

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Analysis the Structural Relationship of Among Organizational Members between Job Complexity, Goal Orientation, Performance Evaluation, and Fairness Perception

Gi-Ryun Park

Ph.D. Candidate, School of Business Administration, Kyungpook National University, South Korea

Gye-Wan Moon

Professor, School of Business Administration, Kyungpook National University, South Korea

Ki-dae Kim

Master Student, School of Business Administration, Kyungpook National University, South Korea

Abstract:

This paper analyzes the relationship between the major factors in the organization that affect the performance evaluation of members, and then draws implications for enhancing the effectiveness of member performance management. This study aims to focus on identify the effect of the performance evaluation fairness perceived by IT company members on goal orientation and the mediating effect of job complexity in this process. The result of the hypothesis test shows that the performance evaluation fairness perceived by the members has a direct positive effect on the job complexity and the goal orientation, and as the fairness of the performance evaluation is secured, the job complexity and the goal orientation are improved. Second, job complexity has a direct positive effect on goal orientation, and it is confirmed that goal orientation is improved as more complex job is pursued and preferred. Finally, it has been confirmed that the impact on the goal orientation of fairness in performance evaluation has a greater indirect impact on job complexity than on direct effect, and task complexity has an effect on measured by parameter. That is, as members are given the right level of job complexity, the better they perceive their attitude, the more their goal oriented of fairness are perceived in performance appraisal. Through discussion of the results of the study, fair performance assessments in the organization allowed members to prefer challenging tasks in complex work situations and more targeted them as opportunities for growth and learning, thus making their attitudes more relevant. In particular, it could be concluded that the task of adequately setting challenging levels of task appropriate to the organization or task situation was crucial to ensure effectiveness in implementing member performance management.

Keywords: Performance evaluation fairness, job complexity, goal orientation, performance management of members

1. Introduction

With the advent of the 4th industrial revolution, changes in the industrial structure have also affected the performance management of members', which is the core of corporate personnel management. There is a growing interest in member performance management that focuses on the creative and innovative thinking and execution capabilities of members rather than on internal competition or superiority. Therefore, understanding the various HR management activities in the organization to promote the innovation activities of the members under the rapidly changing business environment should of becoming more and more important.

Members who recognize the results of the performance evaluation positively prefer highly challenging and challenging jobs. But who has negative perception avoid it by focusing on the possibility of failure (Judge, Bono & Locke, 2000). additionally, a member who recognizes fairness in performance evaluation has the characteristic of increasing the achievement goal by accepting it as an opportunity for growth and learning even if it is given a job with a high degree of difficulty (Judge, Thoresen, Pucik & Welbourne, 1999; Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Li, 2005). However, if it is recognized that the is unfair from the human resource, it is highly likely that it does not accept the result and neglects its role. Steers (1984) defined that Performance evaluation explained that it is a major factor to increase the achievement goal of the members. Especially, It is important to note that fairness within an organization of member has a positive impact on the commitment of the members to achieve the goal (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Greenberg, 1990; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Moorman, 1991; Niehoff & Moorman 1993). The perception of members about the fairness of performance evaluation is closely related to the goal setting process, it is possible to estimate that it affects goal orientations.

Those who prefer tasks with a high degree of difficulty tend to set higher achievement goals and actively implement them in consideration of technical diversity, task identity, task importance, autonomy, and job characteristics that require feedback (Kushman, 1992). Job complexity, which means the degree of difficulty of a job, is defined as the level of stimulating or challenging required for a job assigned to a member (Yitzhak, Samuel, & Haim A, 2002). Such as job satisfaction or organizational have an effect on the organize (London & Klimoski, 1975). From this point of view, the members who easy to perform the tasks with high complexity can have the job ability to perform the job and have a positive perception about the performance evaluation. Judge et al., (2000) verified the structural equation model that set job complexity as a parameter in the relationship between perception of performance evaluation and organizational effectiveness. Oldham and Miller(1979) and Reilly, Brown, Blood, & Malatesta(1981), McEvoy and Cascio(1985) reported that job complexity has a significant moderating effect among organizational factors. This suggests that it is possible to estimate that job complexity can function as an intermediary in relation to the fairness and goal orientation of performance evaluation.

Despite the importance of the role of job complexity with attributes that affect key organizational factors, there is little research on the relationship between performance evaluation justice and goal orientation and factors associated with performance management of members'. In this study, we have examined how the job complexity works in relation to perceived fairness of performance evaluation and goal orientation as a statement of problem. The research subjects conducted IT company members whose job complexity level is known to be relatively high. This work main aim to the study is to identify whether job complexity mediates the causal relationship between perceived performance evaluation fairness and goal orientation. The results of this study show that the recent rapid spread of job and performance of the personnel management which mean that to propose policy direction for execution of member performance management suitable for Korean management environment.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Relationship between Performance Evaluation Fairness and Goal Orientation

The definitions or explanations of goal orientation, which means attributes that aim toward goal, differ somewhat from one scholar to another. Goal orientation acts as an integrated mechanism of cognitive and positive aspects of achievement-oriented behavior (Biornebekk, Diseth & Ulriksen, 2013). But Dweck and Leggett (1988) defined as the total of beliefs or emotions participating in achievement activities and explained that goal oriented behavior has an effect on improving learning motivation. McClelland (1961) addressed that desire to achieve a challenging goal or achieve a difficult task. Ames (1992) explained the tendency to achieve the goal that the individual pursues. The goal orientation in this study is defined as the attribute that the goal set by the member in performing his / her assigned job is to be achieved.

Goal orientation is the purpose and reason for accomplishment, and explained the motivations and active from the viewpoint of the perceived goals of the members (Nicholls, 1989; Ames, 1992; Elliot, 1999). In particular, Staw, Bell and Clausen (1986) addressed to recognized fairness and explained that intrinsically motivated members increase the achievement goal of the task, Bass (1985), but also Fair and fair treatment, motivated members explained that they had a positive influence on performance improvement by developing self-fulfillment desires and immersing themselves in their jobs. previous study examine that affect to the achieve the goal the relationship between perceived fairness and organizational commitment, so that the goal orientation is closely related to intra-organizational fairness. The theory of fairness has explained motivation, performance, and satisfaction within an organization on the assumption from organize of members' that everyone wants to be treated fairly, and that the various schemes or processes being undertaken by the organization, has been dealt with through the recognition of. Folger and Konovsky (1989) suggest that based on the social comparative theory, the achievement goal related to fairness affects the commitment and job satisfaction of the members. Hackman and Oldham (1980) explained recognizing fairness in the organization and intrinsically motivated members are oriented towards higher goals and engage in work. emphasize the fairness of performance evaluation, develop and apply the criteria for evaluation, and assert that fairness in the organization could be secured only when the participation of members in the evaluation process is secured in rewarding the evaluation results. Regarding the Relationship between performance evaluation fairness and goal orientation, previous studies suggest that the goal orientation has been explained the purpose and reason for accomplishment behavior, and the behavior and motivation in terms of what the members perceive is the goal and achieve (Judge, Thoresen, Pucik, & Welbourne, 1999; Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Li, 2005).

In summary, securing fairness to the various systems or processes implemented in an organization provides to internal incentives for members to view higher goals and have a positive influence on the improvement of immersion. Therefore, it was confirmed that when the members of the team were aware of the fairness of the performance assessment, it would be possible to assume that they could be more target-oriented in terms of raising the level of achievements on the goals.

2.2. Relationship between Job Complexity and Goal Orientation

Companies use various methods such as job rotation and job enlargement from the viewpoint of career development to induce the immersion of the members by giving various job experience and skill acquisition opportunities. These activities can be interpreted as inducing performance improvement by assigning jobs with complexity that requires expertise or experience at the member's competence level or higher. Oldham and Miller (1979) suggested that members who perform

tasks with lower complexity tend to have lower task satisfaction and productivity compared to colleagues who perform relatively complicated tasks, this can be seen as explaining the reasons why it is necessary to improve the performance of members in the field.

Theoretical point of view, the task complexity has been addressed factors primarily as an incentive for members to perform tasks in the field of organizational behavior. Since the introduction of the principles of scientific management emphasizing human resources management that differentiates compensation according to achievement in order to improve worker productivity (Taylor, 1911), the relationship between the level of complexity and productivity of the members' job or task has been studied mainly in the field of business administration including industrial engineering. Job complexity is defined as the level of stimulation and challenge required in relation to a specific job assigned to a member (Yitzhak, Samuel, and Haim, 2002). Job complexity in this study is defined as attributes of complexity and degree of difficulty which are more than the job ability of the member, which promotes a challenging and achievement-oriented commitment to achieve the goal.

In a previous study on job complexity, Zigurs and Buckland (1998) suggest that to emphasized that the complexity of the task is directly related to the characteristics such as the amount of information increase, diversity, or change, and that a complex task requires a high perception of the members of the task goal. Following the same statement that When the complexity of the task increases, the knowledge and skills needed to achieve the goal increase together, and it is important for members to recognize complex tasks (Wood, 1986). The more jobs that have more complex attributes, the more motivated the worker 's internal motivation to achieve the goal (Farr, 1990). Campbell and Gingrich (1986) explained that the more clearly the goal setting of the participants in a given task is, the better the task performance. These preceding research require that members performing complex tasks be clearly aware of the nature and goals of the task or task, this process can be seen as an emphasis on achieving a high level of will and desire to achieve goal. This enabled us to identify that it would be possible to assume that when a member was assigned a more complex level of task than his or her own capabilities, he or she would improve his goal orientation.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Model and Hypotheses

This study is investigated the mediating effect of job complexity in relation of goal orientation justice Perception on Performance Complexity and Goal Orientation about Performance Evaluation to conduct among IT Company Members and the Relationship between Performance Evaluation Fairness and Goal Orientation. The research model established base on the theoretical background of the relationship between the variables is as shown, and accordingly the study was guided by the following hypotheses.

- H1: Performance evaluation Fairness will influence a positive impact on job complexity.
- H2: Performance evaluation Fairness will influence a positive effect on goal orientation.
- H3: Job complexity will influence a positive effect on goal orientation.
- H4: Job complexity will have a mediating effect on causality between performance evaluation fairness and goal orientation.

3.2. Data Collection and Procedure

This study was conducted in 9 different of IT company of service and software development department in Techno Valley, Pangyo, Gyeonggi - do. The IT organization members had the characteristic that innovative goal setting based on knowledge and experience according to job specialty determines success or failure of job activity, The data presented in this paper were conducted in considering that the level of complexity of jobs is relatively high compared to other industry members.

In this study, survey were the members of the working - level class except the manager class were set as the survey subjects in order to confirm the perception level of the members about the performance evaluation fairness. In addition, before the conducted survey we got confirmations from the human & resource department and then explain to them who did survey the notice and research purpose, we gave Immediate feedback to them questions related to the questionnaire. The survey was conducted from March 6, 2017 to March 31, 2017. by only considering survey a total of 382 copies distributed and then got 318 copies were collected (83.2% recovery rate), were excluded for 22 copies with false answers or missing, so that data of 296 copies (effective rate 77.5%) were used for analysis.

3.3. Instrument

3.3.1. Performance Evaluation Fairness

The measurement tool about Performance Evaluation Fairness are set up in three areas: distribution fairness, procedural fairness, and interaction fairness in an organization's performance evaluation system.

3.3.1.1. Distribution Fairness

Distribution fairness refers to how much relative results of the performance evaluation are related to and proportional to factors such as ① effort, ② performance, ③ accountability, and ④ career. The measuring instrument used the Distributive Justice Index (Moorman, 1991; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993) and the four items were measured on a 5 – point scale.

3.3.1.2. Procedure Fairness

Procedures Fairness refers to the how much fairness of the standards, processes and systems that an organization uses in the performance appraisal process. The measurement tool utilized the formal procedural fairness measure of formal procedural fairness and interactive fairness proposed (Moorman, 1991). Moorman (1991) suggested as a The procedural fairness measure composed of seven items, but this paper used as five of them were adopted in this study. The items were ① Consistent standards, ② Permission to disclose information, ③ Listening to members, ④ Collecting and reflecting opinions of members, ⑤ Considering factors that could be affected, used on a 5 –point scale.

3.3.1.3. Interaction Fairness

Interaction fairness focuses on how well the evaluator has an appropriate interaction with the evaluated, during the evaluation process and what the evaluator does (Moorman, 1991). 강여진, 장지원 (2005) refer to the scale utilized Based on the scale developed by Moorman (1991) and Niehoff and Moorman (1993) for measuring interactivity fairness, this paper measured the five items on the 5-point scale: ① proper explanation of the personnel decision, ② respect for my opinion, ③ true attitude, ④ attitude without bias, and ⑤ consideration for my position.

3.3.2. Job Complexity

Job complexity be set up as the level of complexity or difficulty in the job in which the member is performing and the degree of preference for how much prepper the job with complexity in the future. The measurement tools are based on the work complexity scale of Maynard and Hakel (1997) and the Work Design Questionnaire reference from Morgeson and Humphrey (2006) Four items used on the 5-point scale: ① seeking the mental burden of performing tasks; ② performing tasks that require knowledge and expertise (3) preference for unfamiliar or challenging tasks, and (4) preference for tasks requiring complex or high-level knowledge and skills.

3.3.3. Goal Orientation

Goal Orientation consists of two domains: learning and performance about the goals that members seek within the organization. First of all, the learning objective is to encourage members to improve their abilities and improve their performance. And the performance goal is to encourage the members to actively perform by themselves by evaluating their abilities and performance positively (Ames &Archer, 1988; Dweck & Leggett, 1988). in order to further in this study, goal orientation was divided into two domains: learning orientation and performance orientation.

3.3.3.1. Learning orientation

Learning orientation refers to the tendency of members to master their tasks and to improve their abilities. suggest that Four items used on the 5-point scale: ① evaluation of self-abilities, ② attitudes to education and training, ③ efforts of voluntary learning activities, ④ efforts to improve proficiency.

3.3.3.2. Performance orientation

Performance Orientation defined a tendency to achieve recognition and value by attaining a value corresponding to one's own abilities. Illustrate the important as a that Four items used on the 5-point scale: ① Voluntary setting of business goals, ② Establishment of detailed business goals, ③ Establishment of the period unit of business goals, ④ Inspection level of business goals

4. Data analysis and results

The collected data was analyzed as following the process data coding and data cleaning as a base for the analysis. The data analysis was conducted in four stages. First, frequency analysis was performed to obtain general characteristics of survey respondents, and descriptive statistics based on mean and standard deviation were calculated. second, exploratory factor analysis with SPSS 18.0 was performed to identify the underlying dimensions. third, confirmatory factor analysis was performed to test how well the measured variables represented the constructs, and to ensure the goodness-of-fit for the measurement model. Finally, the relationships among Performance Evaluation Fairness, job complexity, Goal orientation, Performance management of members were empirically tested using the structural equation modeling (SEM) technique but also path analysis with AMOS 18.0. In addition, decomposition of the effect was carried out to grasp the role of the parameter by the indirect effect.

4.1. Reliability Analysis Result

The Cronbach's Alpha value of performance evaluation fairness was 0.842 for the disparity fairness, 0.870 for the procedural fairness, and 0.912 for the interaction fairness. Job complexity is 0.784, goal orientation is 0.895, and performance orientation is 0.906, confirming internal consistency reliability. The results of the reliability analysis.

4.2. Correlation Analysis Result

As a result of analyzing the correlation between the variables, the lower dimension of the performance evaluation fairness showed a positive (+) correlation with the job complexity ($p < .001$), And there was a positive (+) correlation with the goal orientation of dependent variables ($p < .001$). Also, there is a positive (+) significant correlation between job complexity and goal orientation ($p < .001$). There is a positive (+) significant correlation between fairness, procedural fairness and interaction fairness of performance evaluation fairness ($p < .001$). The results of previous research meaning of way but also to show this study are as follows that the higher the level of perceived fairness of the members' performance evaluation, the higher the job complexity and the goal orientation. The results of the correlation analysis.

As a result of checking the multi-collinearity between the variables, the learning orientation and the performance orientation showed the highest correlation ($r = .728$), But It is confirmed that there is no problem because there are no variables showing a correlation coefficient of .80 or more that can be a problem of multi-collinearity.

4.3 Confirmatory Factor Analysis Result

As a result of confirmatory factor analysis, it was confirmed that all items were over 0.3, and the observational variables explaining the latent variable were well formed. Job complexity, which consists of a single dimension, maintains its own factor loadings at an appropriate level, In the case of performance appraisal fairness be in order, it shows that it explains latent variable in order of interaction fairness, procedural fairness, and distribution fairness. And goal orientation was identified as explaining latent variables in the order of learning orientation and performance orientation. The results of confirmatory factor analysis.

4.4. Hypotheses Testing Result

4.4.1. Structural Model Fit

A maximum likelihood estimation method was used to test the predicted relationships among the constructs. As the result of follow. The overall model fit indices, χ^2 In the case of verification, The p value was less than 0.05 and the research model was rejected. χ^2 Verification is inherently easy to dismiss and the same model can be rejected or adopted according to the size of the sample, It is necessary to evaluate the result with other fitness indexes because it meets the criterion that the χ^2 value divided by the degree of freedom (df) should be less than 3.0. Both the TLI (NNFI) and the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) value exceeded 0.9, confirming that the model is appropriate. Though result of RMSEA indice 0.057 confirmed that it met the criteria. And it dictates The minimum value of the 90% confidence interval was 0.046 and the maximum value was 0.067, As the interval of the confidence interval is narrower, it is judged to be suitable. Accordingly, the research model was confirmed as the final analysis model and the hypothesis test was conducted.

4.4.2. Direct Impact Test Result

The results of the hypothesis test for direct influence between potential variables are as follows. First, the direct influence of performance evaluation fairness on job complexity and goal orientation was significant at significance level 0.001. as a follow it is supported that [hypothesis 1], which predicts that higher perception of performance evaluation fairness will have a positive effect on job complexity, will have a positive effect on job complexity ($\beta = .439$). In addition, the performance evaluation fairness of the members' predicted that the higher the perception of the fairness of the members' performance, the more the goal orientation would be increased [Hypothesis 2] Performance evaluation fairness will have a positive effect on goal orientation ($\beta = .392$). Next, the direct impact of job complexity on goal orientation was also significant at significance level 0.01. In other words, goal orientation is shown to increase with higher job complexity ($\beta = .340$), [Hypothesis 3] Job complexity, which predicts the influence of job complexity on goal orientation, will have a positive effect on goal orientation. It was also confirmed that it was supported.

4.4.3. Indirect Impact Test Result

In addition to direct influence apart from among latent variables, indirect influences on target orientation, which is a dependent variable, were examined through job complexity. The statistical significance of the direct influence between the variables was confirmed, the significance of the indirect effect was verified by bootstrapping. That way, the mediating effect of job complexity on the relationship between performance evaluation fairness and goal orientation in the 95% confidence interval was analyzed. In order to test the mediating effect, the null hypothesis is that the product of each path coefficient time is 0, The implicit significance as the statistics should be outside the confidence interval because the null hypothesis should be rejected for the statistical significance of the indirect effect set by the researcher. As a result of the analysis, the

indirect effect on the goal orientation of the performance evaluation fairness was found to meet these criteria and it was confirmed that the indirect effect was at the 95% confidence level.

as for the total effect, however, the direct effect and the indirect effect are statistically significant, and the indirect effect size of the mediating effect path related to the study hypothesis.

Test on the mediating effect of job complexity of hypothesis, it was found that the performance evaluation fairness has an indirect effect of .475 on goal orientation through job complexity. [Hypothesis 4] Job complexity was supported to have a mediating effect on causality between performance evaluation fairness and goal orientation. The results of the direct effect, indirect effect, and total effect size on the latent variables (performance evaluation fairness, job complexity, goal orientation) included in the research.

5. Discussion and Conclusions

This study investigated the effects of perceived fairness of performance evaluation on job complexity and goal orientation of IT company members-oriented and analyze the mediating effect of job complexity. The results of this study drew on as follows.

First, the performance evaluation fairness perceived by the members has shown a direct positive effect on job complexity and goal orientation. These results of analysis show that support the previous research (Judge et al., 1999; Luthans et al., 2005) results that the positive evaluation members accept complex job situations and overcome them and increase the achievement goal. Therefore, by ensuring the fairness of the performance evaluation of the organization through company-wide efforts, it is necessary to induce the members to perform more difficult tasks, and draw implications very important to have a goal-oriented attitude for achieving achievement.

Second, Job complexity has a direct positive impact on goal orientation. These results are consistent with the results of the previous research (Campbell & Gingrich, 1986), which shows that task performance increases with clearer goal setting of participants in complex tasks or tasks. This implies that it is important to assign tasks or tasks with complexity that match the level of competence of the members in order to encourage them to achieve achievement-oriented thinking or attitude toward the goal.

Third, the influence of the performance evaluation fairness perceived by the members on the goal orientation was more than indirect effect than the direct effect through the job complexity, and that the performance evaluation fairness has a great influence on the goal orientation through job complexity. Thus, job complexity has mediating effects on the causal relationship between two factors. The results of this study indicate that the members who choose complex tasks prefer to work characteristics that require technical diversity, task identity, task importance, autonomy, and feedback, so they act more actively to achieve organizational goals, which is follow previous paper is supported achieve high achievement goals (Kushman, 1992). More specifically, improve the goal orientation of the members, it was possible to obtain the implication that it is important to carry out the performance management of the organization which ensures the fairness evaluation of the performance of the organization and the task or the task with the complexity suitable for the competence level of the members.

This study indicated, When the results accepted as fair, the role of the members is expanded and they are given greater roles and responsibilities, in the performance of the organization's performance evaluation system, it has the research result that it has achievement-oriented attitude. This conclusion is noteworthy in that it is very similar to the virtuous cycle structure of the organizational performance management process. To examine the implications of this study from an academic perspective and from a practical point of view.

From the academic perspective, it was confirmed that the procedural fairness of the performance evaluation and the acceptance of the members of the evaluation result secure the achievement goal by accepting it as an opportunity for growth and learning even if it is in a complex job situation. Especially this study focused on the roles and functions of job complexity as a factor that motivates the motivation of the members. The meaning of the study can be found that job complexity can contribute to achieving organizational and individual performance by activating its execution along with organizational factors related to member performance management.

From a practical point of view, it can be seen in connection with the trend of changes in personnel management practices in the field. In recent years, the number of companies that simplify the personnel level system has rapidly increased in the process of personnel management practices that emphasize individual ability and performance, job ability. Simplification of members' positions or lead wide area is more seniority than difficulty of job performed by individual, in other word to accelerate the performance of member performance management by role level. This study identifies the structural relationship between performance evaluation fairness, job complexity, and goal orientation at the time when goal setting according to individual role scope and strengthening of performance evaluation according to fair procedures are required. The result of this study is meaningful in that it suggests the practical direction for the execution of member performance management.

Despite the significance of the result, this study has a limitation. First, this study was conducted for IT industry members only. Therefore, it is expected that more research results will be obtained if we confirm the effects of various industries and size of the companies by subsequent studies. Therefore, future research could work to develop a more valid If

it expands the scope of our research by analyzing the relationship between various factors, both internal and external, affecting the organization's wage system or employee performance management in connection with the results of this study.

6. References

- i. Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz(Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*(267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- ii. Ames, C. (1992). Achievement goals and adaptive motivation patterns: The role of the environment. In G. Roberts(Ed.), *Motivation in sport and exercise*(161-176), Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- iii. Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning Strategies and motivation process. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80, 260-267.
- iv. Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- v. Biornebekk, G., Diseth, A., & Ulriksen, R. (2013). Achievement motives, self-efficacy, achievement goals, and academic achievement at multiple stages of education: A longitudinal analysis. *Psychological reports*, 112(3), 771-787.
- vi. Campbell, D. J. (1988). Task complexity: A review and analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(1), 40-52.
- vii. Campbell, D. J., & Gingrich, K. F. (1986). The interactive effects of task complexity and participation on task performance: a field experiment. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Process*, 38, 162-180.
- viii. Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95, 256-273.
- ix. Elliot, A. J. (1999). Achievement goals, study strategies, and exam performance: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91, 549-563.
- x. Farr, J. L. (1990). Facilitating individual role innovation. In M. A. West and J. L. Farr(Eds.), *Innovation and creativity at work*(207-230), New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- xi. Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1), 115-130.
- xii. Freel, M. S., & Harrison, R. T. (2006). Innovation and cooperation in the small firm sector: Evidence from Northern Britain. *Regional Studies*, 40(4), 289-305.
- xiii. Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432.
- xiv. Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Cambridge. MA: Addison-Wesley.
- xv. Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., & Locke, E. A. (2000). Personality and job satisfaction: The mediating role of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(2), 237-249.
- xvi. Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Pucik, V., & Welbourne, T. M. (1999). Managerial coping with organizational change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(1), 107-122.
- xvii. Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 656-669.
- xviii. Kushman, J. W. (1992). The organizational dynamics of teacher workplace commitment: A study of urban elementary and middle schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(1), 5-42.
- xix. London, M., & Klimoski, R. J. (1975). A study perceived job complexity. *Personnel Psychology*, 28(1), 45.
- xx. Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Li, W. (2005). The psychological capital of chinese workers: Exploring the relationship with performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 1(2), 249-271.
- xxi. Martell, K., & Carroll, S. J. (1995). How Strategic Is HRM? *Human Resource Management*, 34(2), 253-267.
- xxii. Maynard, D. C., & Hakel, M. D. (1997). Effects of objective and subjective task complexity on performance. *Human Performance*, 10(4), 303-330.
- xxiii. McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. New York: Yan Nostrand.
- xxiv. McEvoy, G. M., & Cascio, W. F. (1985). Strategies for reducing employee turnover: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 342-353.
- xxv. McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(3), 626-637.
- xxvi. Milkovich, T., Newman, M., & Gerhart, B. (2013). *Compensation*. New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- xxvii. Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship?. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855.
- xxviii. Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The work design questionnaire(WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6), 1321-1339.
- xxix. Nicholls, J. G. (1989). *The competitive ethos and democratic education*. Cambridge. MA: Harvard University Press.
- xxx. Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556.
- xxxi. Oldham, G. R., & Miller. H. E. (1979). The effect of significant other's job complexity on employee reaction to work. *Human Relations*, 32(3), 247.

- xxxii. Reilly, R. R., Brown, B., Blood, M. R., & Malatesta, C. Z. (1981). The effects of realistic preview: A study and discussion of the literature. *Personnel Psychology*, 34, 823-834.
- xxxiii. Staw, B. M., Bell, N. E., & Clausen, J. A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31(1), 56-77.
- xxxiv. Steers, R. M. (1984). *Introduction to organization behavior*. New York: Foreman and Company.
- xxxv. Swanson, R. A. (1995). Human resource development: Performance is the key. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 6(3), 207-213.
- xxxvi. Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper.
- xxxvii. Van de ven, A. H., & Ferry, D. L. (1980). *Measuring and assessing organizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- xxxviii. Wood, R. E. (1986). Task complexity: Definition of the construct. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Process*, 37(1), 60-82.
- xxxix. Yitzhak, F., Samuel, M., & Haim A. B. (2002). The joint effect of noise, job complexity, and gender on employee sickness absence. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 133.
- xl. Ziguere, I., & Buckland, B. K. (1998). A theory of task/technology fit and group support system effectiveness. *MIS Quarterly*, 22(3), 313-335.