

# Work Performance and Organizational Success.

## A study of Key Influences and Outcomes

**Dr. Sheeba Gani**

Lecturer, Dept.of Management Studies, Abdul Ahad Azad College, Bemina Srinagar, Kashmir

### ABSTRACT

Earlier work performance was essentially referred as qualitative and quantitative outcome of each employee working in an organization. But in the contemporary world people work much more than their job descriptions generally incorporated into their sets of responsibilities. The major concern of the corporators is the organisational performance as it demonstrates the organisational success. It indicates how well and how far an organization has completed its activities within a specific time frame. Essentially it implies organisational success within the stipulated period of the time considered. The performance of an organisation relies on the performance of the employees and different factors, for example, the environment, the organisational culture, leadership style and the work environment of the organisation. So the value created by an individual outcome contributes to the organisational performance. It appears that the work performance acts as a unit in quantifying the overall achievement of an organisation. In this way, work performance is an important determinant in accomplishing the strategic intent of an organisation formulated in the strategic planning process

Therefore, work performance stands as a very important domain in literature of organizational behavior (OB) and human resource (HR) development and is of high relevance for organizations and individuals alike. Also more research is needed to arrive at a more comprehensive understanding of what happens when individuals are performing, the underlying factors which influence individual performance at the personal and organizational levels.

**Keywords:** Work performance, task performance, adaptive performance, Conceptual performance, Organizational success.

### Introduction

Work performance is often regarded as the foremost and extensively studied determinant in the field of organizational behavior and industrial management (Carpini, et al., 2017). It may be characterized as individual behavior—something people do that is visible—that adds value to the company (Campbell et al., 1993) and helps it achieve its objectives (Campbell & Wiernik, 2015). Another perspective on work performance is to consider the extent to which an individual achieves the overall organizational performance objectives (Afzal et al., 2014). The concept of work performance has undergone substantial transformation in recent decades. Previously, it was often defined in a traditional manner that emphasized job roles and responsibilities. However, there has been a shift towards a broader comprehension of work functions within evolving organizational environments (Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1991). The shift in focus may be attributed to the highly competitive and globalized nature of the contemporary work environment, wherein organizations are compelled to adjust to dynamic and evolving situations (Baard et al., 2014). The current context requires a broader comprehension of job performance that

incorporates all possible actions that contribute to the achievement of the objectives of an organization (Griffin et al., 2017).

In today's changing business environment, a talent force is seen as an organization's most enduring competitive advantage. Performance has been defined in several ways by researchers throughout the years. Porter and Lawler (1974) examined how work performance is influenced by an individual's ability, abilities, and effort within a specific setting. Additional features were incorporated into this notion by others, and some regarded it as a distinct behavior that is intimately connected to the aims of the organization. Murphy (1989) elucidated that work performance should be assessed based on observable behavior rather than only focusing on outcomes. Work performance was described by Campbell (1990) as specific, manageable individual actions that support organizational objectives.

According to Kane (1996), a person's success extends beyond achieving a specific goal and also encompasses the legacy they leave behind. Motowidlo et al. (1997) defined work performance as "the accumulated value to the organization of the discrete behavioral episodes that an individual performs during a regular interval of time" and claimed that it is "behavioral, episodic, evaluative, and multidimensional". Moreover, Organ (1998) proposed an extended domain of work behavior and proposed that this construct be taken into account as a component of total work performance. In this way, it is important to have a feeling of belonging to the company and the position that is played, delivering exceptional performance, which entails exceeding expectations and going above and beyond what is implied by task responsibility. Ferris et al. (1998) posited that an employee's work performance is contingent upon a combination of skill, effort, and opportunity. In their study, Bernardin and Russell (1998) defined work performance as "the measurable results achieved in a specific job function or activity within a defined timeframe.

Otley (1999) classified work performance into two categories: individual performance and organizational performance. The primary focus of the organizations is the organizational performance, since it serves as a clear indicator of the organization's overall success. It measures the level of accomplishment and extent of progress made by an organization during a certain period of time. Essentially, it means achieving accomplishment within the specified time frame set by the organization. According to Otley (1999), an organization's effectiveness is dependent on several elements, including employee performance, the organizational culture, leadership style, and the work environment. The value generated by a single outcome from an individual adds to the overall success of the organization. The work performance serves as a cohesive measure in assessing the overall success of an organization.

The process through which workers carry out tasks successfully and efficiently in order to help the business reach its specified goals Baldwin (2008). Employee performance, according to Armstrong & Baron, (2010), is the growth of an individual's and a team's skills in order to maximize each other's potential contribution to the accomplishment of organizational and individual goals. These definitions emphasize on the relationship between the person and the organization is a key component, therefore employee performance may be seen as the link between corporate strategy and employee contributions to accomplishing organizational goals.

Work performance is a crucial factor in the workplace as it serves as a measure of an employee's progress and recognition. The significance of individual achievement is equally important for both businesses and people. Demonstrating exceptional proficiency in completing activities leads to a sense of contentment, self-confidence, and expertise (Bandura, 1997; Kanfer et al., 2005). Furthermore, those who demonstrate exceptional performance are promoted, rewarded, and recognized. According to Van Scotter et al. (2000), those who excel in their performance have much higher career prospects compared to those who perform at a moderate or low level. ". Viswesvaran and Ones (2000) defined it as the ability of workers to do activities, exhibit behavior, and achieve

outcomes that are aligned with and contribute to the goals of the business. According to Griffin (2007), performance is defined as the collective actions and conduct of employees. According to Pushpakumari (2008), "performance" refers to the amount of effort that an individual puts into their profession. Opatha (2015) proposed that an employee's work performance may be measured by the degree to which they have fulfilled their tasks and responsibilities. The two primary factors used to evaluate job performance are the amount of work completed and the level of work excellence.

While management of a company is active in leveraging the talents and efforts that employees provide to the company, there must be a guarantee that the company will benefit from the employee's contributions. These returns are quantified using the Key Performance Indicators (Kelleher, 2011). So, the primary factor in determining whether the larger corporate strategy is successful or unsuccessful is employee performance. It's important to assess and comprehend the many aspects that affect employee performance in order to effectively manage employee performance (Aguilera, 2005).

Research has shown that the performance of individuals can vary over time. As employees get more experience in a profession, their performance tends to grow until it hits a steady plateau (Griffin et al., 2007). The authors delineated the two distinct phases involved in assessing employee performance, namely the transition stage and the maintenance stage have been explained by Hamid et al. (2017). During the transition stage of a work, individuals are new to their given activities and require a higher level of cognitive ability. However, in the maintenance stage, employees grow more experienced and proficient, requiring less cognitive capacity. Ramawickrama et al. (2017) provide a more thorough definition of work performance. They define it as the degree to which an employee has demonstrated their traits, engaged in behaviors, achieved results that are suitable for task performance and has engaged in citizenship performance and counterproductive performance within a specific timeframe. Opatha and Rathnayake (2018) defines work performance as a combination of the employee's features or qualities, their actions or behaviors, and the outcomes they achieve.

The criteria for measuring performance differ in each phase. Initially, when employees are acquiring skills, performance is largely dependent on controlled processes, declarative knowledge, and the allocation of limited resources. However, as individuals become more experienced and trained, performance primarily relies on routine processes, procedural knowledge, and psychomotor abilities Diamantidis & Chatzoglou (2019).

### **Dimensions of Work Performance**

The concept and definition of work performance have been the subject of much scholarly inquiry in the past 15 to 20 years. Researchers agree that performance must be regarded as a multi-dimensional concept. Murphy (1989) and Campbell (1990) were pioneers in establishing the scope of individual work performance by precisely outlining the major dimensions of generic work performance. Murphy (1989) proposed that the work performance domain may be represented by four dimensions namely, task performance (the ability to complete assigned tasks), interpersonal behaviors (interacting and collaborating with people), work-avoidance behaviors (behaviors that include avoiding work), and destructive/hazardous behaviors (behaviors that provide a clear danger of productivity loss, damage, or setbacks). Campbell's (1990) work performance framework suggested eight dimensions of work performance. These include job-specific task proficiency, non-job-specific task proficiency, written and oral communications, demonstrating effort, maintaining personal discipline, facilitating peer and team performance, supervision, and management and administration. These eight dimensions adequately

capture the underlying structure of performance at a broad level. However, he also observed that the eight elements may exhibit diverse patterns of sub dimensions, and their content and importance might differ across various jobs.

Viswesvaran (1993), developed a set of ten dimensions that define individual job performance. In addition to a broad element of overall job performance, he identified specific dimensions including productivity, work quality, job knowledge, communication skills, effort, leadership, administrative skills, interpersonal skills, and compliance with/acceptance of authority.

Borman and Motowidlo (1993) contended that the entirety of work performance could be encapsulated by the comprehensive dimensions of task performance and contextual performance. Task performance refers to behaviors that directly or indirectly contribute to the organization's technical core. Contextual performance, on the other hand, refers to behaviors that support the organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technological core operates. Contextual actions including volunteering, enduring, assisting, collaborating, and adhering to regulations. Task activities often differ across various occupations, whereas contextual activities are shared by numerous or all occupations.

Job specific frameworks were formulated which mainly targeted at professions like managers, sales and service professions and army. Campbell et al. (1990) proposed a paradigm to define job performance in the army. This framework consists of five dimensions: (1) core technical skill, (2) general soldiering proficiency, (3) effort and leadership, (4) personal discipline, and (5) physical fitness and military bearing. The last term refers to the extent to which individuals keep their physical fitness, adhere to the expected military look, and behave accordingly.

Borman and Brush (1993) devised a framework to describe managerial work performance. This framework consists of four components: (1) technical activities and management mechanisms, (2) interpersonal interactions and communication, (3) leadership and supervision, and (4) beneficial personal behavior and skills, such as persistence, crisis and stress management, and organizational commitment. Maxham et al., (2008) categorized the performance of retail personnel into three distinct areas: (1) in-role performance, (2) extra-role performance towards consumers, and (3) extra-role performance towards the business.

Viswesvaran & Ones (2000) and Rotundo & Sackett (2002) performed two narrative evaluations on frameworks of work performance in the early 2000s. Both assessments determined that work performance may be categorized into three distinct dimensions: task performance, organizational citizenship conduct, and counterproductive work behavior.

Based on the conceptual categorization of work performance factors available in the literature, three main dimensions may be identified: task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior. Some frameworks included dimensions that were not classified within the three aforementioned categories, such as proactive, creative, and adaptable performance. The increasing interdependence and unpredictability of work systems and how this affects the character of an individual's work performance were examined by Allworth & Hesketh (1999), Pulakos et al. (2000) and Griffin et al. (2007). Each of them contended that adaptive performance need to be regarded as a distinct aspect of an individual's work performance. Adaptive performance refers to the degree to which a person adjusts to modifications in a work system or job duties. It encompasses activities like as innovative problem-solving, navigating ambiguous work scenarios, acquiring new skills, technologies, and protocols, and adjusting to diverse persons, cultures, or environments.

Koopmans et al., (2011) conceptualized, task performance, contextual performance, adaptive performance and counterproductive work behavior as the four main theoretical dimensions. They performed their study for determining the dimensions of work performance in relation to numerous research domains, including occupational health, psychology and management. Therefore, it can be viewed as a big research and its heuristic framework is generalizable to all forms of jobs.

Recently, a conceptual framework by Pradhan & Jena (2017) on employee performance proposed task performance, adaptive performance, and contextual performance as three distinct dimensions of employee performance.

### **Antecedents of Work Performance**

Organizations can reap the advantages of a competitive edge when workers consistently meet the necessary performance standards, meaning they actively contribute to the growth and achievement of corporate goals (Liao and Chang, 2004). Therefore, firms must prioritize the factors or the antecedents that might have a beneficial impact on improving employee performance in order to build and maintain a competitive edge.

Multiple factors have been analyzed in relation with work performance. According to Campbell's (1990) Determinants of work Performance Model, work performance is influenced by both system elements and individual characteristics. This implies that work performance is not simply influenced by system elements such as human resource management practices, job characteristics, organizational structure, organizational environment, and culture. Indeed, the individual attributes of employees also have a role in their job performance, since an employee may possess the necessary knowledge, skills, and talents that are appropriate for a specific profession. Furthermore, Schmidt & Hunter, (1998) established that general mental capacity is a highly significant predictor of work performance. Researchers (Farh et al., 2012; Kacmar et al. 2009) identified declarative knowledge (knowledge about facts, principles, and objects), procedural knowledge and skill (the ability to implement declarative knowledge), and motivation (the choice to expend effort, level of effort, and persistence) as three main factors that affect work performance. Human resource management strategies encompass the formal efforts undertaken by businesses to ensure that workers acquire the necessary information and skills for their present or future job roles (Mondy 2011). Learning firms have a significant impact on improving employee performance by offering training and development opportunities for their staff (Gitongu et al., 2016). In their study, Dermal & Cater (2013) defined training and development as a learning process that facilitates people in acquiring new skills and abilities, leading to continuous enhancement in their job performance. The reason for this is because training and development are essential in unleashing employees potential by expanding their knowledge and abilities to address any potential gaps in performance.

Compensation and benefits has been identified as one of the human resource management dimension that aims to effectively attract, motivate, and retain personnel. It is considered the most important driver in inspiring workers to achieve outstanding performance as well as to retain skilled and knowledgeable people (Chiu et al, 2002; Johari et al., 2012).

Furthermore, the use of management standards to assess employee performance is crucial in enhancing employee productivity, as it offers an accurate assessment of performance and its conformity with established benchmarks. Performance appraisal is a crucial tool for organizations to assess their workers performance based on their skills and abilities to carry out the duties and obligations expected by their employer. Performance evaluation is a methodical procedure used to assess and analyze employee

performance with the aim of enhancing it, providing rewards, and giving recognition accordingly (Gibbons & Kleiner 1994; Purohit 2014; Showkat 2014). Akinyele (2010) asserted that a well-designed performance assessment system guarantees ongoing enhancement in employee performance.

### Consequences of Work Performance

Work performance is a crucial factor in the workplace as it serves as a benchmark for an employee's progress and recognition (Mahapatro, 2010). The significance of individual performance is paramount for both organizations and individuals alike. Demonstrating high performance in completing activities leads to a sense of contentment, self-efficacy and a sense of mastery (Bandura, 1997; Kanfer et al., 2005). In addition, those who do very well are promoted, recognized, and rewarded. The career prospects for high-performing individuals are much superior to those who perform at a moderate or low level (Van Scotter et al., 2000).

The outcomes of work performance might differ based on whether it is favorable or unfavorable. Research conducted by Judge et al., (2001) discovered a noteworthy association between work performance and promotions. Colquitt et al.(2000) conducted a meta-analysis that revealed a significant correlation between performance ratings and income increases, ranging from modest to strong. On the other hand negative consequences may include reprimands or disciplinary action, damage to reputation missed opportunities, stress and burnout (Barrick et al.2015).

Moreover, work performance is linked to several organizational outcomes, such as customer service and product quality (Blignaut 2011), manager-employee relationship and employee turnover (Dalal & Hulin 2008).

Work performance is the most important factor for businesses to gain a reasonable edge and be more productive. One of the most important parts of a human resources management is performance. Any business or organization's operations are meant to help it reach its goals, and a good performance management system will help the organization reach its strategic goals. In this context, work performance may be thought of as a collection of specific activities intended to carry out tasks, which are influenced by the environment and employee related variables. Employee expectations about their responsibilities within the firm, how they value accomplishments, and their desire for harmony all influence how well their jobs are done. In this regard, it is important to note that work performance is closely correlated with the competencies that enable employees to contribute to the accomplishment of the corporate goals. As a result, performance assessment has become increasingly important in the management of professional organizations, as it is the core function of human resource management and the link to competitive advantage.

### References

1. Afzal, S. & Yasir, A. F. (2014). Impact of work family conflict/family work conflict on job satisfaction and life satisfaction: A case study of a public sector university Gujranwala Division Pakistan. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Science and Engineering*, 5(8), 31-36
2. Aguilera, R. V. (2005). Family Firms and Corporate Governance: A Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature." *Family Business Review*, 18(2), 135-152.
3. Akinyele, S. (2010). Performance appraisal systems in private universities in Nigeria: A study of Crawford University, Igbesa-Nigeria. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 10(6), 1-11.

4. Allworth, E., & Hesketh, B. (1999). Construct-oriented biodata: Capturing change-related and contextually relevant future performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 7(2), 97–111
5. Armstrong, M., & Baron, A. (2010). *Performance Management. A strategic And Integrated Approach to Achieve Success*. Chennai: JAICO Publishing House
6. Baard, S.K., Rench, T.A., & Kozlowski, S.W.J. (2014). Performance adaptation: A theoretical integration and review. *Journal of Management*, 40(2), 48–99.
7. Baldwin, K. (2008). *Managing Employee Performance in Seven Steps*. Sussex: Lulu.
8. Bandura, A. (1997) *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control* (New York: W.H. Freeman, 1997).
9. Barrick, M. R., Thurgood, G. R., Smith, T. A., & Courtright, S. H. (2014). Collective organizational engagement: Linking motivational antecedents, strategic implementation, and firm performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58, 111–135.
10. Bernardin J. and Russell J. (1998) *Human Resource Management: An Experiential Approach*. USA: McGrawHill, ISBN: 0 07 115674 7, 171, 358.
11. Blignaut, L., 2011, 'Personality as a predictor of performance for customer service centre agents in the banking industry', Master's dissertation, School of Management Sciences, University of South Africa
12. Borman, W. C., & Brush, D. H. (1993). More progress toward a taxonomy of managerial performance requirements. *Human performance*, 6(1), 1-21
13. Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. M. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. *Personnel Selection in Organizations*; San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 71.
14. Campbell, J. P., & Wiernik, B. M. (2015). The modeling and assessment of work performance. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2, 47–74.
15. Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993) 'A theory of performance', in C. W. Schmitt and W. C. A. Borman (eds), *Personnel Selection in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, pp. 35-70
16. 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* (687–732).
17. Carpini, J. A., Parker, S. K., & Griffin, M. A. (2017). A look back and a leap forward: A review and synthesis of the individual work performance literature. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 11(2), 825–885.
18. Chiu, R., Luk, V., & Tang, T. (2002). Retaining and motivating employees: Compensation preferences in Hong Kong and China. *Personnel Review*. 31 (4): 402-431.
19. Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Noe, R. A. (2000). Toward an integrative theory of training motivation: a meta-analytic path analysis of 20 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 678–707.
20. Dalal, R.S. & Hulin, C.L., 2008, 'Motivation for what? A multivariate dynamic perspective of the criterion'. *Work motivation: Past, present, and future*, 63-100.
21. Dermol, V. and Čater, T. (2013), 'The influence of training and training transfer factors on organisational learning and performance', *Personnel Review*, 42, 3, 324–48.
22. Diamantidis, Anastasios D., and Prodromos Chatzoglou. 2019. "Factors Affecting Employee Performance: An Empirical Approach." *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management* 68(1):171–93.

23. Farh, C., Seo, M.G. & Tesluk, P.E., 2012, 'Emotional intelligence, teamwork effectiveness, and job performance: The moderating role of job context', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 97(4), 890-900.
24. Ferris, G., Arthur, M., Berkson, H., Kaplan, D., Harrell-Cook, G., & Frink, D. (1998). Toward a social context theory of the human resource management–organization effectiveness relationship. *Human Resource Management Review*, 8(3), 235–264
25. Gibbons, F., & Kleiner, B. (1994). Factors that bias employee performance appraisals. *Work Study*, 43(3), 10-13.
26. Gitongu, M. K., Kingi, W. K., & Uzel, J. M. (2016). Determinants of employee's performance of state parastatals in Kenya: A case of Kenya Ports Authority. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 6(10), 197-204.
27. Griffin, R., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2017). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(2), 269-290
28. Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of management journal*, 50(2), 327-347.
29. Hamid, M., Sumra, M., Ayesha, C., & Rizwana, Y. (2017). Impact of Human Resource Management on Organizational Performance. *Journal of Accounting & Marketing* 06(01):100–116.
30. Ilgen, D. R., & Hollenbeck, J. R. (1991). The structure of work: Job design and roles. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 165–207). Consulting Psychologists Press.
31. Johari, J. & Yahya, K. Y. (2012). An assessment of the reliability and validity of job performance measurement. *Jurnal Pengurusan*, 36, 17–31.
32. Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological bulletin*, 127(3), 376.
33. Kacmar, K.M., Harris, K.J., Collins, B.J. & Judge, T.A., 2009, 'Core self-evaluations and job performance: The role of the perceived work environment', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94 (6), 1572-1580.
34. Kane, J.S. (1996). The Conceptualization and Representation of Total Performance Effectiveness. *Human Resource Management Review*, 6, 123-145.
35. Kanfer, R., Chen, G., & Pritchard, R. D. (2005). "Performance and Motivation: A Review of Research and Theory." In *Handbook Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 59-99.
36. Kelleher, P. (2010). The Use of Key Performance Indicators in Public Sector Organizations: A Case Study. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 23(4), 330-346.
37. Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C.M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Schaufeli, W. B., De Vet, H. C. W., & Vander Beek, A. J. (2011). Conceptual frameworks of individual work performance A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 53 (8), 856 866.
38. Mahapatro, B.B. (2010) *Human Resources Management*. New Age International (P) Limited, Publishers, New Delhi.
39. Maxham, J. G., Netemeyer, R. G., & Lichtenstein, D. R. (2008). The retail value chain: Linking employee perceptions to employee performance, customer evaluations, and store performance. *Marketing Science*, 27(2), 147-167
40. Mondy, R. W. (2011). *Human resource management* (12th ed.). Pearson
41. Motowidlo, S. J., Barman, W. C. & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance, *Human Performance*, 10: 71-83.

42. Murphy, K. R. (1989). Dimensions of job performance. Teting: Applied and Theoretical Perspective, 218 247. New York: Praeger
43. Opatha, H. D. N. P., & Rathnayake, R. M. S. (2018). Factors Affecting Work Performance: A Study of Employees in the Sri Lankan Apparel Sector." Sri Lankan Journal of Human Resource Management, 8(1), 25-42
44. Opatha, H. H. D. N. P. (2015). Organizational Behavior: The Human Side of Work, Department of Human Resource Management, University of Sri Jayewardenapura, Sri Lanka.
45. Organ, D. W. (1998). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
46. Otley, D. (1999). Performance management: a framework for management control systems research. Management Accounting Research, 10, 363 382
47. Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. (1974). The effect of performance on job satisfaction. Studies in Personal and Industrial Psychology. Third Edition, Illinois
48. Pradhan, R. K., & Jena, L. K. (2017). Employee performance at workplace: Conceptual model and empirical validation. Business Perspectives and Research, 5(1), 69-85.
49. Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. Journal of applied psychology, 85(4), 612.
50. Purohit, M. 2014. Performance appraisal system of cooperative banks in pine region: Its implication to employee's performance. International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research, 5(1), 1161-1170.
51. Ramawickrama, J., & Opatha, H., & Pushpakumari, M.D. (2017). Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction, and the Facets of the Relationship between the Two Constructs. International Business Research. 10. 167-182.
52. Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(1), 66–80.
53. Kacmar, K.M., Harris, K.J., Collins, B.J. & Judge, T.A., 2009, 'Core self-evaluations and job performance: The role of the perceived work environment', Journal of Applied Psychology 94 (6), 1572-1580.
54. Liao, H. & Chang, A. 2004, "A Multilevel Investigation of Factors Influencing Employee Service Performance and Customer Outcomes", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 41-58.
55. Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The Validity and Utility of Selection Methods in Personnel Psychology: Practical and Theoretical Implications of 85 Years of Research Findings. Psychological Bulletin, 124(2), 262-27
56. Showkat, S. (2013). Performance appraisal in banking organizations. International Refereed Research Journal, 6(3), 29-37.
57. Van Scotter, J. R., Motowidlo, S. J. and Cross, T. C. (2000) 'Effects of task performance and contextual performance on systemic rewards', Journal of Applied Psychology, 85: 526-535
58. Viswesvaran, C. (1993). "Performance and Productivity: An Overview of the Research." In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (pp. 1-45).
59. Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8(4), 216–226.

