

Workload, Work Environment and Work Facilities as Determinants of Job Performance among Royal Malaysia Police (PDRM) Officers: The Moderating Role of Organizational Commitment

Mohamad Yazin Ya'akob¹, Nik Sarina Nik Md Salleh²

^{1,2}Faculty of Business & Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Kelantan, Malaysia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600820>

Received: 18 June 2026; Accepted: 24 June 2026; Published: 06 July 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examines the influence of workload, work environment, and work facilities on job performance among officers in the Royal Malaysia Police (PDRM), with organizational commitment proposed as a moderating variable. Grounded in the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model, workload is conceptualized as a job demand that may negatively affect job performance, while work environment and work facilities are viewed as job resources that enhance motivation, effectiveness, and productivity. Organizational commitment is expected to moderate these relationships by strengthening or weakening the effects of job demands and resources on performance. A quantitative research design is proposed using a sample of 248 officers from a population of 600 PDRM personnel. Job performance is conceptualized as a multidimensional construct comprising task and contextual performance. The study addresses key operational challenges in PDRM, including rising service demands and accountability pressures, and is expected to contribute to both theory and practice by extending the JD-R model and informing evidence-based human resource strategies to improve police performance and service delivery.

Keywords: Job performance, workload, work environment, work facilities, organizational commitment, JD-R Theory

INTRODUCTION

The public sector plays a vital role in national development through the provision of essential services that directly influence citizens' well-being, social stability, and economic growth. In an increasingly globalized and citizen-centered environment, public organizations are expected to deliver services that are efficient, accountable, responsive, and of high quality. Consequently, governments worldwide have emphasized organizational effectiveness and employee performance as critical determinants of successful public service delivery. Public institutions must continuously improve their operational capabilities to meet growing public expectations and maintain citizens' trust in government services (Wisniewski, 2001).

In Malaysia, the Malaysian Public Service (MPS) has been instrumental in supporting the country's socio-economic transformation and national development agenda. To strengthen public sector effectiveness, the government has implemented various administrative and management reforms aimed at improving service quality, productivity, and accountability. The adoption of New Public Management (NPM) principles further reinforced the importance of performance measurement and results-oriented management across public sector agencies (Siddiquee, 2006). As a result, employee performance has become a strategic priority in ensuring that public institutions remain effective, efficient, and responsive to societal needs. Among the key agencies within the Malaysian public sector is the Royal Malaysia Police (PDRM), which is responsible for maintaining public order, enforcing the law, preventing crime, and safeguarding national security. Given its critical role in ensuring public safety, the effectiveness of PDRM is closely linked to the performance of its personnel. Police officers are expected to perform a broad range of duties, including crime prevention, criminal investigation, public order management, intelligence gathering, and community engagement. The effectiveness of these responsibilities depends largely on the ability of police personnel to maintain high levels of performance despite increasingly

complex operational demands. However, concerns regarding police performance, service delivery, integrity, and public confidence continue to attract public and policy attention. Statistics from the Enforcement Agency Integrity Commission (EAIC) indicate that complaints involving PDRM have consistently represented the largest proportion of complaints received against enforcement agencies in Malaysia. Between 2011 and 2020, a total of 3,590 complaints were recorded against PDRM, significantly exceeding complaints received against other enforcement agencies. Complaint numbers increased from 440 cases in 2017 to 742 cases in 2019 before remaining relatively high at 699 cases in 2020. These figures suggest persistent public concerns regarding policing practices and service delivery.

Recent data further indicate continuing challenges related to organizational performance and integrity. In 2024, PDRM received 6,696 complaints and reports from the public, an increase from 6,440 complaints recorded in 2023. During the same period, 1,404 police personnel were subjected to disciplinary action, including 164 dismissals for various misconduct offences. Furthermore, 3,603 disciplinary investigation papers were opened in 2024 involving integrity, governance, criminal, drug-related, and corruption-related offences. These statistics demonstrate the ongoing need to strengthen personnel performance, accountability, and organizational effectiveness within the police force. Although disciplinary cases constitute only a small proportion of PDRM's workforce, police leadership has acknowledged that misconduct by a minority of officers can significantly affect public perception and trust in the institution. In 2025, the Ministry of Home Affairs reported that 24 police personnel had been dismissed for corruption-related offences between 2023 and October 2025, highlighting the continuing importance of integrity and ethical conduct in policing. The performance challenges faced by PDRM may be associated with several organizational and occupational factors. Police officers often operate in demanding environments characterized by heavy workloads, extended working hours, exposure to high-risk situations, and significant public scrutiny. These conditions may increase occupational stress and affect individual performance outcomes. Excessive workload can lead to fatigue and reduced effectiveness, while inadequate workplace support and unfavorable work environments may diminish motivation and job satisfaction. At the same time, prolonged exposure to stressful situations may impair decision-making and overall job performance.

Given the strategic importance of PDRM in maintaining national security and public confidence, there is a need to better understand the organizational factors that influence police officers' performance. Despite ongoing reforms and performance improvement initiatives, limited attention has been given to the combined influence of workload, work environment, and work stress on police performance within the Malaysian policing context. Therefore, this conceptual paper proposes a framework that examines the relationships among workload, work environment, work facilities, and job performance among PDRM personnel. By synthesizing relevant theoretical and empirical literature, the paper seeks to provide a foundation for future empirical investigations and contribute to evidence-based human resource management strategies aimed at enhancing police performance and public service effectiveness in Malaysia..

Job Performance

Job performance remains one of the most extensively studied constructs in organizational behavior and human resource management due to its central role in determining organizational effectiveness. It is generally defined as the extent to which an individual carries out tasks and responsibilities that contribute to organizational goals (Campbell, 1990). In industrial and organizational psychology, job performance is conceptualized as an individual-level behavior that is observable, measurable, and directly linked to organizational outcomes such as productivity, service quality, and efficiency (Campbell, 1990; Koopmans et al., 2011).

Contemporary literature emphasizes that job performance is a multidimensional construct rather than a single unified outcome. Campbell (1990) proposed one of the most influential frameworks, identifying several performance dimensions including task-specific behaviors, non-task behaviors, written and oral communication, effort, and leadership-related behaviors. Similarly, Borman and Motowidlo (1993) introduced the distinction between task performance and contextual performance. Task performance refers to core technical activities required by the job description, while contextual performance includes voluntary behaviors such as cooperation, initiative, and helping others, which support the organizational environment and enhance overall effectiveness. Recent research continues to support this multidimensional view. Koopmans et al. (2011) further expanded the concept of individual work performance into task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive

work behavior. This broader classification highlights that job performance is not only about completing assigned duties but also about behaviors that either contribute to or hinder organizational goals. Empirical evidence suggests that both task and contextual performance are important predictors of organizational success, particularly in service-oriented sectors (Koopmans et al., 2011; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993).

The Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model provides a useful theoretical framework for understanding job performance in organizational settings. According to Bakker and Demerouti (2017), job demands such as workload, emotional pressure, and time constraints can negatively affect employee energy and performance. In contrast, job resources such as supportive leadership, adequate facilities, and a positive work environment enhance motivation, engagement, and performance outcomes. This model has been widely applied in public sector and high-stress occupations to explain variations in employee performance. In the public sector context, job performance is particularly critical due to the direct impact of employee behavior on service delivery and public trust. Wright and Pandey (2011) argue that public service performance is influenced by both organizational structures and motivational factors, including public service motivation and perceived organizational support. Similarly, Kim (2014) found that organizational support and job satisfaction significantly enhance performance among public employees, highlighting the importance of workplace conditions in shaping employee outcomes. In high-risk occupations such as policing, job performance is influenced by additional occupational stressors. Police officers are required to manage complex tasks including law enforcement, emergency response, and public order maintenance under conditions of high uncertainty and pressure. Research has shown that sustained exposure to high job demands can reduce performance effectiveness if not balanced by adequate job resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Therefore, understanding the interplay between workload, work environment, and stress is essential for explaining performance outcomes in law enforcement agencies.

In conclusion, job performance is a multidimensional construct influenced by both individual and organizational factors. Modern literature consistently emphasizes the interaction between job demands and job resources in shaping performance outcomes. In the context of policing, these dynamics are particularly important due to the high-pressure nature of work. This supports the need for further investigation into how workload, work environment, and work stress influence job performance among Royal Malaysia Police (PDRM) officers.

Workload

Workload is a central construct in organizational psychology and is widely recognized as a key job demand that encompasses the physical, cognitive, and temporal effort required to complete assigned tasks within a specified timeframe. It is typically conceptualized in two dimensions: quantitative workload, referring to the volume of tasks and time pressure, and qualitative workload, which relates to task complexity and difficulty (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Taris et al., 2019). In high-demand professions such as public administration and law enforcement, workload plays a critical role in shaping both employee well-being and job performance.

The relationship between workload and job performance is firmly grounded in the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model, which posits that job demands, including workload, require sustained physical and psychological effort and are therefore associated with physiological and psychological costs (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Bakker, Demerouti, & Sanz-Vergel, 2023). When workload is excessive and not adequately balanced by job resources such as organizational support or autonomy, employees are likely to experience energy depletion, strain, and reduced capacity to maintain optimal performance. Over time, this health impairment process can lead to disengagement, burnout, and performance deterioration.

Empirical evidence consistently supports a negative relationship between excessive workload and job performance. Elevated workload levels increase fatigue, impair cognitive functioning, and reduce decision-making quality, thereby undermining task effectiveness and productivity (Alarcon, 2011; Lesener, Gusy, & Wolter, 2019). Meta-analytic findings further confirm that job demands, including workload, are significant predictors of burnout and diminished performance across diverse occupational contexts (Lesener et al., 2019; Bakker et al., 2023). Additionally, the distinction between challenge and hindrance demands suggests that while manageable workload may enhance motivation, excessive workload categorized as a hindrance demand consistently produces negative effects on both motivation and performance (Crawford, LePine, & Rich, 2010; Mazzola & Disselhorst, 2019). In the public sector, workload assumes heightened importance due to increasing

service demands, administrative complexity, and accountability pressures. Public employees are often required to multitask while ensuring service quality and regulatory compliance. Excessive workload in such contexts can lead to role overload, time pressure, and diminished prioritization ability, ultimately impairing performance outcomes (Taris et al., 2019). Conversely, a well-balanced workload can enhance concentration, efficiency, and timely task completion. In law enforcement settings, workload is further intensified by operational unpredictability, emergency response duties, administrative reporting, and high-risk deployments. Police officers frequently operate under time pressure and in potentially hazardous environments, increasing both cognitive and emotional demands. Research in policing indicates that excessive workload contributes to occupational strain, fatigue, and reduced operational effectiveness, particularly in situations requiring rapid decision-making and situational awareness (Violanti et al., 2017; Queirós, Passos, & da Silva, 2020). Moreover, workload is closely linked to work stress, which often functions as a mediating mechanism between job demands and performance outcomes. Within the JD-R framework, excessive workload elevates psychological strain and stress levels, which in turn reduce employee motivation, engagement, and overall performance (Bakker et al., 2023). Employees exposed to sustained workload pressure are more likely to experience decreased productivity, increased error rates, and lower service quality. Hence, workload remains a significant predictor of job performance, particularly in high-demand occupations such as policing. While a moderate level of workload may stimulate engagement and productivity, excessive workload consistently leads to adverse outcomes through mechanisms such as fatigue, cognitive overload, and stress. In the context of the Royal Malaysia Police (PDRM), workload is therefore expected to play a pivotal role in influencing officers' job performance and broader organizational effectiveness. Accordingly, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1: Workload negatively influences PDRM officers' job performance

Work environment

Work environment is a critical organizational factor that significantly influences employee attitudes, well-being, and job performance. It broadly refers to the physical, social, and organizational conditions under which employees perform their tasks, including workplace safety, organizational culture, interpersonal relationships, supervisory support, and the availability of resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Chandrasekar, 2011). In high-demand sectors such as public administration and law enforcement, the quality of the work environment is particularly important, as it directly shapes employees' ability to perform effectively in complex and demanding situations.

From a theoretical perspective, the relationship between work environment and job performance is well explained by the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model. According to this model, every occupation consists of job demands and job resources, where job resources—such as supportive supervision, adequate equipment, clear communication, and a positive organizational climate—serve a motivational function that enhances employee engagement and performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Bakker, Demerouti, & Sanz-Vergel, 2023). A supportive work environment is thus conceptualized as a crucial job resource that directly contributes to improved job performance while enabling employees to manage their work demands more effectively. Empirical research provides strong evidence that a favorable work environment is positively associated with job performance. Employees who perceive their work environment as supportive and resource-rich tend to demonstrate higher levels of motivation, commitment, and productivity (Lesener, Gussy, & Wolter, 2019). Key aspects such as effective leadership, teamwork, and access to appropriate tools and facilities enhance employees' ability to focus on tasks, improve efficiency, and produce high-quality outcomes. Conversely, a poor work environment—characterized by inadequate resources, unclear expectations, or lack of support—can hinder employees' ability to perform their tasks efficiently and achieve desired performance levels.

Within the JD-R framework, job resources embedded in the work environment not only exert a direct influence on performance outcomes, but also stimulate positive motivational processes that enhance employees' willingness to invest effort in their work (Bakker et al., 2023). Employees operating in supportive environments are more likely to be engaged, proactive, and committed to achieving organizational goals, which ultimately translates into higher job performance. Furthermore, job resources can strengthen employees' capacity to handle demanding work conditions, ensuring sustained performance over time. In public sector organizations, the work environment plays a particularly significant role due to increasing service demands, bureaucratic procedures, and

accountability requirements. Public employees are often required to coordinate multiple responsibilities while maintaining service quality and regulatory compliance. A supportive work environment—characterized by clear procedures, adequate infrastructure, and effective leadership—facilitates efficiency, coordination, and task accomplishment. In contrast, unfavorable workplace conditions may limit employees' effectiveness in delivering services and meeting organizational expectations (Taris et al., 2019). In law enforcement settings, such as policing, the work environment is uniquely complex and demanding. Police officers operate within structured and hierarchical organizations while being exposed to unpredictable and high-risk situations. The availability of organizational support, proper equipment, teamwork, and effective communication is essential in enabling officers to perform their duties safely and efficiently. Research indicates that a supportive work environment in policing contributes to improved operational performance, better decision-making, and enhanced situational awareness (Violanti et al., 2017; Queirós, Passos, & da Silva, 2020). Conversely, inadequate working conditions may restrict officers' ability to perform optimally, particularly in critical situations. Therefore, the work environment is a key determinant of job performance, particularly in high-demand occupations such as policing. Drawing on the JD-R model, a supportive work environment functions as a vital job resource that enhances employee motivation, facilitates effective task execution, and promotes sustained performance. In the context of the Royal Malaysia Police (PDRM), the quality of the work environment is expected to play a central role in shaping officers' job performance and overall organizational effectiveness. Accordingly, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H2: Work environment positively influences PDRM officers' job performance

Work facilities

Work facilities refer to the physical and technological resources provided by an organization to support employees in performing their job tasks effectively. These include office space, equipment, tools, infrastructure, information systems, and other operational resources necessary for task completion. Adequate work facilities are essential for ensuring efficiency, accuracy, and overall job performance, particularly in high-demand sectors such as public administration and law enforcement (Chandrasekar, 2011). From a theoretical standpoint, the role of work facilities in influencing job performance can be explained using the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model. Within this framework, work facilities are categorized as job resources, which assist employees in achieving work goals, reduce the effort required to perform tasks, and enhance overall performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Bakker, Demerouti, & Sanz-Vergel, 2023). Adequate and well-maintained facilities enable employees to carry out their duties efficiently, while insufficient or outdated facilities can hinder performance by increasing task difficulty and reducing productivity.

Empirical studies consistently show a positive relationship between work facilities and job performance. Employees who have access to appropriate tools, equipment, and infrastructure are more likely to perform their tasks effectively and meet organizational expectations. For instance, the availability of modern technology and well-maintained equipment enhances work speed, accuracy, and service delivery (Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015). In contrast, inadequate facilities can lead to delays, errors, and inefficiencies, ultimately lowering overall job performance. Within the JD-R framework, job resources such as work facilities not only have a direct effect on job performance, but also play a crucial role in enhancing employees' motivation and capacity to perform. When employees are provided with sufficient and reliable resources, they are better equipped to handle job demands and maintain consistent performance levels (Lesener, Gussy, & Wolter, 2019). Conversely, a lack of necessary facilities may restrict employees' ability to execute tasks efficiently, resulting in reduced effectiveness and performance outcomes.

In public sector organizations, work facilities are particularly important due to the nature of service delivery and administrative responsibilities. Public servants depend heavily on infrastructure, communication systems, and administrative tools to process information, manage workloads, and deliver services to the public. Inadequate facilities can disrupt workflow, delay service delivery, and negatively affect organizational performance, whereas well-equipped workplaces promote efficiency and accountability. In law enforcement environments, such as policing, work facilities are even more critical due to the operational and safety requirements of the job. Police officers rely on specialized equipment, communication devices, transportation, and technological systems to perform their duties effectively. The availability and reliability of these facilities are essential for ensuring timely

response, accurate decision-making, and operational effectiveness. Research indicates that inadequate or malfunctioning facilities can significantly impede officers' performance and compromise their ability to carry out duties efficiently (Violanti et al., 2017). On the other hand, well-maintained facilities enhance operational readiness and overall performance. Thus, work facilities are a vital determinant of job performance, particularly in resource-intensive and high-demand occupations. Guided by the JD-R model, work facilities function as an important job resource that enables employees to perform their duties effectively, improve efficiency, and achieve organizational goals. In the context of the Royal Malaysia Police (PDRM), the provision of adequate and reliable work facilities is expected to play a crucial role in enhancing officers' job performance and supporting overall organizational effectiveness. Based on the above discussion, it is proposed that:

H3: Work facilities positively influences PDRM officers' job performance

Organisational commitment

The Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model posits that job demands such as workload and job resources such as work environment and work facilities influence employee outcomes, particularly job performance, through distinct strain and motivational processes (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Within this framework, organizational commitment is increasingly recognized as an important attitudinal construct that may shape how employees respond to workplace conditions. Organizational commitment refers to the psychological attachment of employees to their organization, encompassing identification with organizational goals, willingness to exert effort, and intention to remain within the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Prior studies have consistently demonstrated that organizational commitment is positively associated with job performance, reduced turnover intention, and higher levels of work engagement (Meyer et al., 2002). However, beyond its direct effects, organizational commitment also plays a moderating role by influencing the strength and direction of relationships between work-related factors and employee performance.

Workload is commonly conceptualized as a job demand that may create strain, fatigue, and reduced cognitive capacity, ultimately leading to lower job performance (Karasek, 1979; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). However, the negative effect of workload may not be uniform across all employees. Individuals with high organizational commitment are more likely to perceive workload as meaningful and aligned with organizational goals, thereby maintaining higher levels of effort despite increased demands. From the perspective of social exchange theory, committed employees tend to reciprocate organizational expectations with greater dedication and persistence (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Accordingly, organizational commitment is expected to moderate the relationship between workload and job performance by buffering the negative effects of excessive workload, such that the detrimental impact of workload on performance is weaker among employees with higher commitment. Similarly, a supportive work environment has been widely identified as a key job resource that enhances employee motivation, psychological well-being, and performance. Elements such as supportive leadership, positive interpersonal relationships, and fair organizational practices contribute to improved employee functioning and effectiveness (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Organizational commitment is likely to strengthen the positive effects of a favourable work environment on job performance. Employees with strong affective commitment tend to exhibit a deeper emotional attachment to the organization and are therefore more responsive to supportive environmental conditions, translating such support into higher levels of performance (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Consequently, organizational commitment is expected to enhance the positive relationship between work environment and job performance, strengthening the motivational impact of a conducive workplace.

In addition, work facilities such as equipment, infrastructure, and technological support represent critical job resources that facilitate task completion and improve operational efficiency. Adequate facilities reduce work constraints and enable employees to perform their duties more effectively, thereby enhancing job performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). However, the extent to which these resources translate into improved performance may depend on employees' level of organizational commitment. Highly committed employees are more likely to fully utilize available facilities and align their efforts with organizational objectives, thereby maximizing performance outcomes. In contrast, employees with lower levels of commitment may not fully capitalize on available resources, limiting the effectiveness of such facilities in improving performance. This suggests that organizational commitment strengthens the positive relationship between work facilities and job performance by

enhancing resource utilization and discretionary effort (Meyer et al., 2002). Overall, organizational commitment serves as a critical moderating variable that shapes the relationships between workload, work environment, and work facilities on job performance. Specifically, it is expected to buffer the negative effects of workload while amplifying the positive effects of work environment and work facilities. This moderating role extends the Job Demands–Resources model by incorporating attitudinal commitment as a boundary condition that influences how job demands and resources translate into performance outcomes among employees. Hence, it is proposed that:

H4: Organizational commitment positively moderates the relationship between workload and job performance among PDRM officers.

H5: Organizational commitment positively moderates the relationship between work environment and job performance among PDRM officers.

H6: Organizational commitment positively moderates the relationship between work facilities and job performance among PDRM officers.

METHODOLOGIES

This study adopts a quantitative cross-sectional research design to examine the relationships between workload, work environment, and work facilities on job performance among Royal Malaysia Police (PDRM) officers. Grounded in the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) theory, workload is conceptualized as a job demand, while work environment and work facilities are treated as job resources that influence employee performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). The target population comprises approximately 600 PDRM officers, based on internal administrative records and official personnel data obtained from the Royal Malaysia Police department. This population context is supported by prior research emphasizing the importance of developing talent and enhancing performance among government employees to support Malaysia’s national development agenda (Nik Md Salleh et al., 2024). Following Krejcie and Morgan’s (1970) sampling guideline, a sample size of 248 respondents is deemed adequate, and a simple random sampling technique will be employed to ensure representativeness. Data will be collected using a structured questionnaire administered either in hardcopy or online format, with participation being voluntary, anonymous, and confidential. A pilot study involving 30 respondents will be conducted to ensure clarity and reliability of the instrument. All constructs will be measured using adapted items from established studies, where workload items are drawn from JD-R literature (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), work environment items from Chandrasekar (2011) and Raziq and Maulabakhsh (2015), and work facilities items supported by organizational resource and public sector performance studies, including evidence from Malaysia’s development context (Nik Md Salleh et al., 2024). Organizational commitment will be measured using the Three-Component Model (TCM) Organizational Commitment Scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1991). This scale conceptualizes organizational commitment as a multidimensional construct consisting of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. In addition, job performance will be measured using established scales such as Williams and Anderson (1991), incorporating both in-role and extra-role performance dimensions. A self-assessment approach will be employed, where respondents evaluate their own job performance based on the specified items. All responses will be assessed on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Data analysis will be conducted using SPSS and SmartPLS, including descriptive statistics, reliability analysis (Cronbach’s alpha), validity assessment (average variance extracted), and structural model evaluation to test the hypotheses that workload negatively influences job performance, while work environment and work facilities positively influence job performance. In addition, organizational commitment is hypothesized to moderate these relationships, such that it weakens the negative effect of workload on job performance and strengthens the positive effects of work environment and work facilities on job performance. Ethical considerations will be strictly observed by obtaining necessary approvals and ensuring respondents’ confidentiality and voluntary participation throughout the study.

CONCLUSION

This conceptual paper emphasizes the importance of organizational factors—specifically workload, work environment, and work facilities—in influencing job performance among Royal Malaysia Police (PDRM) officers. Grounded in the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model, workload is identified as a critical job demand

that may negatively affect performance through stress, fatigue, and cognitive overload, particularly in high-pressure policing environments. In contrast, work environment and work facilities function as vital job resources that enhance motivation, engagement, and operational effectiveness. The paper highlights that job performance in policing is multidimensional and directly linked to public trust, service delivery, and institutional integrity. Given ongoing challenges reflected in complaints and disciplinary cases, this framework provides a valuable foundation for understanding how organizational conditions shape performance outcomes and underscores the need to balance job demands with adequate resources to strengthen overall effectiveness in PDRM. To enhance job performance, PDRM is recommended to prioritize effective workload management through task redistribution, improved scheduling, and technological support to reduce strain on officers. Simultaneously, efforts should be made to foster a supportive work environment characterized by strong leadership, teamwork, and positive organizational culture. Investment in modern, reliable work facilities is also essential to improve efficiency and operational readiness. Additionally, implementing stress management and well-being programs can help mitigate the negative effects of demanding work conditions. At the policy level, integrating these factors into human resource and performance management strategies is crucial. Future research is encouraged to empirically test the proposed framework and explore additional variables such as motivation, leadership, and organizational support to strengthen further evidence-based

REFERENCES

1. Alarcon, G. M. (2011). A meta-analysis of burnout with job demands, resources, and attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(2), 549–562. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.03.007>
2. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
3. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2023). Job demands–resources theory: Ten years later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10, 25–53. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933>
4. Bernama. 24 PDRM personnel dismissed for corruption from 2023 to October 2025. <https://bernama.com/en/news.php?id=2495777>
5. Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). Jossey-Bass.
6. Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 687–732). Consulting Psychologists Press.
7. Chandrasekar, K. (2011). Workplace environment and its impact on organisational performance in public sector organisations. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems*, 1(1), 1–19.
8. Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 834–848. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019364>
9. Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874–900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>
10. EAIC (2019). Most complaints to EAIC involve police personnel. https://www.eaic.gov.my/media-home/berita/berita-2019/202-most-complaints-to-eaic-involve-police-personnel-liew?utm_source
11. Enforcement Agency Integrity Commission (EAIC) (2022). Complaint Statistics (2011–2020). <https://www.eaic.gov.my/en/archive/statistics-archive/complaints?>
12. Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250–279. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(76\)90016-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7)
13. Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(2), 285–308. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392498>
14. Kim, S. (2014). Does person–organization fit matter in the public sector? Testing the mediating effect of person–organization fit in the relationship between public service motivation and work attitudes. *Public Administration Review*, 74(6), 830–840. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12232>

15. Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Schaufeli, W. B., De Vet, H. C. W., & Van der Beek, A. J. (2011). Conceptual frameworks of individual work performance: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 53(8), 856–866. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0b013e318226a763>
16. Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>
17. Lesener, T., Gusy, B., & Wolter, C. (2019). The job demands–resources model: A meta-analytic review of longitudinal studies. *Work & Stress*, 33(1), 76–103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2018.1529065>
18. Mazzola, J. J., & Disselhorst, R. (2019). Should we be “challenging” employees? A critical review and meta-analysis of the challenge–hindrance model of stress. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(8), 949–961. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2412>
19. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)
20. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Sage Publications.
21. Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20–52. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842>
22. Motowidlo, S. J., & Kell, H. J. (2012). Job performance. In N. Schmitt & S. Highhouse (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 82–103). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118133880.hop212005>
23. Nik Md Salleh, N. S., Mat Zin, S., Tan Abdullah, I. H., Wan Sulaiman, W. A. T., & Tun Ismail, W. N. A. (2023). DEVELOPING TALENT AND PERFORMANCE OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, CAPACITATE MALAYSIA’S DEVELOPMENT PLAN. *PLANNING MALAYSIA*, 21(30). <https://doi.org/10.21837/pm.v21i30.1392>
24. Park, S. M., & Rainey, H. G. (2012). Work motivation and organizational performance in public organizations: Testing the moderating role of public service motivation. *International Public Management Journal*, 15(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2012.649018>
25. PDRM/JIPS report on disciplinary investigations and dismissals. <https://www.rmp.gov.my/news-detail/2024/02/06/keratan-akhbar-pilihan-139-cops-sacked-last-year?>
26. Queirós, C., Passos, F., & da Silva, C. F. (2020). Burnout and stress measurement in police officers: Literature review and a study with the operational police stress questionnaire. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 587. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00587>
27. Raziq, A., & Maulabakhsh, R. (2015). Impact of working environment on job satisfaction. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23, 717–725. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)00524-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00524-9)
28. Siddiquee, N. A. (2006). *Public management reform in Malaysia: Recent initiatives and experiences*. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 19(4), 339–358.
29. Taris, T. W., Ybema, J. F., & van Beek, I. (2019). Burnout and engagement: Identical twins or just close relatives? *Burnout Research*, 12, 64–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2019.03.001>
30. Taris, T. W., Ybema, J. F., & van Beek, I. (2019). Burnout and engagement: Identical twins or just close relatives? *Burnout Research*, 12, 64–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2019.03.001>
31. The Star (2025). 1,404 police personnel disciplined in 2024, 164 dismissed. <https://www.thestar.com.my/news/nation/2025/02/17/1404-police-personnel-disciplined-in-2024-164-dismissed?>
32. Violanti, J. M., Owens, S. L., Fekedulegn, D., Ma, C. C., Charles, L. E., Hartley, T. A., & Burchfiel, C. M. (2017). An exploration of shift work, fatigue, and gender among police officers: The BCOPS study. *Work*, 56(4), 583–589. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-172516>
33. Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601–617. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700305>
34. Wisniewski, M. (2001). Using SERVQUAL to assess customer satisfaction with public sector services. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 11(6), 380–388.
35. Woo, J. J. (2015). *The evolution of the Malaysian public service: A changing public sector in a competitive environment*. *Public Administration and Policy*, 18(2), 37–55.

36. Wright, B. E., & Pandey, S. K. (2011). Public organizations and mission valence: Examining the effects of public service motivation on job performance. *Public Administration Review*, 71(1), 114–127. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02371.x>