**Campbell’s Model of Job Performance**

Campbell’s Model of Job Performance Psychology deals with behavior. In the case of work psychology, that means the behavior of workers, or worker performance. Consider the following variables that I-O psychologists have used as measures of performance (Campbell, McCloy, Oppler, & Sager, 1993): Time to complete a training course Number of pieces produced Total days absent Total value of sales Promotion rate within an organization An important question that is often overlooked is: To what extent can an individual worker control any of these measures of performance? Research has demonstrated that the actual task design and work flow process can substantially affect an individual worker’s potential output (Doerr et al., 2004; Tett & Burnett, 2003). Let’s examine each of the above performance measures with a more critical view: Time to complete a training course might be constrained by how much time the worker can be away from the workplace. Number of pieces produced is affected by the technology and equipment used by that worker. Total days absent does not distinguish between excused and unexcused absences, sick days, personal days, or vacation days. Total value of sales will be affected by discounts, territory, competition, marketing promotions, or the value of the products the employee is assigned to sell. Promotion rate within an organization will be affected by the turnover rate in that organization. Thus, we can see that in each of these cases, the “performance” measure was not really (or at least not exclusively) an individual behavior. Campbell and his colleagues have argued persuasively that I-O psychology has spent a great deal of time describing the various worker attributes that “cause” or are related to performance but little time describing actual performance at the individual worker level (Campbell, 1990a, 1999; Campbell et al., 1996). They have proposed a model of work performance that provides a more detailed view of performance and that helps to separate the factors that are directly under the worker’s control from those that aren’t. Before presenting this model, we need to set forth some definitions (Campbell et al., 1993).

[**Performance**](https://jigsaw.vitalsource.com/books/9781118819876/epub/OPS/loc_020.xhtml#eid27245) is behavior. In its ideal form, it is something that people actually do and that can be observed. In many jobs, of course, the “behavior” is thinking, planning, or problem solving and cannot be actually observed; instead, it can only be described with the help of the individual worker. In the work setting, performance includes only those actions or behaviors that are relevant to the organization’s goals and can be measured in terms of each individual’s proficiency. Performance is what the organization hires an employee to do and to do well.

Performance

Actions or behaviors relevant to the organization’s goals; measured in terms of each individual’s proficiency.

[**Effectiveness**](https://jigsaw.vitalsource.com/books/9781118819876/epub/OPS/loc_020.xhtml#eid26106) is the evaluation of the results of performance. The variation in a measure of effectiveness is often controlled by factors beyond the actions of an individual, as is evident from the example of total value of sales.

Effectiveness

Evaluation of the results of performance; often controlled by factors beyond the actions of an individual.

[**Productivity**](https://jigsaw.vitalsource.com/books/9781118819876/epub/OPS/loc_020.xhtml#eid27420) is the ratio of effectiveness (output) to the cost of achieving that level of effectiveness (input) (Mahoney, 1988). A profit margin for a unit or company is an index of productivity. For in-depth discussions of the relationship between performance and productivity, see Campbell and Campbell (1988) as well as Pritchard, Harrell, DiazGranados, and Guzman (2008).

Productivity

Ratio of effectiveness (output) to the cost of achieving that level of effectiveness (input).

Campbell’s model also proposes that many of the variables we examined in earlier chapters and will examine in later chapters (ability, personality, interest, training and experience, motivators) have an *indirect* effect on performance. These variables can affect performance only by changing the level of DK, PKS, or M. For example, increased training or experience will affect performance by increasing DK or PKS; incentives for performance will affect performance by increasing M (inducing the person to perform at a higher level or to perform for a longer period of time). Similarly, Tett and Burnett (2003) propose that personality, in particular conscientiousness, has a substantial effect on goal setting, which in turn increases declarative knowledge. They suggest that this connection explains the finding (noted in [**Chapter 3**](https://jigsaw.vitalsource.com/books/9781118819876/epub/OPS/loc_006.xhtml#eid3662)) that conscientiousness has strong and positive correlations with job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991, 2005).

There is one other important aspect to Campbell’s model: actual performance components. DK, PKS, and M are [**determinants of performance**](https://jigsaw.vitalsource.com/books/9781118819876/epub/OPS/loc_020.xhtml#eid26014), but they are not behaviors (i.e., they are not performance itself). Campbell’s research identified eight basic performance components ([**Table 4.1**](https://jigsaw.vitalsource.com/books/9781118819876/epub/OPS/loc_007.xhtml#eid7268)), some or all of which can be found in every job. When we combine the eight performance components with the three direct determinants of performance and the various indirect determinants of performance, we get an expanded model such as the one depicted in [**Figure 4.2**](https://jigsaw.vitalsource.com/books/9781118819876/epub/OPS/loc_007.xhtml#eid7320). Although the model specifies eight distinct [**performance components**](https://jigsaw.vitalsource.com/books/9781118819876/epub/OPS/loc_020.xhtml#eid27250), not all components will appear in all jobs. Nevertheless, the model allows performance in any job to be broken into all or some subsets of these components. Campbell asserted that three of the performance components—core task proficiency, demonstrating effort, and maintaining personal discipline—are essential at some level for every job.

TABLE 4.1: Campbell’s Eight Performance Components

| ***Performance components and definitions*** |
| --- |
| **Job-specific task proficiency:** An individual’s capacity to perform the core substantive or technical tasks central to the job. |
| **Non-job-specific task proficiency:** An individual’s capacity to perform tasks or execute performance behaviors that are not specific to his or her particular job. |
| **Written and oral communication task proficiency:** An individual’s proficiency in writing and speaking, independent of the correctness of the subject matter. |
| **Demonstrating effort:** The consistency of an individual’s effort; the frequency with which people will expend extra effort when required; the willingness to keep working under adverse conditions. |
| **Maintaining personal discipline:** The extent to which an individual avoids negative behavior such as excessive absenteeism, alcohol or substance abuse, and law or rules infractions. |
| **Facilitating peer and team performance:** The extent to which an individual supports peers, helps peers with problems, helps keep a work group goal directed, and acts as a role model for peers and the work group. |
| **Supervision/leadership:** Proficiency at influencing the performance of subordinates through face-to-face interpersonal interaction and influence. |
| **Management/administration:** Behavior directed at articulating for the unit, organizing people and resources, monitoring progress, helping to solve problems that might prevent goal accomplishment, controlling expenses, obtaining additional resources, and dealing with other units. |