

THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS ON WORK PERFORMANCE AMONG EMPLOYEES OF GOVERNMENT AGRICULTURE AGENCIES IN MALAYSIA

Hayrol Azril MOHAMED SHAFFRIL,*
Jegak ULI*

Abstract

Work performance has been identified as the significant key for organizations to gain competitive advantage and superior productivity. Thus, this study intends to discover what exactly affect work performance among employees of government agriculture agencies in Malaysia. A total of 180 employees were selected as the respondents for this study. The respondents were chosen from ten government agriculture agencies in Malaysia. From the ANOVA and independent t-test conducted, type of residential house was found to have significant difference with work performance while Pearson Correlation employed indicated that age, working experience and gross monthly salary has significant and positive relationship with work performance.

Key Words: Socio-demographic Factors, Work Performance, and Agriculture Employee Agency

1. Introduction

Work performance has been identified as the significant key for organizations to gain competitive advantage and superior productivity. Although competitive advantage is more relevant to private sector, it can be extended to public sector by including '*servicing the public*' because it is the ultimate objective of the public sector. Study by Vermeeren et al. (2009) has proved that work performance could help public organization to improve service delivery. Realizing its importance, public organizations seem to pay attention on work performance in relation to formulating policies and enhance service delivery (Leeuw, 1996). In many organizations, people believe that work performance is more beneficial to them, their customer and more importantly, to their organization (McKendall and Margulis, 1995 and Cook and McCaulay, 1997). Since work performance is crucial to government services, high work performance among employees is a significant management challenge for providing excellent services to the public at all levels. However, what exactly affect government servant work performance need to be discovered first, thus this paper tends to reveal what exactly drive work performance among employees of government agriculture agencies in Malaysia.

According to Porter and Lawler (1968), there are three types of performance. One is the measure of output rates, amount of sales over a given period of time, the production of a group of employees reporting to manager, and so on. The second type of measure of performance involves ratings of individuals by someone other than the person whose performance is being considered. The third type of performance measure is self-appraisal and self-ratings. As a result, the adoption of self-appraisal and self-rating techniques are useful in encouraging employees to take an active role in setting his or her own goals. Thus, job performance measures the level of achievement of business and social objectives and responsibilities from the perspective of the judging party (Hersey and Blanchard, 1993).

Changes in demography are one of the factors that affect work performance (Palakurthi and Parks, 2000). However, there were only a few studies that looked into the impact of demographic factors on work performance in Malaysia. Among demographic variables that had been studied were gender, age, organizational tenure, job position and ethnicity. In terms of relationship between gender and work performance, previous studies (Igbaria and Shayo, 2007., Crawford and Nonis, 1996 and Shaiful Anuar, et al, 2009) reported that gender did not have a significant impact on work performance. However, a study done by Bengtson et al. (1978) noted that women were found to have better work performance compared to their counterpart. There are some inconsistencies found where study done by Lynn et al. (1996) found that men's performance increased with career stage measured as professional tenure, but they did not find a corresponding effect among women. Similarly, Larwood and Guket (1989) argued that theories of the career

*Institute for Social Science Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia

development of men do not fit women's career development. They stated that the model of men's career is simple and can be seen as continuous development whereas the career development of women is characterized as disjointed. These inconsistencies demand this research to provide answers to depicts whether situation in Malaysia support either research done by Benggton et al. (1978), or Lynn et al. (1996) and Larwood and Guket (1989).

A study by Yeara (1995) showed that age does not affect work performance, thus it contradicts with what have been revealed by Smedley and Whitten (2006), who suggested that difference of age could be also a potential factor for work performance. This is in tandem with a study by Shultz and Adam (2007) which indicated that there were significant differences between age groups concerning work performance. Kujala et al. (2005) emphasized that younger people are poor on work performance but this is opposed by a study by Birren and Schaie (2001). Level of education was also found not to influence work performance (Linz, 2002). Beside this, McBey and Karakowsky (2001) found that there is likelihood a causal relationship between education level and work performance. Ariss and Timmins (1989) indicated that education somewhat affect work performance. The lower the education level, the less likely people would have better work performance.

Income is indeed an important motivator for work performance. A study done by Dieleman et al. (2003) showed that work performance is influenced by both financial and non-financial incentives. The main motivating factors for workers were appreciation by managers, colleagues and the community, a stable job and income and training. The main discouraging factors were related to low salaries and difficult working conditions. Study done by Dieleman et al. (2003) was then supported by a study completed by Azman et al. (2009) where money acts as a moderating variable in the relationship between income distribution and pay satisfaction in the studied organization thus it will drive to better work performance. Job position is another variable that has been studied beside gender, age, income and education level. Lee et al. (2009) found that there is difference between top managers and middle managers in work performance. This indicates that job position has significant impact on work performance. In contrary, a study by Roebuck et al. (1995) noted that there is no difference in term of work performance between different positions in an organization

2. Methodology

A total of 180 respondents were involved in this study. All of the selected respondents were employees from ten government agriculture agencies in Malaysia (AAE) (see Table 1). Previously the research team decided to get equal number of respondents from each agency, but due to some limitation such as selecting only employee that involved in all of the three work systems (International Standard Organization (ISO), Key Performance Index (KPI) and E-Government); only 200 respondents were involved in this study. Due to some incomplete questionnaire, 20 questionnaire forms were excluded. The sampling procedure used here was stratified random sampling. The data collection process for this study was completed in two months period where drop and pick method was used. The developed questionnaire was used and pre-tested earlier. The pre test process was done on 30 respondents from Universiti Putra Malaysia. The independent variables for this study are age, gender, income, working experience, distance to work place, education attainment, job category and type of residential while the dependent variable is the work performance. The value for the work performance is the cumulative value of four aspects measured which were work quantity, work quality, punctuality and work systems. For the purpose of analysis, SPSS software was used where descriptive and inferential analyses were employed. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation were employed to describe the general data of this study. For the purpose of revealing any difference between selected socio-demography factor and work performance, inferential analyses such as ANOVA and Independent-t test were utilized while for determining any relationship between selected socio-demographic factor and work performance, analyses such as Pearson Correlation was applied.

Table 1: Selected Agriculture Agencies

Organization	Frequency	Percentage
Malaysian Agriculture Research and Development Institute (MARDI)	53	29.4
Department of Agriculture (DOA)	27	15.0
Malaysian Timber Board Industry (MTIB)	21	11.7
Department of Fisheries (DOF)	18	10.0
Malaysian Pineapple Industry Board (LPNM)	14	7.8
LKIM	11	6.1
Malaysia Rubber Board (LGM)	10	5.6
Malaysian Palm Oil Board (MPOB)	9	5.0
FAMA	9	5.0
Farmers Authority Organization (FOA)	8	4.4

3. Results

3.1 Respondents Socio-Demographic Profile

Data presented in Table 2 depicts profile of the respondents for this study. The results gained revealed that majority of AAE in Malaysia are female (57.2%). More than half of the respondents' age are below 40 years (58.9%) while a total of 41.1% of AAE are those age more than 40 years. The mean score for respondents' age is 37.4 years. A large majority of respondents have married (78.3%) while less than a quarter of respondents (21.7%) are among those who are still single/ widow or widower.

The results presented in Table 2 noted that respondents who attained post graduate and degree level is the minority group (28.3%), thus it draws early prediction that only minority are among high income earner. The highest percentage scored by those who possessed Diploma/ certificate (38.4%) and followed by those who are school leavers (33.3%). More than three-quarter of the respondents (77.8%) are support staff while only 22.2% of the respondents are professionals and management staff. In term of monthly income, it was noted that majority of respondents (45.0%) earn between RM1, 501-RM2, 500 followed by those who earn <RM1, 500 per month while 16.7% of the respondents indicated they earn between RM2, 501-RM3, 500 per month. This study found that only 16.1% of the respondents earn more than RM3, 501 per month thus it fits the early prediction that only minority of the respondents are high income earner. The mean score recorded for monthly income is RM2, 486.9.

This study also would like to discover the general data on working experience of AAE. Respondents were asked to indicate their work experience and it was concluded that the mean score for this variable is 14.2 years. Results gained also indicate that a slight majority of respondents (34.4%) are among "junior" employee (1-5 years working experience). This is followed by the "senior" group who working for more than 26 years (28.9%). Most of the agencies involved in this study located in the state of Selangor (39.4%), Kuala Lumpur (27.8%), Putrajaya (25.0%) and Johor (7.5%).

Table 2 has concluded that majority of respondents were able to buy their own house. A total of 56.1% of respondents have their own house. Almost one third of respondents still rent a house while only 13.9% opted to live in government quarters. The mean score recorded for distance from home to work place is 18.2km. Majority of respondents live near to their work place, this can be proved where more than one third of respondents (36.7%) were found to live in the range of 1-10km from their work place, followed by those who live more than 21 km (33.3%) and those who live in the range of 11-20 km from their work place (30.0%).

Table 2: Respondents Socio-Demographic Profile

Variables	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Standard Deviation
Gender				
Female	103	57.2		
Male	77	42.8		
Age			37.4	11.2

<40 years	105	58.9		
>40 years	75	41.1		
Marital status				
Married	141	78.3		
Unmarried/ Widow/Widower	39	21.7		
Education attainment				
Post Graduate/ Degree	51	28.3		
Diploma/ Certificate	69	38.4		
School leaver	60	33.3		
Job category				
Management staff	40	22.2		
Support staff	140	77.8		
Salary (Value in Ringgit Malaysia)			2,486.9	1318.5
≤1500	40	22.2		
1501-2500	81	45.0		
2501-3500	30	16.7		
≥3501	29	16.1		
Working experience			14.7	12.8
1-5 years	62	34.4		
6-15 years	43	23.9		
16-25 years	23	12.8		
≥26 years	52	28.9		
State				
Selangor	71	39.4		
Kuala Lumpur	50	27.8		
Putrajaya	45	25.0		
Johor	14	7.5		
Type of residential				
Government quarters	25	13.9		
Owned	101	56.1		
Rent	54	30.0		
Distance to work place (From home)			18.2	13.6
1-10km	66	36.7		
11-20km	50	30.0		
≥21km	54	33.3		

3.2 Work Performance

To measure work performance of respondents, four aspects were emphasized. The four aspects meant here are work quantity, work quality, punctuality and work systems. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of work performance on the 10-likert scales. From the overall mean score for work performance presented in Table 3 (M= 7.84), it can be concluded that agriculture agencies employee in Malaysia has a high level of work performance and this is a positive development for human resources in Malaysian public sector especially for agriculture agencies.

Table 3: Level of Work Performance among AAE

Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Standard Deviation
Low (0-3.33)	-	-	7.84	1.27
Moderate (3.34-6.67)	28	15.6		
High (6.68-10)	152	84.4		

3.3 Work Quantity

For the aspects of work quantity as presented in Table 4, it was found that a large majority of the respondents (82.2%) have high level of work quantity with the mean score of 7.73 (from maximum 10). Only 17.8% respondents were found to have moderate level of work performance. It is interesting to discover that none of the respondents were found to have low performance on work quantity. In spite of this positive indication that majority of AAE in Malaysia have the ability to receive and deliver their work in a bigger quantity, do this bigger quantity come along with a good quality? Table 6 will answer this question.

Table 4: Work Quantity

Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Standard Deviation
Low (0-3.33)	-	-	7.73	1.32
Moderate (3.34-6.67)	32	17.8		
High (6.68-10)	148	82.2		

From the results depicted in Table 5, it can be concluded that statement of “*I always achieve the quantity of customer demand*” signals the highest mean score which is 7.80. There is a possibility that there is a higher customer satisfaction within these agencies due to positive response towards their demand. The second highest mean score recorded by statement of “*I always achieve my personal work objectives*” (M= 7.71), while the same mean score also recorded for the statement “*I always achieve the organizational goal*”. The lowest mean score recorded by statement “*I always achieve the team work objectives*” (M= 1.70).

Table 5: Percentage on Work Quantity Statements

Statement/ Score Percentage	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Mean	S.D
I always achieve the quantity of customers' demand	-	-	-	1.7	6.1	10.6	16.1	32.8	23.3	9.4	7.80	1.41
I always achieve my personal work objectives	-	-	.6	1.1	6.1	10.6	18.9	33.3	22.2	7.2	7.71	1.38
I always achieve the organizational goals	-	-	-	1.7	6.1	8.9	20.6	33.9	22.8	6.1	7.71	1.33
I always achieve the team work objectives	-	-	-	2.8	4.4	9.4	23.9	28.9	23.9	6.7	7.70	1.37

3.4 Work Quality

Data gathered in Table 6 concludes the overall percentage on work quality. It was found that more than four fifth of respondents (83.9%) have high level of work quality thus it proves that despite having the capability to receive and accomplish task in a bigger quantity, it also comes along with a good quality. Less than one fifth of respondents (16.1%) have moderate level of performance on work quality while none of them have low level of work quality. There is a high mean score recorded for the aspect of work quality among the respondents (M= 7.98, from maximum 10)

Table 6: Work Quality

Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Standard Deviation
Low (0-3.33)	-	-	7.98	1.30
Moderate (3.34-6.67)	29	16.1		
High (6.68-10)	151	83.9		

Based on the result obtained in Table 7, it can be concluded that statement of “*I strive for work excellence*” has been identified as the highest mean score (M= 8.21) thus it gives an early probability that agriculture agencies employees have high commitment towards the tasks given to them. This is followed by the statement of “*I have always ensured continual improvements on my works*” (M= 8.17). On top of it, the statement of “*I have always responded to customer complaints accordingly*” and “*in general, my job performance measure up to expected quality*” recorded the third highest mean score (M= 8.05). Even though the statement of “*I do my work with accuracy*” scored the lowest mean score (M= 7.76), the score is still considered as high.

Table 7: Percentage on Work Quality Statements

Statement/ Score Percentage	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Mean	S.D
I strive for work excellence	-	-	.6	1.1	4.4	8.3	10.0	24.4	33.9	17.2	8.21	1.46
I have always ensured continual improvements on my works	-	-	-	1.1	6.7	5.6	9.4	30.0	32.8	14.4	8.17	1.41
I have always responded to customer complaints accordingly	-	-	-	1.1	5.6	8.3	13.3	29.4	28.3	13.9	8.05	1.41
In general, my job performance measures up to expected quality	-	-	-	1.1	6.7	5.6	13.9	26.1	38.9	7.8	8.05	1.35
I have always fulfilled customer needs	-	-	.6	.6	7.2	6.7	19.4	30.6	27.8	7.2	7.82	1.37
I always work systematically	-	-	-	1.7	6.7	8.3	17.2	33.9	23.9	8.3	7.80	1.38
I do my work with accuracy	-	.6	1.1	6.7	7.8	20.6	31.1	31.1	25.0	7.2	7.76	1.39

3.5 Punctuality

Table 8 concludes the punctuality of the selected respondents on delivering and accomplishing tasks and duties responsible to them. Table 4 and 6 has summarized that AAE in Malaysia have high level of work quantity and work quality, but do these two elements manage to be accomplished by the employee based on time allocated to them. Table 8 has the answer. Based on the overall mean score recorded (M=7.94) and majority of the respondents (82.2%) were found to punctually submit the tasks given to them, this study proves that AAE in Malaysia not only fulfill the expectation of having good work quantity and quality but also able to meet the date in accomplishing the tasks demanded by their organization.

Table 8: Punctuality

Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Standard Deviation
Low (0-3.33)	-	-	7.94	1.40
Moderate (3.34-6.67)	32	17.8		
High (6.68-10)	148	82.2		

For measuring punctuality, six statements have been asked to the respondents. Based on the data presented in Table 9, it can be seen that the statement of “*I always do my job according to stipulated time*” recorded the highest mean score (M= 8.03), thus it portrays an early picture that majority of AAE is able to meet the specific dateline of the tasks given to them and this for sure will enhance the quality and quantity of the organization products and outputs. The lowest mean score was scored by the statement of “*I always delivered my work on time*” (M= 7.89). It can be noted that even though it is the lowest, but there is only a slight difference between the highest mean score and the lowest mean score which is 0.14.

Table 9: Percentage on Punctuality Statements

Statement/Score Percentage	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Mean	S.D
I always do my job according to stipulated time	-	-	-	1.7	6.1	6.7	16.7	27.2	25.6	16.1	8.03	1.47
I always make decision promptly when necessary	-	.6	-	.6	6.7	7.8	16.7	27.8	25.6	14.4	7.97	1.49
I am always consistent in meeting my work targets	-	-	-	1.7	6.7	7.8	15.0	29.4	27.2	12.2	7.94	1.45
I am always consistent in completing my work	-	-	.6	1.7	6.1	7.2	16.1	29.4	27.8	11.1	7.92	1.46
I always do my job promptly	-	.6	-	1.7	6.1	7.2	18.3	27.2	26.7	12.2	7.90	1.50
I always delivered my work on time	-	-	.6	1.7	7.2	8.3	12.8	30.6	27.8	11.1	7.89	1.50

3.6 Work Systems

It has been proved that AAE have high performance on work quantity, work quality and punctuality, but do these aspects accompanied by a systematic work? The main question should be raised here is do AAE perceived positively the work systems designated to them? Table 10 will conclude this query. More than three quarter of the respondents (78.9%) have high perception on work systems while slightly more than one fifth of the respondents (20.6%) found to have moderate perception on work systems. Only .6% respondents have low perception on work systems. The overall mean score recorded for work systems aspect is 7.57.

Table 10: Work System

Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Standard Deviation
Low (0-3.33)	1	.6	7.57	1.42
Moderate (3.34-6.67)	37	20.6		
High (6.68-10)	142	78.9		

Table 11 explains the percentage recorded by each of the statement prepared to measure respondents' perception on work system. From the overall mean recorded for all the statements range from 7.49 to 7.68 (from maximum 10.0) it can be considered that all of these statements recorded high mean score. The highest mean score scored by statement of "the work system fulfills the customer's requirement" (M= 7.68) thus it proves that not only the established work system is suitable for the employee but it also able to meet the customer demand. AAE also perceived that the work system will aid them in fulfill the mission and vision of the organization (M= 7.59) and fulfill their team work objectives (M= 7.52).

Table 11: Percentage on Work System Statements

Statement/ Score Percentage	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Mean	S.D
The work system fulfills the customer's requirement	1.1	-	-	1.7	8.3	11.1	20.0	31.7	21.7	4.4	7.68	1.41
The work system fulfills the mission and vision of organization	-	.6	.6	1.7	7.8	10.6	20.6	32.8	21.1	4.4	7.59	1.60
The work system fulfills the team work objectives	1	.6	1.7	1.7	8.9	8.9	16.1	31.1	24.4	6.7	7.52	1.45
The work system fulfills my personal work goals	-	-	.6	1.1	8.3	9.4	16.7	33.3	25.0	5.6	7.49	1.53

3.7 Difference between Work Performance and Selected Independent Variables.

Is there any equality on work performance among AAE in Malaysia? If not, what factors contribute to this difference? Can we rely on what have been done previously by Linz (2002), Bengtson et al. (1978) and Smedley and Whitten (2006) who said that education, distance to work places, gender and position have influence on work performance? To achieve this objective, ANOVA and independent t-test were done. The outcomes from these two analyses were portrayed in Table 12 and Table 13.

Table 12 tells us the difference on work performance and type of residential home, job category and gender. Based on ($M=7.60$, $SD=1.42$) for those who lived in government quarters or rent a house and [$M=8.04$, $SD=1.11$; $t(180) = 2.348$, $p=.020$] for those who own their own house, it signals that there is significant difference on job performance between these two type of residential house. There is probability that those who own their house possess better work performance based on the higher mean score compared to their counterpart. Independent t-test also was done on two other variables, which is job category and gender. For job category there was no significant difference found on this variable based on ($M=8.04$, $SD=1.22$) for management staff and for support [$M=7.79$, $SD=1.28$; $t(180)= 1.123$, $p=.263$]. This is a good result for the organization knowing that the support staff even though have lower salary compared to the management staff, they still possess equal work performance as to the management staff. The same case found on gender where there is no significant difference found between male and female employee based on ($M=7.87$, $SD=1.33$) for male employee and for female employee [$M=7.82$, $SD=1.23$; $t(180)= .270$, $p=.787$]. The equality gained here is not surprising as it is in tandem with a study done by Standing and Baume (2000) and Kakar (2002). On top of it, the equality gained is also a positive indicator that male and female employee is equally striving hard for achieving the organization objectives.

Table 12: Difference on Work Performance Using Independent-t test

Variables	n	Mean	S.D	t	p
Type of residential home				2.348	.020
Government quarter/ Rented house	79	7.60	1.42		
Own House	101	8.04	1.11		
Job category				1.123	.263
Management staff	40	8.04	1.22		
Support staff	140	7.79	1.28		
Gender				.270	.787
Male	77	7.87	1.33		
Female	103	7.82	1.23		

Education attainment of the respondents may not affect AAE work performance. Based on the ANOVA, F Value (3,180) = .418, $p > 0.05$, there is no significant difference in work performance in the three groups studied. This is a great signal that people from different level of education have similar level of work performance thus it will contribute positively to the organization. The result gained here is not in tandem with studies done by Gebel and Kogan (2009) and Chen and Silverthorne (2008).

The highest mean score recorded for those who attained degree/ Master/ PhD level ($M= 7.94$), followed by those who attained diploma/ certificate ($M= 7.88$). The lowest mean score recorded for those who attained PMR/ SPM and SPMV level ($M= 7.73$).

Table 13: Difference between Work Performance and Education Attainment Using ANOVA

Variables	n	Mean	S.D	F	p
Education attainment				.418	.659
Degree/ Master/ PhD	51	7.94	1.28		
Diploma/ Certificate	69	7.88	1.31		
School leaver (PMR/ SPM/ SPMV)*	60	7.73	1.22		

*PMR (Malaysia Lower Education Certificate)

*SPM (Malaysia Higher Education Certificate)

*SPMV (Malaysia Higher Vocational Certificate)

3.8 Relationship between Work Performance and Selected Independent Variables

For the purpose of determining the relationship between AAE work performance and selected independent variables, Pearson Correlation was employed. Based on the result presented in Table 14, it can be concluded that age ($p = .009$), working experience ($p = .003$) and gross month salary ($p = .002$) has a significant and positive relationship with work performance. The data presented here is in tandem with what have been done by Czaja et al. (1995), and Sharkey and Davis (2008). Previous study done by Kolz et al. (1998) proved that experienced people do have better work performance due to their huge amount of knowledge on the tasks need to be done. The same case also found in this study. Financial factor is identified as the main motivator for employee to perform their best (Torgler et al., 2006) where he found the higher income employee received the better work performance they will have.

Referring to the result, there is low relationship between work performance and gross month salary ($r = .229$), it can be concluded that there is low relationship between these two variables. The same case also recorded for working experience ($r = .219$). Age found to have significant and positive relationship but the relationship with work performance is negligible ($r = .194$) while there is also negligible relationship between distance to work place and work performance ($r = .112$)

Table 14: Relationship between Selected Independent Variables and Work Performance

Independent Variables	r	p
Working experience	.219	.003
Gross month salary	.229	.002
Age	.194	.009
Distance to workplace	.112	.112

4. Conclusion

Most of the AAE were female employees, most of them are youths because their age <40 years, have married, working as support staff, earn between RM1501-RM2500 a month, possessed diploma or certificate. Majority of them can be considered as “junior” employee based on their working experience, which is between 1-5 years. Most of them are able to own their own house and lived near to their workplace.

Percentage on education attainment portrays that those who attained university level of education (diploma, degree, master and PhD) was 68.7%, thus it give an early prediction that majority of AAE are among the earners of high income but when we go to the mean score of the gross salary per month, the result is disappointing. The mean score recorded for gross salary per month was RM2, 486.9, Majority of them also found to earn just RM1500 to RM2500 per month. This means that there are university graduates out there who are just working as support staff. This means that government should provide more employment opportunities for university graduates in the management post especially in agriculture agencies, which is crucial. Data gained also proved that the salary earned among the AAE is at a low level compared to the salary of public sector workers in developed countries like Japan, Korea and Germany. A bigger allocation should be provided by the government for the salary of their workers. This is indeed important as education and salary are among the main contributors to high work performance as proved by Kahya (2007) Soon et al. (2005), Krueger and Rose (1998) and Jensen and Murphy (1990).

Age also is an important determinant of work performance. Based on the result, most of them are youths. This is the group, which should be concentrated more in term of strengthening their knowledge, and skills as emphasized by Cappelli and Ragoovsky (1995), while Jabroun and Balakrishnan (2000) and Fereshteh and Seyed Jamal (2007) noted that working experience is a significant factor in work performance. They claimed that the older the employee to be, the higher work performance he has. This is then supported by a research completed by Borghans and Nelen (2009) who noted that younger employees have lower work performance compared to older workers.

References

- Ariss, S.S. and Timmins, S.A. 1989. Employee Education and Job Performance: Does Education Matter? *Journal of Public Personnel Management*, Volume 18, Issue 2, pp. 100-112.
- Azman, I., Girardi, A., Mohd Nor, M.S., Muhammad Madi, A., Dousin, O., Zainal Ariffin, A., Abdul Halim, M. and Zalina, I. 2009. Empirically Testing the Relationship between Income Distribution, Perceived Value Money and Pay Satisfaction. *Journal of Intangible Capital*, Volume 5, No 3, pp. 235-258.
- Bengtsson, C., Vedin, J.A., Grimby, G. and Tibblin, G. 1978. Maximal Work Performance Test in Middle-aged Women: Results from a Population Study. *Scandinavian Journal of Clinical and Laboratory Investigation*, Volume 38, Issue 2, pp. 181-188.
- Borghan, L. and Nelen, A. 2009. Learning on the Job, The Composition of Tasks and the Earnings of the Older Workers. Available at: <http://www.netspar.nl/events/2009/annual/paperborghans.pdf>
- Birren, J.E. and Schaie, K.W. 2001. *Handbook of the psychology of aging*. Gulf Professional Publisher. London.
- Cappelli, P. and Ragovalski .1995. Self-Assessed Skills and Job Performance. NCAL Technical Reports TR94-08, January 1995. Available at: <http://www.literacy.org/PDFs/TR9408.pdf>
- Chen, J. and Silverthorne, C. 2008. The Impact of Locus of Control on Job Stress, Job Performance and Job Satisfaction in Taiwan. *Journal of Leadership and Organization*, Volume 29, Issue 7, pp. 572-582
- Cook, S. and McCaulay, S. 1997. How Colleagues and Customers can Help Improve Team Performance. *Journal of Team Performance Management*, Volume 3, Issue 1, pp. 12-17
- Crawford, J.C. and Nonis, S. 1996. The Relationship between Boundary Spanners' Job Satisfaction and the Management Control System. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, Volume 8, Issue 1 125-134
- Czaja, S.J. 1995. Aging and Work Performance. *Journal Review of Public Personnel Administration*, Volume 15, Issue 2, pp. 46-61.
- Dieleman, M., Cuong, P.V., Vu Anh, L. and Martineau, T. 2003. Identifying Factors for Job Motivation of Rural Health Workers in Vietnam. *Journal of Human Resources for Health*, Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 1-10
- Fereshteh, G.G. and Seyed Jamal, F.H. 2007. Factors Affecting the Performance of the Agricultural Advisors in Increasing Production in the Wheat Self Sufficiency Plan (WSP) in Qazvin Province. Available at: [http://www.apec.upm.edu.my/agrex/FULL%20PAPER%20PDF%20\(AGREX08\)/fereshteh%20ghiasvand-60.pdf](http://www.apec.upm.edu.my/agrex/FULL%20PAPER%20PDF%20(AGREX08)/fereshteh%20ghiasvand-60.pdf)
- Gebel, M. and Kogan, I. 2009. *Education and labor Market Entry in Ukraine*. Paper presented at RC28 Meeting in Stanford, California, in the framework of the project "Education systems and labour markets in Central and Eastern Europe" financed by the Volkswagen Foundation, August 6-9, 2009.
- Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K.H. 1993, *Leadership Style: Attitudes and Behaviors*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Jabroun, N. and Balakrishnan, V. 2000. Participation and Job Performance in the Malaysian Public Service Department. Available at: <http://emeraldinsight.com/Insight/viewPDF.jsp?contentType=Article&Filename=html/Output/Published/EmeraldFullTextArticle/Pdf/3480100305.pdf>
- Jensen, M.C. and Murphy, K.J. 1990. Performance Pay and Top-Management Incentives, *Journal of Political Economy*, Volume 98, Issue 2, pp. 225-64.**
- Kahya, E. 2007. The Effects of Job Characteristics and Working Condition on Job Performance. *International Journal on Industrial Ergonomics*, Volume 37, Issue 2007, pp. 515-523.
- Kakar, S. 2002. Gender and Police Officers' Perceptions of Their Job Performance: An Analysis of the Relationship between Gender and Perceptions of Job Performance. *Journal of Criminal Justice Policy Review*, Volume 13, Issue 3, pp.238-256**
- Kolz, A.R., McFarland, L.A. and Silverman, S.B. 1998. Cognitive, Ability and Experience and Predictors for Work Performance. *Journal of Psychology*. Available at: <http://www.encyclopedia.com/The+Journal+of+Psychology/publications.aspx?date=199809&pageNumber=1>
- Krueger, A.B. and Rouse, C. 1998. The Effect of Workplace Education on Earnings, Turnover and Job Performance. *Journal of Labor Economics*, Volume 16, Issue 1, pp. 61-94.
- Kujala, V., Remes, J., Ek, E., Tammelin, T. and Laitinen, J. 2005. Classification of Work Ability Index among Young Employee. *Journal of Occupational Medicine*, Volume 55, Issue 2005, pp. 399-401.
- Larwood, L. and B. A. Guek. 1989. Working towards a women's career development, (pp. 170-183) in B. A. Gutek and L. Larwood (eds.) *Women's Career Development*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Lee, Geon. and Benedict, J. 2009. "Does Organizational Performance Make a Difference to Public Employees Job Turnover in the Federal Government? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association 67th Annual National Conference, The Palmer House Hilton, Chicago, IL, April 02, 2009
- Leeuw, F.L. (1996). Performance Auditing, New Public Management and Performance Improvement: Question and Answer. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Accountability*, Volume 9, Issue 2, pp. 92-102.
- Linz, S. J.2002. *Job Satisfaction among Russian Workers*. William Davidson Institute Working Paper Number 468. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=313641> or DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.313641
- Lynn, S. A., L. T. Cao and B. C. Horn. 1996. The influence of Career Stage on the Work Attitudes of Male and Female Accounting Professionals. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Volume 17, Issue 2, pp. 135-149.
- McBey, K. and Karakowsky, L. 2001. Examining Sources of Influence on Employee Turnover in the Part-Time Context. *Journal of Career Development International*, Volume 21, Issue 3, pp. 136-144
- McKendall, M.A. and Margulis, S.T. 1995. People and Their Organization: Rethinking the Assumption. *Journal of Business Horizon*, Volume 38, Issue 4, pp. 21-28
- Palakurthi, R.R. and Parks, S.J. 2000. The Effect of Selected Socio-Demographic Factors on Lodging Demand in the USA. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Volume 12, Issue 2, pp. 135-142.
- Porter, L.W. and Lawler, E.E. 1968, *Managerial Attitudes and Performance*, Irwin-Dorsey, Homewood, Illinois .
- Roebuck, D.B., Sightler, K.W. and Brush, C.C. 1995. Organizational Size, Company Type and Position Effects on the Perceived Importance of Oral and Written Communication Skills. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, Volume 7, Issue 3, pp. 77-85
- Shaiful Anuar, K., Kamaruzaman, J., Hassan, A., Mohamad, I., Kamsol, M.K. and Norhashimah, A.R. 2009. Gender as Moderator of the Relationship between OCB and Turnover Intention. *Journal of Asian Social Science*, Volume 5, Issue, pp. 6 108-117.
- Sharkey, B.J. and Davis, P.O. 2008. *Hard Work: Defining Physical Work Performance Requirements*. Human Kinetics Publisher, Champaign, Illinois
- Shultz, K.S. and Adam, G.A. 2007. *Aging and Work in the 21st Century*. New Jersey, Routledge Publisher
- Smedley, K. and Whitten, H. 2006. *Age Matters, Employing, Motivating and Managing Older Employees*. United Kingdom, Gower Publisher.
- Soon, A., Quazi, H.A., Tay, C. and Kelly, K. 2005. *Studies on the Impact of Work-Life Initiatives and Firm Performance*. Available at: http://www.mom.gov.sg/publish/etc/medialib/mom_library/Workplace_Standards/files3.Par.92710
- Standing, H. and Baume, E. 2000. *Equity, Equal Opportunities, Gender and Organization Performance*. Paper presented at Workshop on Global Health Workforce Strategy Annex, France, 9-12 December 2000.
- Torgler, B., Schmidt, S.L. and Frey, B.S. 2006. *Relative Income Position and Performance: An Empirical Panel Analysis* (April 2006). FEEM Working Paper No. 39.2006. Available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=889328>
- Vermeeren, B., Kuipers, B. and Steijn, B. 2009. *A Study of HRM, Employee Attitude and Behavior and Public Service Quality of Ducth Municipalities*. Paper presented at EGPA Conference, September 2-5 2009, Saint Julian's, Malta.
- Webster, E. 2002. *Intangible and Intellectual Capital: A Review of the Literature*. Melbourne Institute Working Paper No. 10/02. Available at: <http://www.melbourneinstitute.com/wp/wp2002n10.pdf>
- Yearta, S.K. 1995. Does Age Matter. *Journal of Management Development*, Volume 14, Issue 7, pp. 28-35