

TESTING THE ROLE OF TASK PERFORMANCE AS A MEDIATING VARIABLE ON THE EFFECT OF ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION AND JOB SATISFACTION ON CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE

Fahrudin Js Pareke¹
Lizar Alfansi²
Benardin³

ABSTRACT. Employees' performance is one of the most important aspects that have attracted interest from practitioners, researchers and academicians. Performance can be classified into task performance and contextual performance, might determined by achievement motivation and job satisfaction. Current study investigated empirically the causal relationship among achievement motivation, job satisfaction, task performance and contextual performance. Two-hundred-and-sixty-four employees selected as a research sample using stratified random sampling method, just as many as 249 questionnaires returned, and only 228 questionnaires are processed further in data analyses. The data analyses using Hierarchical regression analysis (HRA) and Mediated Regression Analysis (MRA). This study concluded that the achievement motivation affect the task performance, but not the contextual performance. Job satisfaction has a positive effect on task and contextual performance. Effect of job satisfaction is higher than achievement motivation on the task performance and contextual performance. Furthermore, the study also proved that the task performance mediated the effect of job satisfaction on contextual performance.

Keywords: achievement motivation; job satisfaction; task performance; contextual performance

2016 GBSE Journal

INTRODUCTION

Performance affects the various aspects of the employee's work life, such as behavior, attitudes and traits which help to increase the productivity of an organization (Som, 2015). According to Wetzels et al. (2000), employee's performance is the level of success in executing tasks, responsibilities, and orders assigned to them. Organ (1988) identified and classified the performance of individual employees into two major parts, task performance and contextual performance. Task performance involves patterns of behaviors that are directly involved in producing goods or service or activities that provide indirect support for the organization's core technical processes (Kahya, 2007). While contextual performance is the individual efforts are not directly related to the duties and functions of the main it is important for the effectiveness of the organization in the long term (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Motowidlo & Schmit, 1999; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). Contextual performance differs from task performance as

the latter contributes to the technical core and involves work directed towards the production of goods and services i.e. job role and assigned task duties whereas the former provides support to the social and psychological environment where in the assigned duties are performed. (Sen and Kaul, 2015).

¹Faculty Member at Graduate School of Management, Faculty of Economics & Business, University of Bengkulu, Indonesia. E-mail: fahru_jsp@yahoo.com

²Professor in Marketing, Faculty of Economics & Business, University of Bengkulu, Indonesia

³Faculty Member at Economics Department, Faculty of Economics & Business, University of Bengkulu, Indonesia

Employee's performance can be determined by achievement motivation, as concluded by Emanuel et al. (2014), there was a positive relationship between achievement motivation and academic achievement. Achievement motivation defined as a strong desire of a person to overcome, succeed at difficult tasks, and do it better than others (Greenberg and Baron 2000: 113). Achievement motivation was developed from the concept of the need for achievement, serves as the driving force that motivates the spirit of working person. Someone with high achievement motivation will be encouraged to develop creativity and directing all of the capabilities as well as its energy in order to achieve maximum performance. Ghazemi (2011) found the effect of creativity and achievement motivation on entrepreneurship. Achievement motivation of a person will determine the performance of its duties. Emmanuel et al. (2014) found the importance of achievement motivation and academic self-concept to academic achievement.

In addition to achievement motivation, both task performance and contextual performance has also been linked with job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is a proven predictor of employee performance (Miao, 2011; Diefendorff et al., 2006; Samad, 2005; Carmeli and Freund, 2004; Brown and Chin, 2004; Goris et al., 2003; Crossman and Abou-Zaki, 2003). Job satisfaction is one form of employee behavior is defined as something pleasant or positive emotional outcome hand on assessment of work or person's work experience (Vandenberg and Lance, 1992). Job satisfaction determined by the difference between all that was expected with all that is felt from work or all of the actual receipt. Job satisfaction was found to be an intervening variable in the relationship between the environment and personal characteristics with organizational commitment (Lum et al., 1998).

Ahmed et al. (2011) noted that job satisfaction play a very important role, because satisfied employees rarely quit his job, thus saving the costs of selection, training, reduced productivity. Job satisfaction was also associated with increased effectiveness, lower levels of absenteeism and worker turnover. Michael (2014) found that supportive communication supervisor mediated the relationship between LMX and employees' contextual performance in terms of interpersonal facilitation and job dedication, and job dedication mediated the relationship between SSC and task performance. Yun et al. (2007) concluded that role ambiguity moderated the effects of self-enhancement motives on job performance behaviors and managerial perceptions of an employee's commitment moderated the effects of reviews those organizational citizenship behaviors that are aimed at other individuals on managers' reward allocation decisions.

METHODS

Primary data were used, 58 self-report items from 228 respondents. Sample was chosen based on 747 employees who are work for public and private organizations in the western Sumatera Island, Indonesia. Currently, the respondents are completing their master degree at a public university in Bengkulu Province. Fifteen-nine percent respondents were women; 60.52 percent were between 31 to 40 years old; 57.89 have between 5 to 15 tenure; 90.8 served as public officer; and 18,9 were middle managers in their organizations. Data were collected using survey methods, directly to the respondents. Confidential of the answers from the respondents were guarantee.

Achievement motivation measured using 11 items adopted from Sekaran (2000: 1998), consisted of 5 dimensions, which is controlled by work, unable to relax, not tolerate to the false, looking for moderate challenge, asking for feedback. Job Satisfaction measures consisted of 5 dimensions, i.e pay, promotion, peer, supervisor, and work itself. This variable was measured using 20 items self-report measured adopted from Celluni dan DeVries (Mas'ud, 2004). Following Kahya (2007), we use 7 items measure in single dimension to predict the task performance. Contextual performance measured using 20 items applied to measure the OCB based on Konovsky dan Organ (1996), consisted of 5 dimensions, which is altruism, courtesy, sportmanship, conscientousness, dan civic virtue. For achievement motivation, job satisfaction, and task performance using five point Likert scale, 5 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree. While the contextual performance using five point semantic differential scale (Sekaran, 2000: 198-199) used, 1 = never to 5 = always. Some items using reverse score.

Data analyzed using Hierarchical Regression Analysis (HRA) and Mediated Regression Analysis (MRA). HRA applied to test the effect of achievement motivation and job satisfaction on task performance and contextual performance, and to test which variables between achievement motivation and job satisfaction that has a higher effect on task performance and contextual performance. MRA applied to test the role of task performance as mediating variable in the effects of achievement motivation and job satisfaction on contextual performance. The same procedures were also applied by Van Dyne at al. (1994), Novalinda and Pareke (2010), Delastri and Pareke (2011). At the first step, the mediator variable is regressed on the independent variable. At the second step, the dependent variable is regressed on the dependent variable. And for the third step, the dependent variable is regressed simultaneously on both the independent variable and the mediator variable. Mediation is indicated for a independent-mediator-dependent variable relationship if the following conditions are met (Van Dyne et al., 1994); The independent variable must affect the mediator in the first equation; the independent variable must affect the dependent variable in the second equation; the mediator must affect the dependent variable in the third equation; and finally, the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable must be less in the third equation than in the second equation. Full mediation is supported if the independent variable has no effect when the mediator is controlled, and partial mediation is indicated if the independent variable's effect smaller but still significant when the mediator is controlled (Van Dyne et al., 1994)

RESULTS

Tabel 1
Means, Standard Deviation, and Correlations (n=228)

Variables	Means	s.d.	Variables									
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
(1) Gender	.41	.493										
(2) Age	34.56	5.898	.050									
(3) Tenure	9.33	5.429	-.010	.728**								
(4) Organization Type	1.09	.290	.011	-.322**	-.232**							
(5) Job Level	1.23	.473	.211**	.405**	.317**	.036						
(6) Job Satisfaction	3.43	.446	.105	-.046	.023	.071	.056	(.825)				
(7) Achievement Motivation	3.42	.329	.104	-.016	.064	.085	.024	-.117	(.620)			
(8) Contextual Performance	3.88	.320	-.164*	-.062	.139*	.070	-.163*	.195**	.065	(.682)		
(9) Task Performance	4.03	.411	-.058	-.176**	-.021	.146*	-.072	.231**	.138*	.424**	(.742)	

***correlation significant at $\alpha = 0,000$;

** correlation significant at $\alpha = 0,01$;

* correlation significant at $\alpha = 0,05$.

Table 1 shows the means, standard deviation, zero-order correlation, and Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. Correlation for all variables represented the expected directions, ranging from -.176 to .728. Correlation between independent variables indicated low level of the colinearity. As Table 1 showed, the reliabilities of all variables (in parentheses) meet the acceptance level, ranging from .620 to .825. According to Sekaran (2000), Cronbach' coefficient alpha below .60 indicated that the reliability of the variable's are poor, ranging 0.70 are acceptance, and over .80 are good.

The Effect Of Achievement Motivation And Job Satisfaction On Task And Contextual Performance

HRA was conducted to test the effect of achievement motivation and job satisfaction on the tasks performance and contextual performance. Table 2 demonstrates the effect of job satisfaction on task performance and contextual performance, and the effect of achievement motivation on contextual performance.

In the first step of HRA, the control variables (Gender, age, tenure, organizational status and job level) included in the analysis. The goal is to clean the effects of the control variables on job satisfaction as the dependent variable. As seen in Table 2, the age of the respondents have negative effects on task performance and contextual performance at all stages of regression. While tenure has positive effects, except in the 3rd stage of the task performance. This means that the younger employee will have a higher task performance than the elderly. Conversely, the longer employees work for the organization, the higher their task performance. Another 3 control variables are gender, organization type, and job level not to significantly affect the task performance, this means that the high or low employees' task performance not determined by whether they male or female, civil servants or private employees and whether they are staff, managers or executives. By neutralizing the effect of the control variables, then we can confidently conclude that the effect on the task performance is the achievement motivation and job satisfaction. The second step is to enter achievement motivation and job

satisfaction as independent variables in the analysis. Table 2 presents the empirical evidence that both achievement motivation and job satisfaction affect task performance positively. However, contextual performance only affected by the job satisfaction, but not by achievement motivation.

To test which variable (between achievement motivation and job satisfaction) has a higher effect on the dependent variable (performance task and contextual performance), we look at standardized coefficient (β) value. As seen in Table 2, for the regression equation of task performance as the dependent variable, standardized coefficient for job satisfaction ($\beta = .238$) in the second stage is higher than the standardized coefficient for achievement motivation ($\beta = .153$). It means that job satisfaction has a greater effect on the task performance compared to the achievement motivation. Similarly to the contextual performance, Table 2 also shows that the standardized coefficient for job satisfaction ($\beta = .207$) in the second stage is higher than the standardized coefficient for achievement motivation ($\beta = .077$). That is, job satisfaction has a higher effect on contextual performance than the effect of achievement motivation. Furthermore, for comparative analysis of these influences, it is clear that job satisfaction significantly influence contextual performance while achievement motivation has no effect.

To clarify this conclusion, hierarchical regression analysis applied to achievement motivation and job satisfaction individually, to see whether achievement motivation able to explain incremental variance in the dependent variable respectively exceed capable explained by the job satisfaction, or vice versa. The results of the analysis in Table 2 show that job satisfaction is able to provide an additional explanation for incremental variance in job performance variables ($R^2 = 0.053$) and contextual performance ($R^2 = 0.040$), higher than the explanations demonstrated by achievement motivation (respectively $R^2 = 0.022$; and 0.005).

Tabel 2
Hierarchical Regression Analyses (*Standardized Coefficient*) for Task and Contextual Performance

	Task Performance			Contextual Performance		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Control Variables:						
- Gender	-.038	-.060	-.080	-.114	-.134*	-.143*
- Age	-.297**	-.265**	-.244**	-.242*	-.213*	-.203*
- Tenure	.225*	.197*	.168	.387***	.362***	.347***
- Organization Type	.104	.093	.078	.089	.079	.072
- Job Level	-.018	-.030	-.029	-.167*	-.177*	-.177*
Job Satisfaction	-	.215**	.238***	-	.192**	.207**
Achievement Motivation	-	-	.153**	-	-	.077
R^2	.066	.111	.133	.121	.158	.163
F	3,144	4,611	4,838	6,094	6,902	6,141
R^2	-	.045	.022	-	.037	.005
<i>Sig. F</i>	.009	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Control Variables:						

- Gender	-.038	-.052	-.080	-.114	-.119	-.143*
- Age	-.297**	-.283**	-.244*	-.242*	-.237*	-.203*
- Tenure	.225*	.205*	.168	.387***	.379	.347***
- Organization Type	.104	.093	.078	.089	.085	.072
- Job Level	-.018	-.017	-.029	-.167*	-.166*	-.177*
Achievement Motivation	-	.118	.153*	-	.047	.077
Job Satisfaction	-	-	.238***	-	-	.207**
R^2	.066	.080	.133	.121	.123	.163
F	3,144	3,184	4,838	6,094	5,156	6,141
R^2	-	.014	.053	-	.002	.040
<i>Sig. F</i>	.009	.005	.000	.000	.000	.000

***Significant at $\alpha = 0,000$;

** Significant at $\alpha = 0,01$;

* Significant at $\alpha = 0,05$.

Mediating Roles Of Achievement Motivation And Job Satisfaction In The Effect Of Task Performance On Contextual Performance

To determine the role of task performance as mediating variable in the effects of job satisfaction and achievement motivation on the performance, Table 3 presents the results of Mediated Regression Analysis (MRA). In the first step, job satisfaction affect the job performance ($\beta = .238$). In the second step, job satisfaction affect the contextual performance ($\beta = .207$). In the third step, job satisfaction and task performance affect the contextual performance (respectively $\beta = .123$ and $\beta = .353$). Table 3 also shows that the effect on the contextual performance on job satisfaction for the third step ($\beta = .123$) lower than in the second step ($\beta = .207$). However, the role of achievement motivation as mediating variable is not supported, since the third step, achievement motivation has no effect on contextual performance ($\beta = .023$; 0.70).

Tabel 3
Mediated Regression Analyses (*Standardized Coefficient*), Job Satisfaction and Achievement Motivation as Mediated Variables

Regression	Variables	Task Performance ()	Contextual Performance ()
Step I	Job Satisfaction	.238***	
	Achievement Motivation	.153*	
	R ²	.133	
	F	4.838***	
Step II	Job Satisfaction		.207**
	Achievement Motivation		.077
	R ²		.163
	F		6.141***
Step III	Job Satisfaction		.123*
	Achievement Motivation		.023
	Task Performance		.353***
	R ²		.271
	F		10.200***

***Significant at = 0,000;

** Significant at = 0,01;

* Significant at = 0,05.

DISCUSSIONS

The study concluded that achievement motivation and job satisfaction has positive effects on both the task performance and contextual performance. This conclusion is in line with several previous studies (Castle, 2007; Miao, 2011; Diefendorff et al., 2006; Samad, 2005; Carmeli and Freund, 2004; Brown and Chin, 2004; Goris et al., 2003; Crossman and Abou-Zaki, 2003).

Castle (2007) concluded that low job satisfaction among nurses associated with the movement of work, absenteeism, and poor job performance. Almost no debate pointed in this case, a person who enjoys and earns high satisfaction from the work he/she does, tend to have a higher performance than the individual who is not. This study was to investigate further by detailing aspects of task performance and contextual performance. Therefore, we can conclude with confidence that if an employee feels happy or feel the positive emotional side in doing the work, then the employee is likely to be able to perform the duties of his job well and will show positive behavior outside their duties behavior more often .

The results of this study demonstrate that the role of job satisfaction is more important than achievement motivation in their impact on performance. In line with the results of Beam (2006) which concluded that job satisfaction is significantly related to the goals and priorities of the professional company for which they work. Respondents tended to feel less satisfied with the job if they work in organizations that are profit-oriented and more satisfied with their work when they work for organizations that appreciate good journalism.

Furthermore, the research found there is a crucial role of the task performance in the effect of job satisfaction on contextual performance. Continuing the previous findings, such as

Kappagoda (2014), which concluded that psychological capital related to employee performance and attitude, the attitude is also associated with the performance and attitude mediates the relationship of psychological capital and performance. Although each individual in the organization have a different view and assessment of the interest of their task and job performance (Befort and Hatstrup, 2003), every employee is relative will give more attention to the task performance than contextual performance. So the effect of achievement motivation and job satisfaction on job performance will be higher than its effect on contextual performance. However, these effects are not restricted to the task performance, where individuals who have a good level of task performance will tend to show better contextual performance.

CONCLUSSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Several conclusions can be derived from the results and discussion above, *first*, respondents' age affected the task performance and tenure affected the contextual performance. While others control variables still have a potential effect on contextual performance, such as gender, age and job level. *Second*, task performance affected by Job satisfaction and achievement motivation, while the contextual performance just affected only by job satisfaction. *Third*, task performance mediated the effect of Job satisfaction on contextual performance, which indicated that the drive of contextual performance can be resulted through employee's task performance.

The results of this study have important implications, both academically and managerial implications for practices in the field of human resource management. The preliminary findings of the role of task performance as a mediating variable on the effect of job satisfaction on contextual performance, clarify the pattern of the causal relationship between job satisfaction and performance, thereby contributing to the development of body knowledge in the field of organizational behavior from the perspective of substantive validity. From the practical side, this finding suggests an increase in contextual performance of employees as OCB must be done simultaneously with increased employee task performance and job satisfaction

REFERENCE

- Ahmed, I., Ahmad, Z., Nawaz, M. M., & Ahmad, Z. 2011. Explicit and implicit factors of job satisfaction: A combination that works. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research In Business*, 2 (12): 577-586
- Beam, R. A. 2006. Organizational goals and priorities and the job satisfaction of U.S. Journalists. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 83 (1): 169-185
- Befort, N., & Hatstrup, K. 2003. Valuing task and contextual performance: experience, Job roles, and ratings of the importance of job behaviors. *Applied HRM Research*, 8 (1): 17-32.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. 1993. Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In Schmitt, N., Borman, W. C. (Eds) . *Personnel Selection in Organization*. Jossey-Bass, New York: 71-98.
- Brown, S.P. & Chin, W.W. 2004. Satisfying and retaining customers through independent service representatives. *Decision Sciences*, 35 (3): 527-550.

- Carmeli, A. & Freund, A. 2004. Work commitment, job satisfaction and job performance: an empirical investigation. *International Journal of Organisation Theory and Behaviour*, 7 (3): 289-309.
- Castle, N. G. Assessing job satisfaction of nurse aides in nursing homes: The nursing home nurse aide job satisfaction questionnaire. *Journal of Geontological Nursing*, 33 (5): 41-47
- Crossman, A., & Abou-Zaki, B. 2003. Job satisfaction and employee performance of Lebanese banking staff. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18 (4): 368-376
- Delastri, N., & Pareke, F. Js. 2011. The role of work motivation as mediating variable on the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction: Empirical investigation at regional district office, Bengkulu Province. *Jurnal Bisnis dan Ekonomi*, 18 (1): 30-35
- Diefendorff, J.M., Richard, E.M. & Gosserand, R.H. 2006. Examination of situational and attitudinal moderators of the hesitation and performance relation. *Personnel Psychology*, 59 (2): 365-93.
- Emmanuel, A., Adom, E. A., Josephine, B., & Solomon, F. 2014. Achievement motivation, academic self-concept and academic achievement among high school students. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences*, 2 (2): 24-37.
- Ghasemi, F., Rastegar, A., & Jahromi, R. G., & Marvdashti, R. R. 2011. The relationship between creativity and achievement motivation with high school students' entrepreneurship. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30 (?): 1291-1296
- Goris, J.R., Vaught, B.C. & Pettit, J.D. 2003. Effects of trust in superiors and influence of superiors on the association between individual-job congruence and job performance/Satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17 (3): 327-343.
- Greenberg, J., and Baron, R.A. 2000. *Behavior in Organization: Understanding and Managing the Human Side of Work*. Prentice Hall International, New Jersey
- Kahya, E. 2007. The effect of job characteristics and working conditions on job performance. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 37: 515-523.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. 1996. Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17: 253-266
- Kappagoda, U. W. M. R. S., Othman, H. Z. F., & Alwis, G. D. 2014. Psychological capital and job performance: the mediating role of work attitudes. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 2 (?): 102-116
- Lum, L., Kervin, J., Clark, K., Reid, F., & Sirola, W. 1998. Explaining nursing turnover intent: job satisfaction, pay satisfaction or organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19: 305-320.
- Mas'ud, F. 2004. *Survai Diagnosis Organisasional: Konsep dan Aplikasi*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro. Semarang
- Miao, R. 2011. Perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, task performance and organizational citizenship behavior in China. *Institute of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 105-127

- Michael, D. F. 2014. Supportive supervisor communication as a mediator of the leader-member exchange and subordinate performance relationship. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8 (2): 45-65
- 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.
- Organ, D. W. 1988. *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books
- Novalinda, F., & Pareke, F. Js. 2010. Kepuasan kerja sebagai variable pemediasi pengaruh kompensasi, kemampuan kerja dan jam kerja terhadap kinerja. *Management Insight*, 5 (2): 88-97),
- Samad, S. 2005. Unravelling the organisational commitment and job performance relationship: exploring the moderating effect of job satisfaction. *The Business Review*, 4 (2): 79-84.
- Sekaran, U. 2000. *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach*. John Willey & Sons, Inc. United Staed of America
- Sen, C., & Kaul, A. 2015. Psychological Correlates of Contextual Performance at Work: An Empricial View. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 2 (3): 10-16
- Som, R.M., Mustapha, R.M.R., Othman, A. K., Aziz, R. A., & Noranee, S. 2015. Exploratory Factor Analysis: Conceptualization, Reliability and Validity of Job Performance. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 5 (5): 440-445
- Vanderberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. 1994. Examining the causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Management*, 18 (1): 153-167.
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. 1994. Organizational citizenship behavior: construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*. 37 (4): 765-802.
- Wetzels, M., de Ruyter, K. & Bloemer, J. 2000. Antecedents and consequences of role stress of retail sales persons. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, (7): 65-75.
- Yun, S., Takeuchi, R., & Liu, W. 2007. Employee self-enhancement motives and job performance behaviors: investigating the moderating effects of employee role ambiguity and managerial perceptions of employee commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92 (3): 745–756