

## **LINKAGE OF JOB ANALYSIS TO PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT: A CASE STUDY**

**Dr. Sunitha Kshatriya\***

---

### **Abstract**

This paper is aimed at developing a valid performance management tool based on an accurate, detailed, thorough and thoughtful functional job analysis methodology set on North American human resources standards' approved job fact sheet, job analysis questionnaire, task statements' sheet, job duties, job statements and job specifications that were identified. Based on which, key knowledge, skills, abilities and other attributes (KSAO's) from the task inventory and task statements were subsequently derived. A performance management tool based on an absolute rating system using graphic rating scales was designed along with definition of job performance dimensions for a 'requisite' customer care representative position based on the KSAO's derived. The job analysis carried out not only assures managers that a valid performance management instrument can be developed based on a job analysis, but also demonstrates to HR Managers how systematic human resource decisions can be based on approaches adopted in this research.

**Key Words: Performance Management, Functional Job Analysis, Knowledge, Skills, Abilities, Attributes (KSAO's), Job Duties, Specification, Task Inventory and Worker-Function Orientation**

---

\* **Department of Business Administration, Al Dar University College, Al Garhoud**

## 1. Introduction

This paper is a result of the continuation of an earlier research ‘*Job Analysis: Case Study of a Multinational Firm*’ that began its journey in the Winter of 2012 through the research corridors of York University in *Toronto*; field work that was concluded with a Multinational Company (MNC) based in *Toronto* and its various branches within *Canada*; documentation completed at 657 Grand Trunk Avenue, *Ontario*; conference presentation done at ICOM, *Abu Dhabi* in Nov. 2015; various teaching and assessments derived from it at Al Dar University College classrooms in *Dubai* between Spring 2015-2016 and, its final culmination as a paper published (Sunitha Kshatriya, 2016, IJMRA, USA, pg.204-230), thus completing a full circle of its *globetrotting* experience! One of the conclusions made in that paper was *scope for further research*, which included: developing a Performance Appraisal Tool for the same position (Customer Care Representative) using Graphical Rating Scale as a valid and reliable predictor based on critical criteria derived through the job analysis to evaluate Task, Contextual and Counter Productive Behaviors.

A study examined the impact of job analysis on organizational performance among 148 companies based in the United Arab Emirates (UAE), a Gulf-region country. Survey results of that study indicated that a practice of proactive job analysis was strongly related to organizational performance (Siddique, C.M, 2004). Job Analysis gives managers a legally defensible tool against pleas of discrimination against protected groups, when hiring and selection decisions are made including performance appraisal and other HR decision related to pay increases, promotion, training etc are based on job analysis (Kshatriya S.S.T, 2016). Another study concluded in 2011 showed how Organizational Behavior Management research and practice can incorporate tools from Job Analysis to achieve an effective and socially valid organizational improvement strategy (Crowell, Charles R.; Hantula, Donald A.; McArthur, Kari L., 2011). Job analysis is thus a key to Recruitment, Selection, Orientation, Training, Career Development, Counseling, Health, Safety, Performance Management and Compensation.

Job Analysis answers the questions of what tasks performed in what manner make up a job, which this research evaluates using a Performance Management tool. The major focus of this paper is developing a performance appraisal tool based on the final 15 KSAO’s that were derived

based on a rigorous and detailed *Functional Job Analysis* shown in its preceding paper. This paper documents the link established between the final 15 KSAOs derived for a requisite position within a multinational company and the process showing the creation of a Performance Appraisal Tool using Graphical Rating Scales based on those criteria. This paper begins from where the earlier one concluded.

## 2. Literature Review

Research has established the link between HR practices and organizational performance, suggesting that the HR system has great strategic potential to drive organizational effectiveness (Heneman, Herbert G.; Milanowski, Anthony T, 2011). Based on Campbell's (1990, Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 2nd ed., Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 687–732) multi-factorial model of job performance, the Expatriate Performance Scales were developed by Lee, Leanda and Donohue Rossin 2012 to measure components of expatriate performance. These procedures resulted in 32 items measuring an amended model of expatriate performance with six components that included task performance (*task*), communication performance (*contextual*), demonstrating effort, maintaining personal discipline (*counter-productive*), team and leadership performance (*contextual*) and, management and administration performance (*contextual*). Research completed earlier for a large international craft union provided the opportunity for an empirical assessment of functional job analysis (FJA) as a method for developing job-related performance standards (Olson, Howard C.; Fine, Sidney A.; Myers, David C.; Jennings, Margarete C., 1981).

JA plays a vital role in Human Resource Management and is a prerequisite for other core functions of HRM such as Selection, Training and Development, Compensation and Performance Management (Nankervis and Compton, 1994 as referenced in Zubair S.S & Khan M. A. 2014). Competency with regards to job analysis is a list of tasks, duties, responsibilities, knowledge, skills, and abilities that a person must have in order to be sufficiently competent at a given position, Bodnarchuk (2012). Singh (2009) has highlighted the importance of JA in the changing work place environment. "Job Analysis is an important factor in designing performance appraisal tools i.e. it guides in development of different tools for different types of jobs. It involves an organized set of activities for drafting out duties of an individual employee" (Zubair S.S & Khan

M. A. 2014). Moreover, it also assists in identification of Knowledge, Skills and Abilities (KSA) required in performing a job (Whetzel & Wheaton, 1997 as referenced in Zubair S.S & Khan M. A. 2014). Few researchers have discussed the relationship between JA and PM to find out the impact of Job Analysis on Job Performance (Safdar et al. 2010 as referenced in Zubair S.S & Khan M. A. 2014). Although some have established the link between JA and PM in order to enhance the understanding of strategic connection between these two (Zubair S.S & Khan M. A. 2014). Nankarvis et al. (2002) have presented a strategic model for HRM clearly depicting the strategic association between Job Design and Performance Management (as referenced in Zubair S.S & Khan M. A. 2014). The fact is that through Job Analysis two important documents i.e. Job Description and Job Specification are developed that set a bases for Performance Management. However, Job Analysis is done under the light of the overall organizational strategy which itself is derived from overall organizational objectives and goals. (Zubair S.S & Khan M. A. 2014).

Job analysis is a key to recruitment, selection, orientation, training, career development, counseling, health, safety, performance management and compensation. Byars & Rue, (2006) discussed that “the backbone of the most human resource activities is Job analysis which can serve a number of functions. Job Analysis also gives managers a legally defensible tool against pleas of discrimination against protected groups, when hiring and selection decisions including performance appraisal and other HR decisions (Kshatriya, 2016). Job analysis answers the questions of what tasks, performed in what manner, make up a job. Outputs of this analytical study include: (a) a list of the job tasks; (b) details of how each task is performed; (c) statements describing the responsibility, job knowledge, mental application, and dexterity, as well as accuracy required; and (d) a list of the equipment, materials, and supplies used to perform the job Clifton P. Campbell, (1989). Frear, Katherine A et Al (June, 2011) offer the view on the importance of specificity to improving performance management. They mention that human resource (HR) departments substitute specificity with generality due to organization growth and needs for cheaper job analysis methods. However, such practice leads to vague assessments; thus, declining performance management. Job Analysis (JA) should be considered as a pre requisite by all organizations. There is a positive link between JA and PM. (Zubair S.S & Khan M. A. 2014). One of the central themes in the fields of Organizational Psychology is mapping the relationship between individual characteristics (e.g., skills, abilities, personality traits) and workplace

behavior (Gruys and Sackett, 2003). Hughes, Garry L et al. work in 2011 stated that “a single job skill may be a prerequisite for performance in a variety of tasks, and any one task may require multiple skills of varying levels for effective performance”.

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1 Conducting a Functional Job Analysis**

Initially a functional job analysis was carried out for the requisite position based on National Classification Code of Canada, wherein a Standardized Job Analysis Interview Questionnaire was developed and implemented to assess important tasks, knowledge, skills, abilities required, physical abilities, environmental conditions, typical working incidents, supervisory responsibilities, etc., for a sample of 9 customer service representatives and 3 Groups’ subject matter area experts taken from within the MNC. A task statement bank sheet was used to evaluate the worker function orientation and percentage of data, things and people needed to perform the job. Task statements were created based on the identification of critical statements leading to the formation of a task inventory incorporating the following 4 elements – a verb describing the action; an object of the verb; a description of tools, equipment, aids and processes used on the job; and the expected job output, rated these tasks in order of its Frequency, Importance and Difficulty on a 5-point scale of 1-5

Questions asked included knowledge of subject matter area covered by each task / major duties; environmental conditions of the job; assessing the worker-function orientation with regards to the facts and principles needed on the job; level, degree and breath of knowledge required for the area; duration of each major task in terms of duration and periodicity; general education and reasoning, math and language abilities. Based on the evaluation of answers received from each of the samples, final task statements were derived to indicate tasks where at least 75% employees engaged in them. This task inventory was identified in terms of *frequency*, *Importance* and *Difficulty* on a 5-point scale of 1-5. Creating a short-list of 14 task statements prior to the 75% rating done.

Then, 37 KSAO’s were derived out of 14 task statements as a result of the analysis of the final task statements that included uncovering 11 KNOWLEDGE areas, 9 SKILL areas, 12 ABILITY

areas and 5 OTHER ATTRIBUTE components. However, in the final task inventory only final 11 task statements were taken, those with a Mean of 3 and upwards on a 5-point scale. Each KSAO was then rated in order of Importance on a 5-point scale of 1-5 and in order of Proficiency on a 3-point scale of 1-3. Finally, a Task \* KSAO matrix was compiled. Task Characterization was done and final KSAO's and job performance dimensions were listed based on their order of weighting / ranking. These were further differentiated on the basis of Tasks, Context and Counterproductive behavioral components as follows:

Table 1:

Rank	KSAO's	% Weights
1	Ability to make Judgment	92 % (Task)
2	Ability to work Concurrently	92% (Context)
3	Ability for Self-Management	92% (Context)
4	Ability to Multitask	92% (Task)
5	Attribute of Emotional Intelligence	92% (Context)
6	Ability to work in a cramped Environment and Space	83% (Task)
7	Ability to Make Decisions	83% (Task)
8	Knowledge of English Language	73% (Context)
9	Knowledge of Computers	73% (Task)
10	Attribute of Honesty	67% (Counter-productive)
11	Skill in Written Communication	58% (Task)
12	Skill in using Microsoft Word, Excel and Outlook	58% (Task)
13	Skill in Verbal Communication	50% (Task)
14	Interpersonal Ability	50% (Context)
15	Ability to deal with new People and Situations	50% (Context)

A detailed step-by-step process of the Functional Job Analysis that was conducted can be viewed in my earlier paper that has been published as referenced below:

Kshatriya, S. (July 2016). Job Analysis: Case Study of a Multinational Firm.

*International Journal of Management, IT and Engineering*, Houston, USA, Vol.6, Issue 7, ISSN: 2249-0058. Pg.204-230

### **3.2 Performance Management tool developed with its link to KSAO's**

A Performance Appraisal tool is developed based on an *Absolute Rating System* using a *Graphical Rating Scale*. An *Absolute Rating System* is chosen, as it is more *valid* and *reliable*. This compares employee performance with an absolute standard of performance. Performance is first assessed for each of the *Performance Dimensions* as identified in the final 15 KSAO's and derived from those, which are critical for the performance of the job selected. A rating scale is subsequently developed for each of the dimension that is to be evaluated.

The *Graphical Rating Scale* was selected as it is *valid*, *reliable* and *practical* and meets the current resources. Furthermore, since the job is a *requisite job* and not a *strategic job*, using *Graphical Rating Scales* serves the objective of *performance appraisal*. The *anchors* (poor, average, excellent) developed provide sufficient guidance to raters and help ensure consistency in rating even without detailed behavioral descriptions of what is meant by "average" or "excellent"; since the *job dimensions* are fairly straightforward and simple and the job is not a very complex one. However, if the job was a *strategic* one then a more complex procedure of *Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales* would have had to be chosen to help raters understand subtle differences in the scales.

### **3.3 KSAO's used in the Performance Management (PM) Tool**

8 Task Behaviors, 6 Contextual Behaviors and 1 Counter Productive / Preventive Behavior were used for developing the PM tool. In all, 15 key behaviors were aligned to the 15 final KSAO's derived from the process of the previous job analysis. The Tasks Behaviors included 1 Knowledge, 4 Abilities and 3 Skill components. The Contextual Behaviors included 1 Knowledge, 4 Abilities and 1 Attribute components. The Counter Productive or Preventive Behavior included 1 Attribute component. Thus in all, 2 Knowledge Behaviors, 8 Ability Behaviors, 3 Skill Behaviors and 2 Attribute Behaviors were used to develop the PM tool in the order of their % weight distribution to reflect priority and periodicity of usage in their job performance, as follows:

**KSAO's****% WeightsBehaviors****3.4 Task Behaviors Used**

1.	Ability to make Judgment	– 92%	- Task
2.	Ability to Multitask	– 92%	- Task
3.	Ability to work in a cramped Environment and Space	– 83%	- Task
4.	Ability to Make Decisions	– 83%	- Task
5.	Knowledge of Computers	– 73%	- Task
6.	Skill in Written Communication	– 58%	- Task
7.	Skill in using Microsoft Word, Excel and Outlook	– 58%	- Task
8.	Skill in Verbal Communication	– 50%	- Task

**3.5 Context Behaviors Used**

1.	Ability to work Concurrently	– 92%	- Context
2.	Ability for Self-Management	– 92%	- Context
3.	Attribute of Emotional Intelligence	– 92%	- Context
4.	Knowledge of English Language	– 73%	- Context
5.	Interpersonal Ability	– 50%	- Context
6.	Ability to deal with new People and Situations	– 50%	- Context

**3.6 Preventive Behaviors Used**

1.	Attribute of Honesty	– 67%	- Counter-Productive
----	----------------------	-------	----------------------

**3.7 The PA method developed**

*Graphical Rating Scales* were produced for each of the 15 *job dimensions* – the KSAO's. The scale consisted of the following for each *job dimension*:

1. Name of the *job dimension*
2. A brief definition of the dimension
3. A 5-point scale with equal intervals, placed on the scale from 1-5
4. Verbal labels / anchors of - *Poor, Below Average, Average, Above Average* and *Excellent* attached to numerical scale, and



5. Instruction for making a response.

### 3.8 **The *Graphic Rating Scales* (5-point):**

The following formed verbal anchors of the *Performance Management* tool designed along with their rating scale

- *Poor* – point 1
- *Below Average* – points 2
- *Average* – points 3
- *Above Average* – points 4
- *Excellent* – points 5

### 3.9. **15 Job Performance Dimensions**

These were aligned to the final 15 KSAO's and explained in terms of what each dimension means in the context of the job, with their definitions given in the PM tool developed

- Judgment
- Work Concurrently
- Self Management
- Multitask
- Emotional Intelligence
- Working in Cramped Space
- Decision Making
- English Language
- Computers
- Honesty
- Written Communication
- Microsoft Office Applications
- Verbal Communication
- Interpersonal
- New People and Situations

**3.10 Instruction on how to make a response**

The following instruction followed each definition of the *job dimension*, e.g.: “Circle the number that best reflects the employee’s *ability to deal with new people and situations* on the job”.

**4. Results:**

Below is a sample of the PM Tool that is developed that includes all of the below as explained on page 9:

- Name of the *job dimension*
- A brief definition of the dimension
- A 5-point scale with equal intervals, placed on the scale from 1-5
- Verbal labels / anchors of - *Poor, Below Average, Average, Above Average* and *Excellent* attached to numerical scale, and
- Instruction for making a response.

The Performance Management tool developed is shown below:

**PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT TOOL**

1. **JUDGMENT** – This job requires making judgment on potential of customers, disabling non-potential customers from the database, forwarding relevant customer information to the Branch for follow up etc. Consider the employee’s ability to do this.

*Circle the number that best reflects the employee’s ability to use his/her judgment on the job.*

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Poor	Below	Average	Above	Excellent
Average				

2. **WORK CONCURRENTLY** – This job requires working on different job aspects at the same time - speaking to customers on phone, recording information given, reading from a product list, giving information to customers, answering queries etc. Consider the employee’s ability to do this.

*Circle the number that best reflects the employee’s ability to work concurrently on the job.*

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Below	Average	Above	Excellent
Average		Average		

3. **SELF-MANAGEMENT** – This job requires one to self-manage while making calls, speaking to customers, updating the database and disabling customers, etc. Consider the employee's ability to do this.

*Circle the number that best reflects the employee's ability to self-manage on the job.*

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Below	Average	Above	Excellent
Average		Average		

4. **MULTITASK** – This job requires multitasking to prepare promotional packages, talk to customers, prepare reports, compile statistics, monitor sales records etc. Consider the employee's ability to do this.

*Circle the number that best reflects the employee's ability to multitask on the job.*

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Below	Average	Above	Excellent
Average		Average		

5. **EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE** – This job requires using emotional intelligence while talking to customers, dealing with Branches and employees. Consider the employee's attributes for this.

*Circle the number that best reflects the employee's attribute of emotional intelligence on the job.*

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Below	Average	Above	Excellent
Average		Average		

6. **WORKING IN CRAMPED SPACE** – This job requires working in cramped space at the Branch sometimes to perform various tasks. Consider the employee's ability to do this.

*Circle the number that best reflects the employee's ability to work in a cramped space on the job.*

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Below	Average	Above	Excellent
Average		Average		

7. **DECISION MAKING** – This job requires making decisions while speaking to customers, passing information to Branches, disabling customers in the database. Consider the employee's ability to do this.

*Circle the number that best reflects the employee's ability to take decisions on the job.*

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Below	Average	Above	Excellent
Average		Average		

8. **ENGLISH LANGUAGE** – This job requires using grammatically correct English Language for understanding and talking to customers, reading instructions / information and for writing letters. Consider the employee's knowledge of this.

*Circle the number that best reflects the employee's knowledge of the English language required on the job.*

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Below	Average	Above	Excellent
Average		Average		

9. **COMPUTERS** – This job requires using computers on a daily basis. Consider the employee's knowledge of this.

*Circle the number that best reflects the employee's knowledge of computers required on the job.*

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Below	Average	Above	Excellent
Average		Average		

10. **HONESTY** – This job requires honesty while dealing with customers, staff and managers. Consider the employee's attribute for this.

*Circle the number that best reflects the employee's attribute of honesty on the job.*

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Below	Average	Above	Excellent
Average		Average		

11. **WRITTEN COMMUNICATION** – This job requires written communication for preparing customized letters for customers. Consider the employee's skill at this.

*Circle the number that best reflects the employee's skill in written communication on the job.*

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Below	Average	Above	Excellent
Average		Average		

12. **MICROSOFT OFFICE APPLICATIONS** – This job requires working with various software application for preparing monthly performance reports, recording statistics and information, making graphs and charts, emailing customers / staff and for preparing presentations. Consider the employee's skill at this.

*Circle the number that best reflects the employee's skill at using Microsoft Word, Excel, Power Point and Outlook on the job.*

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Below	Average	Above	Excellent
Average		Average		

13. **VERBAL COMMUNICATION** – This job requires verbally communicating with customers, employees and to convince customers. Consider the employee’s skill at this. *Circle the number that best reflects the employee’s skill in verbal communication on the job.*

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Below	Average	Above	Excellent
Average		Average		

14. **INTERPERSONAL** – This job requires dealing interpersonally with Customers’ at varying levels; peers, managers and other staff. Consider the employee’s ability to do this. *Circle the number that best reflects the employee’s ability for maintaining interpersonal relationships on the job.*

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Below	Average	Above	Excellent
Average		Average		

15. **NEW PEOPLE AND SITUATIONS** – This job requires dealing with new people and situations while talking on the phone and while dealing with Branch staff. Consider the employee’s ability to do this. *Circle the number that best reflects the employee’s ability to deal with new people and situations on the job.*

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Below	Average	Above	Excellent
Average		Average		

#### 4.1 *Limitations of using this tool*

Although there is a limitation in using the *Graphical Rating Scale*, of raters using other interpretations of *job dimensions* in giving ratings; however, at least raters have to consider the standardized definition provided. The anchors provide benchmarks to help raters understand differences between degrees of various *job dimensions*; however, different raters may still have a different understanding of what constitutes “average” behavior.

### 5. Discussion

The job analysis that was concluded in the earlier research quoted on page 2 of this paper led to the identification of final 15 key Knowledge, Skills, Abilities and Other attributes (KSAO's).

#### 5.1 *Knowledge*

Being a body of information that is distributive and procedural in nature, needed for the successful performance of a requisite job.

#### 5.2 *Skills*

Being at the level of competency or proficiency / atomicity as expressed in numerical terms for specific tasks.

#### 5.3 *Ability*

Being a more general capability needed by employees at the beginning of tasks that includes their values and attitudes.

#### 5.4 *Other Attributes*

Included personality traits or other personal specific traits integral to performance of the job.

These KSAO's were derived based on a detailed *interview* conducted. The process involved identification of *critical statements* and analyses of *task statements*; compilation of a *task inventory*; getting that *task inventory* rated by multiple incumbents and SME's to arrive at a final list of task statements based on 75% *agreeability*, after calculating the *mean* of the *frequency*, *importance* and *difficulty* of each *task statement* as rated by other incumbents. Only 11 task

statements were finally considered from initial 14, whose mean was 3 and above on a 5-point scale. Key KSAO's were identified and analyzed based on their *importance and proficiency*. Finally a *task statement and KSAO matrix* was drawn and *evaluated for the number of positives, based on 50% and more occurrence of each KSAO's within each task statement; percentage weighting/ ranking given to significant KSAO's*. From the initial list of 37 KSAO's arrived at prior to the *task statement and KSAO matrix evaluation* was completed, they *came down to 15 significant KSAO's* after the *matrix evaluation* was completed, which were further identified on the basis of *tasks, context and counterproductive* components, they corresponded to.

These same final 15 KSAO's were then used to develop a Performance Appraisal Tool for requisite position of a Customer Care Representative using Graphical Rating Scales as a valid and reliable predictor based on the critical criteria of the 15 KSAO's derived through the job analysis, to evaluate Task, Contextual and Counter Productive Behaviors. Job performance has three dimensions: task performance, citizenship behavior / contextual performance, and counterproductive behavior.

### 5.5 ***Task performance***

This includes employee behaviors that are directly involved in the transformation of organizational resources into the goods or services that the organization produces. Task Behavior is an employee's response to a task-based environment in which this employee operates.

### 5.6 ***Contextual Performances***

This contains elements of organizational citizenship behavior and pro-social organizational behavior. This concerns aspects of an individual's performance that maintains and enhances an organization's social network and the psychological climate that supports technical tasks. (Borman and Motowidlo, 1997)

### 5.7 ***Counter Productive***

This is an employee's behavior that goes against the legitimate interests of an organization. These behaviors can harm organizations or people in organizations including employees and clients, customers.



### **5.8 Rationale for the type of job analysis used**

Functional Job Analysis (FJA) was used as it is more structured, reliable, thorough and a more rigorous method. Cronshaw, S. F., Best, R., Zucek, L., Warner, M. A., Hysong, S. J., & Pugh, J. A. (2007) showed the validation of FJA task data based on social-organizational validation strategies.

### **5.9 Rationale for the type of performance appraisal tool developed:**

The Performance Appraisal tool is based on the *Absolute Rating System* and uses the *Graphical Rating Scale*. The *Absolute Rating System* was chosen as it is more valid and reliable as it compares employee performance with an absolute standard of performance.

## **6. Conclusion**

A well planned and *strategically aligned* performance management tool can help the Human Resource Department of any organization to design well structural recruitment process including screening, interviewing and final decision making. The final 15 KSAO's identified through the process of *job analysis* and, which have been used to develop the *performance management* tool that will be the basis of the *selection for promotion criteria*. Candidates who fall short of the criteria required will be rejected. The extensive exercise of identifying the KSAO's based on major task assessment and then developing a PM tool aligned to that for a particular job help managers evaluate employees fairly in an unbiased manner leading to effective promotion decisions related to an employee that has strategic value for an organization.

## **7. Managerial Relevance**

According to Nankarvis, A., Compton, R., & Baird, M (2002), 'Job Analysis is an important factor in designing performance appraisal tools'. The ongoing research will help today's Managers further in various ways:

1. In developing an aligned behavioral description interview questionnaire that ensure that only candidates with job required KSAO's are selected.
2. In developing Job Descriptions and Job Specifications. As per Bodnarchuk (2012) 'the interviews show that job descriptions are important in the company'.

3. In recruitment, by assessing applicants to see whether there is a person-organization fit and ascertains if a candidate has the required KSAO's or competence.
4. In screening application forms for the minimum qualification (MQ) that are based on the required KSAO's for evaluating successful performance on the job.
5. In screening / testing potential employees and to finalize job candidates who have the required KSAO's to successfully perform at the job.
6. In conducting a standardized structured interviews based on the KSAO's derived from the Job Analysis.
7. Finally, in decision-making where hiring decisions will be based on valid and reliable measurement of various KSAO's, which have been tested and derived using job analysis.

### **Acknowledgements**

1. Dr. MJ Ducharme – Associate Professor, York University
2. Mr. Tony Richardson – Group Manager, Torbram Electric Supply, Toronto
3. Dr. Sonia Singh – Assistant Professor, Faculty and Trainer, United Arab Emirates

### **8. References**

- Bodnarchuk, M. (2012). The role of job descriptions and competencies in an international organization case: *Foster Wheeler Energia Oy* (Bachelor's Thesis). Retrieved from <http://publications.theseus.fi/handle/10024/44051>
- Borman & Motowidlo. (1997). Task Performance and Contextual Performance. *Asian Personality at Work*, University of Queensland, Australia. Retrieved from <http://personality.cn/personality-at-work-scientific-literature-review/task-performance-and-contextual-performance/>
- Byars, L.L. & Rue, L.W. (2006). *Human Resource Management* (8 Ed.). New York: The McGraw-Hill.
- Clifton P. Campbell, (1989) "Job Analysis for Industrial Training", *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 13 Iss: 2

- Crowell, Charles R.; Hantula, Donald A.; McArthur, Kari L. (Oct-Dec, 2011). From Job Analysis to PerformanceManagement: A Synergistic Rapprochement to Organizational Effectiveness. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*. Vol. 31 Issue Cronshaw, S. F., Best, R., Zugec, L., Warner, M. A., Hysong, S. J., & Pugh, J. A. (2007). A five component validation model for functional job analysis as used in job redesign. *Ergometrika*, 4, 12-31
- Frear, Katherine A.; Paustian-Underdahl, Samantha C. (June, 2011). From Elusive to Obvious: Improving PerformanceManagement Through Specificity.*Industrial & Organizational Psychology*. Vol. 4 Issue 2, p198-200
- Gruys, L.M, & Sackett, P.R. (Mar, 2003). Investigating the Dimensionality of CounterProductive Work Behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol.11 No.1, pg.30–43
- Heneman, Herbert G.; Milanowski, Anthony T. (2011). Assessing human resource practices alignment: A case study. *Human Resource Management*. Jan/Feb2011, Vol. 50 Issue 1,
- Hughes, Garry L.; Prien, Erich P. (1989). Evaluation of Task and Job Skill Linkage Judgment used to Develop Test Specifications. *Personnel Psychology*. Vol. 42 Issue 2, p283-292
- Kloot, L., Martin, J. (2000); Strategic performance management: A balanced approach to Performance management issues in local government, *Management Accounting Research*, Vol.11 No.2, pg.231–251
- Kshatriya, S.S.T. (July 2016). Job Analysis: Case Study of a Multinational Firm. *International Journal of Management, IT and Engineering*, Houston, USA, Vol.6, Issue 7, ISSN: 2249-0058. Pg.204-230

- Lebas, M J. (1995): Performance measurement and performance management, *International Journal of Production Economics*, vol. 41(3),pp.23–35
- Lee, Leanda & Donohue, Ross. (Mar, 2012). The construction and initial validation of a measure of expatriate jobperformance. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Vol. 23 Issue 6, p1197-1215
- Levine, E. L., Sistrunk, F., McNutt, K. J., & Gael, S. (1988). Exemplary job analysis systems in Selected organizations: A description of processes and outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol.3. pp.3–21.
- Nankarvis, A., Compton, R., & Baird, M (2002). Strategic Human Resource Management. Singapur: Thomson Publishing.
- Olson, Howard C.; Fine, Sidney A.; Myers, David C.; Jennings, Margarette C. (1981). The use of Functional Job Analysis in Establishing Performance Standards for Heavy Equipment Operators. *Personnel Psychology*. Vol. 34 Issue 2, p351-364
- Rehman, M. S. (2010). *Impact of Job Analysis on Job Performance: A Study of Public Sector Organizations of Pakistan*. PhD thesis, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad.
- Safdar, R., Waheed, A., & Rafiq, K. H. (2010). Impact of Job Analysis On Job Performance. *Journal of Diversity Management*. Vol.5 No.2.
- Siddique, C.M. (2004). Job analysis: a strategic human resource management practice. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Vol. 15 No.1 pp. 219–244
- Singh, P. (2009). Job Analysis for a changing workplace. *School of Administrative Studies, York University*, 4700 Keele Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M3 I P3.

- Whetzel, D. L., & Wheaton, G. R. (1997). Applied measurement methods in industrial psychology. Davies-Black.
- Zubair S.S & Khan M. A. (2014), Job Analysis and Performance Management in Pakistan Army: *A Strategic Human Resource Management Perspective*. *Information and Knowledge Management*, Vol.4, No.10, 2014. ISSN 2224-5758 (Paper) ISSN 2224-896X (Online)