimensions

Observed variables	SMC	Error	No. of items	Variance Extracted
Task performance	0.827	0.060		
Conscientiousness	0.497	0.360		
Courtesy	0.648	0.230		
Civic virtue	0.453	0.380		
Sportsmanship	0.452	0.290		
Total	2.877	1.320	5	0.501
Altruism	0.638	0.390		
Innovative behavior	0.776	0.180		
Total	1.414	0.570	2	0.713

## FIRST-ORDER AND SECOND-ORDER JOB PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT MODEL

The first order measurement model shows the value of TLI and CFI as 0.989 and 0.995, respectively. All loadings of items on their targeted factors are high, statistically significant, and above 0.55 the cutoff point used in the exploratory factor analysis. Both factors are correlated with the correlation value of 0.54, suggesting that these factors are interrelated, but are relatively orthogonal of one another. The hierarchical factor structure of job performance is also hypothesized and tested. The second order measurement model is found to be good fitted, with TLI = 0.991, CFI = 0.987, RMSEA = 0.039, RMR = 0.011,

normed chi-square = 1.387 ( $\chi^2 = 12.484$ ,  $df = 9$ ,  $p = 0.187$ ). The factor loadings for task performance and OCB are 0.94 and 0.58, respectively. In other words, both latent constructs converge with the job performance hierarchical factor structure. Observed variables load on each factor with standardized factor loadings of 0.67 to 0.91 ( $p < 0.05$ ), lending the evidence of convergent validity for all of the items. Model fit statistics comparing both factor models are presented in Table 5. The results indicate that the two measurement models for the job performance construct meet the criteria for good fitting models. The second order factor produces similar results to the earlier first order factor.

TABLE 5. Model fit statistics for each hypothesized measurement model

Model	df	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2/df$	RMSEA	RMR	TLI	CFI
First-order	10	14.791	0.140	1.479	0.043	0.016	0.989	0.995
Second-order	9	12.484	0.187	1.387	0.039	0.011	0.991	0.987

## DISCUSSIONS

The construct validation results have provided a strong ground for the two-dimensionality of the job performance measure. However, it is crucial to note that task performance is no longer a single factor measure because four OCB dimensions, namely sportsmanship, courtesy, civic virtue, and conscientiousness, load on the task performance factor, instead of the OCB factor. The validation analyses report that only altruism and voice behavior describe the OCB factor. The results show that respondents mostly perceive job performance items as issues of task performance, rather than OCB. Specifically, supervisors in the public sectors who respond to the questions tend to perceive OCB as task performance. One of the plausible reasons is attributed to the dimensions being used in the performance appraisal in the public sector. As shown in the performance appraisal form, Malaysian public servants are being evaluated based on several criteria that include dimensions similar to OCB items, including sportsmanship, courtesy, conscientiousness, and civic virtue. As such, these supervisors would naturally view the OCB items as task performance, rather than discretionary behaviors. This plausibly reasons out the cross loadings of OCB items into the task performance factor.

The construct validation results are also attributed to the nature of the jobs in the organization. According to Moore (1996), public servants are highly interdependent of each other in performing jobs. A job involves several tasks to be done by several individuals, involving support, management and a professional group. A high level of interdependency among employees in getting a job done would result in a high level of engagement in OCB. This is because each of the individuals involved is expected to show some form of discretionary behavior in order to get his/her job done on time. Discretionary behavior

includes sportsmanship, courtesy, conscientiousness and civic virtue. For instance, public servants should engage in sportsmanship, whereby they do not complain about meeting job deadlines. They are also expected to show some level of conscientiousness by performing their tasks beyond the minimum required level and be courteous by taking preventive steps to avoid problems with others. Public servants are expected to stay focused on work so that all tasks can be completed on time. In other words, OCB is required of public servants to ensure effective overall functioning of the public service organization and, for this reason, OCB is evaluated as task performance instead of OCB by the supervisors in the public sector.

Another plausible justification is based on the fact that the public service sector is a service-based organization. As the job title suggests, the core tasks of the public servants are to serve customers in the public sector. As far as public service is concerned, the job nature in this sector requires public servants to do beyond what is stated in their job descriptions in order to fulfill the needs of multiple stakeholders. OCB consists of voluntary behaviors performed by employees to ensure the smooth functioning of the organization. When attending to the needs of clientele, public servants are expected to engage in sportsmanship by showing a positive attitude and not complaining about having to do additional tasks so as to meet different expectations. Furthermore, they must also exhibit a high level of conscientiousness by 'walking the extra mile' to serve the customers. As such, OCB is expected from each individual in the public service, where its main function is to fulfill the needs of all of its stakeholders.

Most importantly, the findings are in agreement with results of previous research, such as Wilson (2005), who finds that 94 percent of supervisors considered OCB as part of their subordinates' task performance. Likewise, Vey and Campbell (2004) find that 17 of the 30 OCB items

were categorized by 85 percent of the supervisors as task performance. This is in agreement with the assertions of Borman and Motowidlo (1997) and Fisher and Hartel (2004) that supervisors tend to view and evaluate task and OCB as a similar construct in appraising their subordinates' job performance. A plausible reason for the similar results is attributable to the fact that items in the job performance measure were very subjective as they are perceptual in nature. Therefore, to evaluate the items as task or OCB is very much dependent upon how these items are perceived by supervisors.

As noted earlier by Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996), it is difficult to separate task performance from several dimensions of contextual performance in practice among supervisors who tend to view OCB as task performance. This is because the assessment is based solely on the supervisors' perceptions. Supervisors would plausibly require their subordinates to engage in OCB as part of their task performance, but not as discretionary behaviors. This is consistent with the assertion of Organ (1997) that OCB is no longer to be considered as "discretionary behavior, not directly rewarded by the formal system" because, in most cases, supervisors tend to take into consideration the level of engagement in OCB among their subordinates if they are to make decisions regarding performance appraisal and reward distributions. This assertion is also supported by Borman and Motowidlo (1997), Fisher and Hartel (2004), Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996), and Vey and Campbell (2004), who point out that OCB items should be included in the job performance measure because most of the items are integrally measuring task performance and important in assessing employees' overall job performance. Therefore, based on the research results and empirical support in the literature, items on task performance and OCB should be integrated in job performance appraisals, particularly among public servants.

#### IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

One important theoretical contribution of this study relates to the construct validation of the instruments. Specifically, this study uses the job performance instrument, as adapted from Williams and Anderson (1991), to evaluate task performance and the approach utilized by Organ (1990), Morrison and Phelps (1999), Van Dyne & Le Pine (1998) to assess OCB in terms of sportsmanship, courtesy, altruism, conscientiousness, civic virtue, and voice behavior. Based upon suggestions in the literature (e.g. Deewar et al. 1980; Fried & Ferris 1987; Griffin & Brueckner 1980; House & Rizzo 1972; Kanungo 1982; Scandura & William 2000), a construct validation is deemed crucial to ensure that more meaningful results could be elicited from any research. Furthermore, construct validation could be of substantial value to the theoretical domain in the respective field. Given the limited empirical scrutiny on measurement validation in the Malaysian context, this study has taken

the step to provide evidence of construct validity of the Malay-translated version of the scale that measures the job performance construct.

Importantly, the evidence of construct validation of the Malay-translated instruments employed in this study manages to add more empirical support in the respective theoretical domain, indicating the utility of all the measures in the Malaysian context, particularly the public service sector. Furthermore, composite reliability, variance extracted, and confirmatory factor analysis have provided the evidence of construct validity based on tests of significance and assessment of the measurement model fit. Thus, the two subscales of job performance, with first order and second order measurement models, can be useful instruments in examining job performance in the Malaysian setting.

#### REFERENCES

- Ashton, M. C. 1998. Personality and job performance: The importance of narrow traits. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 19(3): 289-303.
- Bagozzi, R. P. & Edwards, J. R. 1998. A general approach for representing constructs in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods* 1(1): 45-87.
- Bandalos, D. L. 2002. The effects of item parceling on goodness-of-fit and parameter estimate bias in structural equation modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling* 9(1): 78-102.
- Bandalos, D. L. 2008. Is parceling really necessary? A comparison of results from item parceling and categorical variable methodology. *Structural Equation Model: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 15(2): 211-240.
- Bateman, T. S. & Organ, D. W. 1983. Job satisfaction and the good soldier: the relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal* 26(4): 587-595.
- Becker, T. E. & Kernan, M. C. 2006. Matching commitment to supervisors and organizations to in-role and extra-role performance. *Human Performance* 16(4): 327-348.
- Bergeron, D. M. 2007. The potential paradox of organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Review* 32(4): 1078-1095.
- Bogler, R. & Somech, A. 2005. Organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration* 43(5): 420-438.
- Bohlander, G. & Snell, S. 2007. *Managing Human Resources*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.
- Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H. & Bloodgood, J. M. 2002. Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of Management Review* 27(3): 256-277.
- Borman W. C. 2004a. Introduction to the special issue: personality and the prediction of job performance: more than the big five. *Human Performance* 17(3): 267-269.
- Borman, W. C. 2004b. The concept of organizational citizenship. *American Psychological Society* 13(6): 238-241.
- Borman, W. C. & Motowidlo, S. J. 1993. Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In *Personnel Selection in Organizations*, eds. N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

- Borman, W. C. & Motowidlo, S. J. 1997. Organizational citizenship behavior and contextual performance. *Human Performance* 10(2): 67-70.
- Bowler, W. M. 2006. Organizational goals versus the dominant coalition: A critical review of the value of organizational citizenship behavior. *Institute of Behavioral and Applied Management*.
- Brislin, R. W. 1970. Back-translation for cross cultural research. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology* 1: 185-216.
- Byrne, B. M. 2005. *Structural Equation Modeling with AMOS*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Campbell, J. P. 1990. Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, edited by M. D. Dunette & L. M. Houghs, Vol. 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 687-732. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Campbell, J. P., McHenry, J. J. & Wise, L. L. 1990. Modeling job performance in a population of jobs. *Personnel Psychology* 43(2): 313-333.
- Castro, C. M., Armario, E. M. & Ruiz, D. M. 2004. The influence of employee organizational citizenship behavior on customer loyalty. *International Journal of Service Industry Management* 15(1): 27-53.
- Cavana, R. Y., Delahaye, B. L. & Sekaran, U. 2001. *Applied Business Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods*. Singapore: John Wiley & Sons.
- Chiaburu, D. S. & Baker, V. L. 2006. Extra-role behaviors challenging the status-quo. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 21(7): 620-637.
- Danaeefard, H., Balutbazeh, A. E. & Kashi, K. H. 2010. Good soldiers' perceptions of organizational politics: understanding the relation between organizational citizenship behaviors and perceptions of organizational politics: Evidence from Iran. *European Journal of Economics, Finance, and Administrative Sciences* 18(1): 146-162.
- Deewar, R. D., Whetten, D. A. & Boje, D. 1980. An examination of the reliability and validity of the Hage and Aiken scales of centralization, formalization, and task routineness. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 25(1): 120-128.
- Donaldson, S. L. & Grant-Vallone, E. J. 2002. Understanding self-report bias in organizational behavior research. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 17(2): 245-260.
- Fisher, G. B. & Hartel, C. E. 2004. Evidence for crossvergence in the perception of task and contextual performance: a study of western expatriates working in Thailand. *Cross Cultural Management* 11(2): 3-15.
- Fried, Y. & Ferris G. R. 1987. The validity of the job characteristics model: a review and metaanalysis. *Personnel Psychology* 40: 287-322
- Geisinger, G. F. 2003. Testing and assessment in cross-cultural psychology. In *Handbook of Psychology: Assessment Psychology*, edited by J.R. Graham, J.A. Naglieri & I.B. Weiner, Vol.10: 95-118. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- George, J. M. & Jones, G. R. 1997. Organizational spontaneity in context. *Human Performance* 10(2): 153-170.
- Gomez-Mejia, L. R., Balkin, D. B. & Cardy, R. L. 2007. *Managing Human Resources*. Upper Sadle River, NJ: Pearson Education International.
- Griffin, W. L., Brueckner, H. K. 1980. Caledonian Sm-Nd ages and a crustal origin for Norwegian eclogites. *Nature* 285: 319-321.
- Gwynne, P. 2000. How consistent are performance review criteria? *MIT Sloan Management Review* (Summer): 15-16.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E. & Tatham, R. L. 2006. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 6<sup>th</sup> edition. Uppersaddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Heneman, H. G. & Judge, T. A. 2003. *Staffing Organizations*. Middleton, MI: McGraw Hill.
- Holt, J. K. 2004. Item parceling in structural equation models for optimum solutions. Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, October 13-16, Columbus, OH.
- Hoofman, B. J., Blair, C. A., Meriac, J. P. & Woehr, D. J. 2002. Expanding the criterion domain? A quantitative review of the OCB literature. 21<sup>st</sup> Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Dallas, Texas.
- House, R. J. & Rizzo, J. R. 1972. Role conflict and ambiguity as critical variables in a model of organizational behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 7: 467-505.
- Jex, S. M. & Britt, T. W. 2008. *Organizational Psychology: A Scientist-practitioner Approach*. Hoboken, NJ: John-Wiley & Sons.
- Johnson, J. W. 2001. The relative importance of task and contextual performance dimensions of supervisory judgments of overall performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(5): 984-996.
- Kanungo, R. N. 1982. Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 67(3): 341-49.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. 1978. *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Kim, S. 2006. Public service motivation and organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Manpower* 27(8): 722-740.
- Kim, J. O. & Mueller, C.W. 1978. *Factor Analysis: Statistical Methods and Practical Issues*. Newbury Park: Sage Publication Inc.
- Kline, R. B. 2005. *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Koster, F. & Sanders, K. 2006. Organizational citizens or reciprocal relationships? an empirical comparison. *Personnel Review* 35(5): 519-537.
- Krejcie, R. V. & Morgan, D. W. 1970. Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 30: 607-61.
- Law, K. S. & Wong, C. S. 1999. Multidimensional constructs in structural equation analysis: An illustration using the job perception and job satisfaction constructs. *Journal of Management* 25(2): 143-160.
- Law, K. S., Wong, C. S. & Chen, Z. X. 2005. The construct of organizational citizenship behavior: Should we analyze after we have conceptualized? In *Handbook of Organizational Citizenship Behavior*, edited by D.L. Turnispeed, 47-65. New York, NY: Nova Scotia Publishers, Inc.
- LePine, J. A., Hanson, M. A., Borman, W. C. & Motowidlo, S.J. 2000. Contextual performance and teamwork: Implications for staffing. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* 19: 53-90.
- Luo, Z., Shi, K., Li, W. & Miao, D. 2008. Construct of job performance: Evidence from Chinese military soldiers. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* 11: 222-231.

- Moideenkutty, U. 2005. Organizational citizenship behavior and developmental experiences: do role definitions moderate the relationship? *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management* 6(2): 91-108.
- Moideenkutty, U., Blau, G., Kumar, R. & Nalakath, A. 2006. Comparing correlates of organizational citizenship and in-role behavior of sales representative in India. *International Journal of Commerce and Management* 16(1): 15-28.
- Moon, H., Van Dyne, L. & Wrobel, K. 2005. The circumplex model and the future of organizational citizenship behavior research. In *Handbook of Organizational Citizenship Behavior*, edited by D.L. Turnispeed, 1-23. New York: Nova Scotia Publishers, Inc.
- Morrison, E. W. 1994. Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal* 27(6): 1543-1567.
- Morrison, E. W. & Phelps, C. C. 1999. Taking charge at work: extra role efforts to initiate work change. *Academy of Management Journal* 42(4): 403-419.
- Motowidlo, S. J. 2003. Job performance. In *Handbook of Psychology: Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, edited by W.C. Borman, D.R. Ilgen & R.J. Klimoski, Vol. 12: 39-53. NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Motowidlo, S. J. & Van Scotter, J. R. 1994. Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 79(4): 475-480.
- Mwita, J. I. 2000. Performance management model: a system based approach to public service quality. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 13(1): 19-37.
- Netemeyer, R. G. & Maxham, J. G. 2006. Employee versus supervisor ratings of performance in the retail customer service sector: differences in predictive validity for customer outcomes. *Journal of Marketing* 71(2): 46-62.
- Organ, D. W. 1988a. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. 1988b. A restatement of the satisfaction-performance hypothesis. *Journal of Management* 14(4): 547-557.
- Organ, D. W. 1990. The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In *Research in Organizational Behavior*, eds. B.M. Staw, & L.L. Cummings, Vol. 12, 43-72. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Organ, D. W. 1997. Organizational citizenship behavior: it's construct cleanup time. *Human Performance* 10(1): 85-97.
- Organ, D. W. & Ryan, K. 1995. A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology* 48(4): 775-802.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M. & MacKenzie, S. B. 2006. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pincus, J. D. 1986. Communication satisfaction, job satisfaction, and job performance. *Human Communication Research* 12(3): 395-419.
- Podsakoff, P. M. & MacKenzie, S. B. 1997. Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: a review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance* 10(2): 133-152.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R.H. & Fetter, R. 1990. Transformational leadership behaviors and their effect on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and OCB. *Leadership Quarterly* 1(2): 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P., Mackenzie, S., Paine, J. & Bachrach, D. 2000. Organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management* 26(3): 513-563.
- Public Service Department 2011. Maklumat perjawatan dan pengisian sektor awam. Putrajaya: Author. Available at <http://www.jpa.gov.my/i-mapsa/Default.aspx?alias=www.jpa.gov.my/i-mapsa/perangkaan>.
- Pulakos, E. D., Schmitt, N. & Chan, D. 1996. Models of job performance ratings: an examination of rate race, rate gender, and rater level effects. *Human Performance* 19(2): 103-119.
- Radhakrishnan, P., Arrow, H. & Sniezek, J. A. 1996. Hoping, performing, learning, and predicting: changes in the accuracy of self-evaluations performance. *Human Performance* 9(1): 23-49.
- Sackett, P. R., Berry, C. M., Wiemann, S. A., Laczko, R. M. 2006. Citizenship and counterproductive behavior: clarifying relations between the two domains. *Human Performance* 19(4): 441-464.
- Sarminah, S. 2005. Unraveling the organizational commitment and job performance relationship: exploring the moderating effect of job satisfaction. *The Business Review Cambridge* 4(20): 79-84.
- Sekaran, U. 2003. *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach*. 4<sup>th</sup> edition. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Scandura, T. A. & Williams, E. A. 2000. Research methodology in management: current practices, trends, and implications for future research. *Academy of Management Journal* 43(6): 1248-1264.
- Schmitt, N. & Chan, D. 1998. *Personnel Selection: A Theoretical Approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schumacker, R. E. & Lomax, R. G. 2004. *A Beginner's Guide to Structural Equation Model*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Spitzmuller, M., Van Dyne, L. & Ilies, R. 2008. Organizational citizenship behavior: a review and extension of its nomological network. *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Behavior* 106-123.
- Suliman, A. M. 2003. Self and supervisor ratings of performance: Evidence from an individualistic culture. *Employee Relations* 20(4): 371-388.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. 2007. *Using Multivariate Statistics*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Tett, R. P. & Burnett, D. D. 2003. A personality trait-based interactionist model of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 88(3): 500-517.
- Tubre, T. C. 2000. Development of a general measure of performance. Unpublished doctoral Diss., Texas A & M University, Texas.
- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L. & McLean Parks, J. 1995. Extra role behavior: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). In *Research in Organizational Behavior*, eds. L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw. Vol. 17, 215-285. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Van Dyne, L. & LePine, J. A. 1998. Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: evidence of construct validity and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal* 37(4): 765-802.

- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W. & Dienesch, R. M. 1994. Organizational citizenship behavior: construct redefinition, measurement and validation. *Academy of Management Journal* 37(4): 756-802.
- Van Scotter, J. R. & Motowidlo, S. J. 1996. Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 81(5): 525-531.
- Veal, J. 2005. *Business Research Methods: A Managerial Approach*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Frenchs Forest: Pearson Education Australia.
- Vey, M. A. & Campbell, J. P. 2004. In-role or extra-role organizational citizenship behavior: which are we measuring? *Human Performance* 17(1): 119-135.
- Viswesvaran, C. 1993. Modeling job performance: Is there a general factor? Unpublished Doctoral Diss., The University of Iowa, Iowa.
- Viswesvaran, C., Ones, D. S. & Schmidt, D. S. 1996. Comparative analysis of the reliability of the job performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 81(5): 557-574.
- Wall, T. D., Michie, J., Patterson, M., Wood, S. J., Sheehan, M., Clegg, C. W. & West, M. 2004. On the validity of subjective measures of company performance. *Personnel Psychology* 57(2): 95-118.
- Werner, O. & Campbell, D. T. 1970. Translating, working through interpreters and the problem of decentering. In *A Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*, ed. R.N. Cohen. New York, NY: American Museum of Natural History.
- Wiedower, K. A. 2001. A shared vision: the relationship of management communication and contingent reinforcement of the corporate vision with job performance, organizational commitment, and intent to leave, Unpublished Doctoral Diss., Alliant International University, California.
- Williams, R. S. 2002. *Managing Employee Performance: Design and Implementation in Organizations*. London, UK: Thompson Learning.
- Williams, L. J. & Anderson, S. E. 1991. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship behavior and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management* 17(1): 601-617.
- Wilson, M. G. 2005. Refining organizational citizenship behavior: the soldier's tale. In *Handbook of Organizational Citizenship Behavior*, ed. D.L. Turnispeed, 345-361. New York, NY: Nova Scotia Publishers.
- Wong, C., Law, K. S. & Huang, G. 2008. On the importance of conducting construct-level analysis for multidimensional constructs in theory development and testing. *Journal of Management* 34(1): 744-764.
- Worthington, R. L. & Whittaker, T. A. 2006. Scale development research: a content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist* 34(6): 806- 838.
- Yousef, D. 1998. Satisfaction with job security as a predictor of organizational commitment and job performance in a multicultural environment. *International Journal of Manpower* 19(3): 184-194.

Johanim Johari (Corresponding author)  
College of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia  
06010 Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia  
E-mail: johanim@uum.edu.my

Khulida Kirana Yahya  
College of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia  
06010 Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia  
E-mail: khulida@uum.edu.my