

Valuing Task and Contextual Performance: Experience, Job Roles, and Ratings of the Importance of Job Behaviors

Nancy Befort and Keith Hattrup
San Diego State University

The present research examined the effects of managerial experience and managerial job roles on ratings of the importance of behaviors reflecting task and contextual performance. As hypothesized, managerial experience was positively related to perceptions of the importance of contextual performance behaviors reflecting compliance and extra effort. Managers who reported performing leadership role behaviors were also more likely than those who reported fewer of these activities to value extra effort, whereas managers who performed more supervisory activities valued task performance more than did those who were less involved in supervision. Regression analyses indicated that experience had unique effects on ratings of compliance and extra effort after controlling for the managerial role variables, whereas the unique effects of the role variables only approached significance after controlling for experience.

It is widely agreed that job performance is a multidimensional construct (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Campbell, Gasser, & Oswald, 1996). Of the dimensions of performance that have been discussed, two general factors have received the most attention, namely task performance and contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Motowidlo & Schmit, 1999; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). Task performance includes behaviors that contribute to the core transformation and maintenance activities in an organization, such as producing products, selling merchandise, acquiring inventory, managing subordinates, or delivering services (Motowidlo & Schmit, 1999). Contextual performance, in contrast, refers to behaviors that contribute to the culture and climate of the organization, in other words, the context within which transformation and maintenance activities are carried out. Volunteering for extra work, persisting with enthusiasm, helping and cooperating with others, following rules and procedures, and supporting or defending the organization are all examples of contextual performance behaviors (Motowidlo & Schmit, 1999).

The nature of job performance in an organization depends on the demands of the job, the goals and mission of the organization, and beliefs in the organization about which behaviors are most valued (Motowidlo & Schmit, 1999; Murphy & Shiarella, 1997). Thus, research has established that the relative importance given to task versus contextual behaviors has important implications for the definition of performance that is used in formulating human resource decisions. For example, Murphy and Shiarella (1997) showed that the validity of selection procedures depends on the relative values placed on task and contextual performance. Research

has also demonstrated that supervisors differ in the relative weight they give to the two dimensions when judging an employee's overall contribution to the organization (e.g., Johnson, 2001; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). Decisions about promotions or other rewards, therefore, may depend on the relative values that managers place on the task and contextual performance-relevant behaviors exhibited by their subordinates. Other research has demonstrated that the relative importance that an organization places on task and contextual performance may influence adverse impact and minority hiring (Hatrup, Rock, & Scalia, 1997).

Values about the nature of job performance are typically expressed most directly in the context of a thorough job or organization analysis (e.g., Harvey, 1991). A common job analysis method involves collecting ratings of the importance of various job-relevant behaviors; the Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ; McCormick, Jeannerett, & Mecham, 1972) is a noteworthy example. When such ratings are provided, the job/organization analysis has the potential to clarify and communicate the job-relevant behaviors that are most valued, and thus guide decisions about who is hired, the types of behaviors that are exhibited at work, the behaviors that are trained, and the behaviors that are rewarded by supervisors. Although several studies have examined variation in job analysis ratings (Ferris, Fedor, Rowland, & Porac, 1985; Landy & Vasey, 1991; Mullins & Kimbrough, 1988; Schmitt & Cohen, 1989), very little of the research has been driven by theory, and virtually no research has examined variation in ratings of the importance of task and contextual performance in organizations.

Hence, the purpose of the present research is to examine individual variation in ratings of the importance of behaviors reflecting task and contextual performance. Given the important implications for human resource planning and decision making of differing values of task and contextual performance, there is a critical need to explore potential sources of variation in these values. Of particular interest is whether such variation can be predicted based on existing theoretical and empirical literature. Thus, the present study relies on existing literature to develop hypotheses about the influences of managerial experience and job roles on the relative importance that managers place on task and contextual performance behaviors.

Variation in Job Analysis Ratings

The collection of ratings about the importance of tasks or behaviors in an organization involves inherently perceptual and subjective processes (Morgeson & Campion, 1997). As a consequence, perceptions of the importance or value of organizationally-relevant behaviors are subject to variability among individuals, work units, organizations, and so on. For example, several studies have shown variability in the ratings provided by different subject matter experts during job analyses (Ferris et al., 1985; Landy & Vasey, 1991; Mullins & Kimbrough, 1988; Schmitt & Cohen, 1989). Most of the research on variability in job analysis ratings assumes that such variability reflects inaccuracy (Morgeson & Campion, 1997). However, because definitions of valued job tasks and behaviors are inherently social constructions, and because individuals often redefine the nature of their specific job and role (Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1991; Murphy & Jackson, 1999), it is difficult to

ascertain whether variability in job ratings reflects inaccuracy or true and substantively important differences (Morgeson & Campion, 1997).

Although the theoretical and practical implications of variability in ratings of job behaviors are significant, the majority of the empirical research on job analysis rating variance has been inconsistent and atheoretical (Harvey, 1991; Schmitt & Chan, 1998). Although several studies have observed a small number of weak effects associated with rater experience, sex, race, and other demographic variables, there have been few attempts to provide theoretical explanations of these results (Schmitt & Chan, 1998). Morgeson and Campion (1997) recently proposed a model that includes 16 potential social and cognitive sources of variance in job ratings. They also identified a number of rating method and source variables that may influence ratings of job tasks and behaviors.

Another approach to the study of job rating variance would incorporate recent taxonomic models of the dimensions of job behavior (cf. Schmitt & Chan, 1998), and available research on factors that might contribute to differences in perceptions of job behaviors that reflect various performance dimensions. Such research has the potential to uncover processes that influence the definition of job performance that is used in formulating human resource planning and decision making. As described below, the present study tests hypotheses about the impact of managerial experience and job roles on ratings of the importance of task and contextual performance behaviors using a sample of computer software engineering managers.

Hypotheses

Of the factors that might influence perceptions of the relative importance of behaviors in an organization, we focus on two variables at the individual level of analysis that reflect salient dimensions along which managers differ, namely experience and job roles. Managers play a central role in organizations by formulating policy, developing strategies, and directing, facilitating, and monitoring the performance of others (Yukl, 2002; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992). Several models of the development of leadership focus on the role of experience in the acquisition of skills and attitudes relevant to the effective management of organizations (Mumford, Marks, Connelly, Zaccaro, & Reiter-Palmon, 2000; Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs, & Fleishman, 2000). For example, McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) reported that an increased focus on the social and interpersonal context of work was associated with the development of leadership competence through experience. They noted that beginning managers typically focused on technical knowledge and corporate procedural guidelines in the earliest stages of their careers. Novice managers are likely to be assigned well-structured tasks with narrow-reaching consequences, and they are usually more closely supervised than managers with greater experience (Mumford, Marks, et al., 2000; Yukl, 2002). In the counseling literature, Hess (1987) and Watkins (1990) argued that beginning supervisors focus on what is concrete and how to teach specific task skills to their subordinates. A focus on the tasks performed by oneself and others would, therefore, seem common among inexperienced managers.

With increased experience, however, managers are typically assigned more complex problems and are given responsibility for solutions that have potentially far-reaching consequences (Mumford & Connelly, 1991; Yukl, 2002). Thus, higher levels of creative problem solving and an increased need to be aware of the social context within which plans are implemented become increasingly important as leaders acquire experience and gain responsibility (Mumford & Connelly, 1991; Mumford, Marks, et al., 2000; Mumford, Zaccaro, et al., 2000). For example, McCall et al. (1988) reported that, with experience, managers learned that their effectiveness as leaders depended on the social and interpersonal context within which tasks were carried out. Mumford, Marks, et al. (2000) observed that more experienced managers had higher levels of skills related to complex social judgment. Because managers appear to develop through experience an appreciation of behaviors reflecting contextual performance, we predict that ratings of the importance of contextual behaviors in the organization will be higher among more experienced managers compared to their less experienced counterparts.

Hypothesis 1: Managerial experience will be positively correlated with ratings of the importance of contextual performance in organizations.

Theories of the development of leadership skills and attitudes (McCall et al., 1988; Mumford, Zaccaro, et al., 2000) posit that experienced managers develop complex problem solving skills, creativity, and task knowledge. Furthermore, Conway (1999) observed that supervisors tended to focus more on task performance than contextual performance when evaluating subordinates, suggesting that supervisors and managers are generally concerned about the task performance of their work units. Thus, we do not hypothesize any relationship between managerial experience and ratings of the importance of task performance in organizations.

The developmental nature of managerial experience does not occur simply because of the passage of time, or the sheer number of managerial experiences. The behaviors, skills, attitudes, and values that are acquired also depend on the nature of the job roles to which managers are assigned (Day, 2000; McCall et al., 1988; Mumford, Zaccaro, et al., 2000; Yukl, 2002). This distinction between the amount of time a manager has held leadership positions, or the number of managerial positions he or she has held, and the *types* of roles that the manager has filled, is similar to a distinction offered in the literature between experience amount and experience type (Tesluk & Jacobs, 1998). Certainly, it is reasonable to expect that the types of positions or roles occupied by managers, or the types of behaviors they are called upon to exhibit, change over time with the accumulation of greater amounts of relevant experience. Thus, it is important to evaluate the relationships between managerial job roles and perceptions of the importance of task and contextual behavior.

The roles occupied by organization members determine the types of behaviors they exhibit (Murphy & Jackson, 1999; Yukl, 2002). Thus, the developmental models of leadership described above imply that the behaviors exhibited by managers change over time as a function of new assignments or areas of responsibility. Less experienced managers are typically assigned well-structured

problems of limited scope where their behaviors are closely monitored (Mumford, Marks, et al. 2000; Yukl, 2002). These types of limited assignments require day-to-day monitoring, coaching, support, and evaluation of subordinates (McCall et al., 1988; Mumford, Marks, et al., 2000; Mumford, Zaccaro, et al., 2000). Managers who exhibit these types of day-to-day supervisory activity should be focused on the accomplishment of specific or narrow tasks, and are, therefore, likely to value the task performance of their subordinates more than managers who do not exhibit these types of managerial behaviors. As managers are assigned more complex problems or broader areas of responsibility, their behavior focuses more on coordination and negotiation with other constituencies, planning, and development of organization strategy (McCall; et al., 1988; Mumford, Marks, et al., 2000; Mumford, Zaccaro, et al., 2000; Yukl, 2002). Because these types of behaviors require attention to the context within which tasks are performed, managers who report exhibiting these types of higher-level leadership functions should value contextual performance in the organization more than managers who do not engage in these activities. Thus, we predict that ratings of the importance of task performance in the organization will be positively related to the extent to which managers report performing day-to-day supervisory activities, and ratings of the importance of contextual performance will relate to the extent to which managers report performing higher level leadership activities.

Hypothesis 2a: Ratings of the importance of task performance will correlate positively with ratings of the extent to which managers exhibit day-to-day supervisory behaviors.

Hypothesis 2b: Ratings of the importance of contextual performance will correlate positively with ratings of the extent to which managers exhibit higher-level leadership behaviors.

Method

Participants and Procedure

A questionnaire assessing managerial experience, job roles, and perceptions of the importance of various job behaviors was electronically mailed (e-mailed) to all 302 managers and directors of a mid-sized computer software engineering firm located in the United States. Of the 302 participants identified for the study, 96 questionnaires were returned, reflecting a response rate of 31.8%. Eight participants indicated that they held non-managerial positions (e.g. account representatives), and therefore were excluded from analysis, resulting in a final sample of 88 managers. All respondents completed the questionnaire on their personal computers, and returned their responses via e-mail.

Of the final sample, 67 (76.1%) were men and 21 (23.9%) were women, with an average age of about 42 years old ($M = 41.65$, $SD = 7.09$). Most ($N = 78$; 88.6%) indicated they were of North American or European descent; the remainder were Hispanic ($N = 4$; 4.5%), African American ($N = 1$; 1.1%), Asian ($N = 4$; 4.5%), or

Asian/Indian ($N = 1$; 1.1%). The sample reported having an average of 9.81 years of experience in managerial positions ($SD = 7.64$), and an average of 2.07 years in their current positions ($SD = 1.87$). Because of the anonymous nature of the questionnaire administered in this study, we were not able to assess the representativeness of the sample of managers with respect to experience. However, the age, gender and ethnicity of the final sample of participants was reasonably representative of the total population of managers in this organization ($N = 302$: Mean age = 41.67, $SD = 6.92$; Percent male = 83.4%; Percent non-white = 12.6%).

Measures

Managerial Experience. Because our hypothesis with respect to the effects of experience focuses on the impact of the amount or length of experience in managerial roles on beliefs about job behaviors, we developed a multi-item measure that reflected the quantity of experience in managerial roles. In particular, four items were written to assess (1) the number of months employed in managerial positions, (2) the number of managerial positions held, (3) the number of organizations in which a managerial position was held, and (4) the number of industries in which a managerial position was held. Intercorrelations among these items ranged from .45 to .69, with an average inter-item correlation of .58. Given the high degree of collinearity among these items, we formed a single composite measure of experience by averaging the standardized scores on the four experience items. The internal consistency reliability (Alpha) of the 4-item measure was .84 in the present sample.

Managerial Job Roles. To assess the primary job functions or roles performed by participants, we constructed a multi-item measure of the extent to which participants performed each of several common managerial behaviors. Participants rated the frequency with which they performed each of 11 general management behaviors that we derived from the *O*NET Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT)*, 1998-1999 version. The eleven behaviors were a sample of those that appeared in the job descriptions for each managerial position described in the DOT, and thus, have wide applicability across managerial positions. The items used to assess managerial job roles are presented in the Appendix. An effort was made to include behaviors that reflected day-to-day supervision and monitoring of individual subordinate performance (e.g., “How frequently do you schedule work and activities?”), and higher-level leadership behaviors (e.g., “How frequently do you develop objectives and strategies?”). Participants used a 5-point Likert scale with anchors, “Never” to “Very Frequently”, to indicate how often they performed each behavior.

An exploratory principal factors analysis was performed on the 11-item measure. Items were retained for a factor if their loadings exceeded .25 on the primary factor, and differed by at least .15 between factors. Two interpretable factors were extracted, together accounting for 44.39% of the item variance. The first factor included five items that measured day-to-day monitoring and management of subordinates and was labeled *supervision*. The second factor included 6 items that measured development, goal setting, and planning and was

labeled *leadership*. The items included in each scale are shown in the appendix. The factor analysis largely supported our expectation that managerial behaviors would be distinguishable on the basis of the extent to which they reflected day-to-day supervisory activities reflecting a direct authority role, and behaviors reflecting higher-level leadership activities, such as influencing others. Internal consistency reliabilities of the supervision and leadership scales that were formed from these factors were .68 and .80, respectively.

Task and Contextual Job Behaviors. Based on a review of the available literature, a multi-item measure was developed to assess perceptions of the importance of several general work behaviors. Given that participants in this study, and the employees they managed, performed a variety of job functions with unclear boundaries between identifiable “jobs”, we focused on perceptions of the importance of work behaviors in the *organization* generally, rather than the importance of behaviors for a specific *job*. In that sense, our approach is similar to recent suggestions that performance in modern flexible organizations in volatile industries, like the organization that participated in this research, does not fit the model of work as organized according to neatly bundled jobs (Bowen, Ledford, & Nathan, 1991; Bridges, 1994; Motowidlo & Schmit, 1999; Murphy & Jackson, 1999). As a consequence, our approach is more similar to an analysis of the organization’s goals, mission, and values, rather than the requirements of specific jobs per se (Bowen et al., 1991; Kristof, 1996).

A total of 9 items were written to assess the importance of behaviors reflecting task performance. These included 4 items designed to assess the importance of behaviors that reflect core transformation activities (e.g., “The individual proficiently completes all duties that are central to the job”), 3 items designed to assess the importance of behaviors that service and maintain the organization’s technical core (e.g., “The individual ensures that all items necessary to complete his/her duties are in ample supply at all times”), and 2 items designed to assess the importance of oral and written communication. An additional set of 11 items were written to assess the importance of behaviors relevant to the five categories of contextual performance described by Borman and Motowidlo (1993), including volunteering to carry out additional tasks, persisting with enthusiasm, helping and cooperating with others, following rules and procedures, and endorsing and supporting organizational objectives. Participants were asked to rate the importance of each of the 20 behaviors in their organization using a 5-point Likert scale with anchors, “Not at all Important” to “Very Important.”

An exploratory principle factors analysis was performed to identify dimensions of behaviors considered important by participants. Three interpretable factors were extracted from the principle factors analysis, accounting for 33.96% of the item variance. Appendix A presents the final scales formed from the factor analysis. The first factor, labeled *compliance*, included items related to following organizational rules and procedures, and items related to representing the organization favorably to others. A second factor was comprised of items that related to extra effort and initiative, and was labeled *extra effort*. The distinction between compliance and extra effort in the present results is similar to a distinction

described by Organ (1988) between generalized compliance and altruism, respectively, and a distinction described by Coleman and Borman (2000) between job-task conscientiousness and organizational citizenship. A third factor in the present study included items reflecting task performance behaviors, and was labeled *task performance*. Although three factors were identified in the principle factors analysis, *communication* was added as a fourth a priori factor given the somewhat anomalous finding that the oral and written communication items loaded weakly on the first factor extracted in the analysis. In all, three of the behavior importance items were discarded for failing to load on any factor. The internal consistency reliabilities of the task performance, communication, compliance, and extra effort scales were .68, .73, .77, and .71, respectively.

Results

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics and intercorrelations among the study variables. As can be seen, experience correlated positively with ratings of the importance of compliance and extra effort, supporting the first hypothesis of the study. Experience was not significantly correlated with ratings of the importance of task performance or communication. As hypothesized, the leadership role scale was positively correlated with ratings of the importance of extra effort, but was not significantly correlated with ratings of the importance of the other three job behavior dimensions. The supervision scale correlated positively with ratings of the importance of task performance, as predicted by Hypothesis 2a. The supervision scale did not correlate with ratings of the importance of the other categories of behavior, however.

As can be seen in Table 1, experience also correlated positively with the leadership role scale, indicating that as managers acquired more experience they were more likely to perform the leadership role behaviors. This is not surprising given that experienced managers are more likely than less experienced managers to take on activities associated with high-level executive positions in organizations, where they focus more on long-range planning and strategy development (e.g., Yukl, 2002). Age was also correlated positively with experience, which is an expected result. Given these correlations among the independent variables, we performed a series of regression analyses to explore the unique effects of experience and job roles on perceptions of the job behaviors. An additional set of regression analyses were performed controlling for age.

Table 2 presents results of regression analyses of each of the dimensions of job behavior on the set of independent variables. As can be seen from the results of tests that excluded age from the models, none of the independent variables had a significant effect on perceptions of the importance of task performance or communication. Although the zero-order correlation between supervision and ratings of the importance of task performance was statistically significant, the unique effects of supervision after controlling for experience only approached significance. After controlling for the supervision and leadership scales, experience related significantly to ratings of the importance of compliance; however, the job role scales failed to have significant unique effects. Ratings of the importance of extra effort

were significantly related to experience after controlling for the supervision and leadership scales. The unique effects of leadership on ratings of extra effort only approached significance.

Results of regressions that controlled for age showed a pattern that was similar to what was observed when age was excluded from the analyses. After controlling for age, experience continued to have significant positive effects on ratings of the importance of extra effort, both when the job role scales were included (Model 3) and when they were excluded (Model 2) from the analyses. Again, the unique effects of leadership on perceptions of the importance of extra effort approached significance. However, experience failed to demonstrate unique significant effects on ratings of the importance of compliance when age was statistically controlled.

Discussion

The purpose of this research was to explore variation in ratings of the importance of task and contextual behaviors. We hypothesized that managerial experience and job roles would explain variance in perceptions of the importance of behaviors reflecting task and contextual performance. Hence, the primary goal of this study was to explore individual differences in the meaning of job performance, and whether variation in values placed on different types of job-relevant behavior could be predicted based on the extant literature. Given that beliefs about the importance or value of job behaviors can have profound effects on many human resource decisions, including staffing, performance appraisal, rewards, training, and job design, there is a critical need to identify potential sources of variation in these values. The results of the present study provide an initial test of two hypothesized factors at the individual level of analysis that may influence variance in these values.

Table 1: Means, standard deviations, internal consistency reliabilities, and intercorrelations of variables in the study

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Age	41.65	7.09								
2. Experience	0.00	.85	.55**	(.84)						
3. Supervision	3.90	.70	.19	.13	(.68)					
4. Leadership	3.65	.65	.26**	.32**	.49**	(.80)				
5. Task performance	3.97	.52	.14	-.03	.23*	.14	(.68)			
6. Communication	3.89	.82	.04	-.01	-.05	.08	.36**	(.73)		
7. Compliance	3.25	.62	.16	.21*	-.04	.02	.32**	.37**	(.77)	
8. Extra effort	3.21	.67	.22	.33**	.04	.25*	.23*	.25*	.22*	(.71)

* p < .05 ** p < .01

Table 2: Results of regressions of job dimension ratings on experience, job roles, and age

Variables	Task Performance		Communication		Compliance		Extra Effort	
	Excluding Age	Controlling for age	Excluding Age	Controlling for age	Excluding Age	Controlling for age	Excluding Age	Controlling for age
	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β
Model 1								
Age		.13		.04		.16		.20 [†]
R ²		.02		.00		.03		.04 [†]
Model 2								
Age		.19		.05		.07		.05
Experience	-.03	-.12	-.01	-.03	.21*	.18	.33**	.31*
R ²	.00	.03	.00	.00	.05*	.05	.11**	.11**
Model 3								
Age		.16		.06		.08		.04
Experience	-.07	-.15	-.04	-.07	.23*	.19	.27*	.25*
Supervision	.21 [†]	.19	.15	-.12	-.03	-.04	-.10	-.11
Leadership	.07	.06	-.12	.15	-.05	-.06	.21 [†]	.21 [†]
R ²	.06	.08	.02	.02	.05	.06	.14**	.14*

[†] p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01

Tests of the zero-order correlations between managerial experience and perceptions of the importance of various dimensions of job performance supported our hypothesis that more experienced managers would value contextual performance to a greater degree than would less experienced managers. In particular, managerial experience, operationalized with a multi-item measure of the amount of time spent in management and the number of managerial roles held across organizations and industries, was positively correlated with ratings of the importance of compliance and extra effort. As hypothesized, results of the present study supported the notion that managers develop an appreciation of the importance of the organizational context within which tasks are performed as they acquire experience. Our results are consistent with McCall et al.'s (1988) observations that managers learn over time to focus more on behaviors that contribute to the social and interpersonal needs of their subordinates, and behaviors that contribute to a positive work climate. Our results, however, did not indicate that ratings of the importance of task performance or communication differed between managers who differed in experience. These results are consistent with the notion that task performance is important to all managers, and perhaps is perceived as central to the functioning of an organization,

whereas the value of contextual performance increases as managers acquire experience.

Tests of the relationships between managerial job roles and ratings of the importance of job behaviors supported the hypothesis that managers who perform higher-level leadership behaviors as part of their job roles value extra effort more than do managers who perform fewer of these leadership behaviors. The nature of the demands of leadership roles are such that they appear to increase the likelihood that managers will consider extra effort in the organization as salient and important, compared to when managers perform fewer of these leadership behaviors. Results also demonstrated that managers who reported performing more of the day-to-day supervisory behaviors valued task performance more than did managers who reported performing fewer of these behaviors. As expected, the demands of supervisory roles are such that they appear to increase the likelihood that the task performance of organizational members is considered salient and important. It is not entirely clear why ratings of the importance of communication and compliance were unrelated to managerial roles. Research is clearly needed to replicate and extend these findings in different samples.

Results of hierarchical regression analyses designed to evaluate the unique effects of the experience and managerial job role variables demonstrated that experience continued to have significant unique effects on ratings of the importance of compliance and extra effort after controlling for the supervision and leadership job role scales. This suggests that the effects of experience on ratings of the importance of contextual performance are not entirely mediated through differences in job roles. In other words, experience appears to add something to the prediction of ratings of the importance of job behaviors that is unrelated to experience-related differences in job roles. The unique effects of the managerial job role scales on ratings of the importance of task performance and extra effort only approached significance, however, despite the fact that the zero-order correlations between the job role scales and these performance dimensions were statistically significant. This suggests that some of the effects of the managerial role variables on perceptions of the importance of behaviors are accounted for by the experience variable. It is quite likely, however, that with greater statistical power, both the role variables and experience would have demonstrated significant unique effects on ratings of the importance of task performance and compliance. In the balance, the overall pattern of results suggests that experience and managerial job role variables have significant and somewhat unique effects on ratings of the importance of behaviors reflecting extra effort and task performance.

As would be expected given the nature of experience, age was positively correlated with the amount of experience reported by managers in the present sample. When age was statistically controlled in the regression analyses, experience continued to have significant positive effects on perceptions of the importance of extra effort, whereas the relationship between experience and ratings of compliance became non-significant. Thus, among managers who are equivalent in age, higher levels of experience relate to higher perceptions of the importance of extra effort. In contrast, the zero-order correlation we observed between experience and ratings of the importance of compliance appeared from the regression analyses to be largely a

function of age. We consider this a particularly strong test of the effects of experience given the natural confound that exists between age and experience in the population. The results of our regressions demonstrate that extra effort matters more to managers who have more experience, regardless of their age, whereas compliance matters more to more experienced managers, in part, because of increased age. Clearly, there is a need to replicate and extend these findings using samples of organization members who differ in job level, experience, age, and a host of other factors.

As with all field research, this study is not without limitations. Perhaps most significant is the small sample available for the factor analyses used to construct scales, and for the regression analyses of unique effects of the independent variables. The results of our regression analyses showed that, of the regression models that were statistically significant, about 5% to 14% of the variance in perceptions of the importance of job behaviors were related to age, experience, and managerial job roles. However, it is important to note that although the overall effects of the independent variables we examined were not large, the effects are likely to compound in most organizations given the important role that these perceptions would likely play in determining many human resource decisions, including selection, appraisal, training, and compensation, to name a few.

Overall, the results of the present study provide evidence that organizational members differ in their perceptions of the value of different kinds of behaviors at work. Differences in the value of work behaviors appear to be related to the level of experience of organizational members who manage and coordinate the activities of others, and who establish strategies and goals for the organization. Given that perceptions of the value of job behaviors are social constructions that can have profound effects on who gets hired, who is rewarded, how workers are trained, and what workers are expected to do, there is a critical need to examine the individual, organizational, and cultural sources of differences in these values. The present findings suggest that managerial experience and job roles may influence the definition of job performance that is used in formulating human resource decisions. An important direction for future research might be to examine how agreement about the meaning of job performance emerges in organizations and how it is communicated to organizational members.

References

- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bowen, D. E., Ledford, G. E., & Nathan, B. R. (1991). Hiring for the organization, not the job. *Academy of Management Executive*, 5, 35-51.
- Campbell, J. P., Gasser, M. B., & Oswald, F. L. (1996). The substantive nature of job performance variability. In K. R. Murphy (Ed.), *Individual differences and behavior in organizations* (pp. 258-299). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Coleman, V. I., & Borman, W. C. (2000). Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain. *Human Resource Management Review, 10*, 24-44.

Conway, J. M. (1999). Distinguishing contextual performance from task performance for managerial jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 3-13.

Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly, 11*, 581-613.

Ferris, H. S., Fedor, D. B., Rowland, R. M., & Porac, J. F. (1985). Social influence and sex effects on task performance and task perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 36*, 66-78.

Harvey, R. J. (1991). Job analysis. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd Ed., Vol. 2, pp. 71-164). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists' Press.

Hatrup, K., Rock, J., & Scalia, C. (1997). The effects of varying conceptualizations of job performance on adverse impact, minority hiring, and predicted performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 656-664.

Hess, A. K. (1987). Psychotherapy supervision: Stages, Buber, and a theory of relationship. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18*, 251-259.

Ilgen, D. R., & Hollenbeck, J. R. (1991). The structure of work: Job design and roles. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd Ed., Vol. 2, pp. 165-207). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists' Press.

Johnson, J. W. (2001). The relative importance of task and contextual performance dimensions to supervisor judgments of overall performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 984-996.

Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49*, 1-50.

Landy, F. J., & Vasey, J. (1991). Job analysis: The composition of SME samples. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 27-50.

McCall, M. W., Lombardo, M. M., & Morrison, A. M. (1988). *The lessons of experience: How successful executives develop on the job*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

McCormick, E. J., Jeanneret, P. R., & Mecham, R. C. (1972). A study of job characteristics and job dimensions based on the Position Analysis Questionnaire. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 56*, 347-368.

Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (1997). Social and cognitive sources of potential inaccuracy in job analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 627-655.

Motowidlo, S. J., & Schmit, M. J. (1999). Performance assessment in unique jobs. In D. R. Ilgen & E. D. Pulakos (Eds.), *The changing nature of performance* (pp. 56-86). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Mullins, W. C., & Kimbrough, W. W. (1988). Group composition as a determinant of job analysis outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*, 657-664.

Mumford, M. D., Marks, M. A., Connelly, M. S., Zaccaro, S. J., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2000). Development of leadership skills: Experience and timing. *Leadership Quarterly, 11*, 87-114.

Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Harding, F. D., Jacobs, T. O., & Fleishman, E. A. (2000). Leadership skills for a changing world: Solving complex social problems. *Leadership Quarterly, 11*, 11-35.

Murphy, K. R., & Shiarella, A. H. (1997). Implications of the multidimensional nature of job performance for the validity of selection tests: Multivariate frameworks for studying test validity. *Personnel Psychology, 50*, 823-854.

Murphy, P. R., & Jackson, S. E. (1999). Managing work role performance: Challenges for twenty-first-century organizations and their employees. In D. R. Ilgen & E. D. Pulakos (Eds.), *The changing nature of performance: Implications for staffing, motivation, and development* (pp. 325-365). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

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*, 66-80.

Schmitt, N., & Chan, D. (1998). *Personnel selection: A theoretical approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schmitt, N., & Cohen, S. A. (1989). Internal analyses of task ratings by job incumbents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 96-104.

Tesluk, P. E., & Jacobs, R. R. (1998). Toward an integrated model of work experience. *Personnel Psychology, 51*, 321-355.

Watkins, C. E. (1990). Development of the psychotherapy supervisor. *Psychotherapy, 27*, 553-559.

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G., & Van Fleet, D. D. (1992). Theory and research on leadership in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd Ed., Vol. 3, pp. 147-198). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists' Press.

Address correspondence to:

Keith Hattrup
Department of Psychology
San Diego State University
5500 Campanile Dr.
San Diego, CA 92182-4611
khatrup@sunstroke.sdsu.edu
(619) 594-1876

Appendix

Measures of Supervision, Leadership, Task Performance, and Contextual Performance

Managerial Job Role Scales

Supervision

How frequently do you schedule work and activities?

How frequently do you coordinate the work activities of your subordinates?

How frequently do you guide, direct, and motivate your subordinates?

How frequently do you coach and develop your subordinates?

How frequently do you monitor the progress of your subordinates?

Leadership

How frequently do you develop objectives and strategies?

How frequently do you resolve conflicts?

How frequently do you develop and build teams in your organization?

How frequently do you teach coworkers?

How frequently do you provide consultation and advice to other coworkers?

How frequently do you influence others in the organization?

Task and Contextual Performance Scales

Task Performance

Produces high quality work.

Proficiently completes all duties central to the job.

Completes job duties in a timely manner.

Ensures that all items necessary to perform the job are present.

Makes few mistakes.

Prioritizes work schedule according to deadlines.

Communication

Displays good written communication skills.

Displays good oral communication skills.

Compliance

Endorses organizational policies and procedures.

Adheres to organizational values even when inconvenient.

Displays respect for authority.

Completes job duties according to procedures.

Represents the organization favorably to outsiders.

Extra Effort

Volunteers to complete extra tasks.

Takes on extra projects that are not formally part of the job.

Displays extra effort in the completion of tasks.

Completes job duties with extra enthusiasm.