THINK INDIA (Quarterly Journal)

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

Predictors of Job Performance among Spinning Mill Employees in Kerala

Sarath, P.
Assistant Professor (Guest)
Department of Psychology
University of Calicut
Calicut University (P.O)
Pin: 673635

Manikandan, K.
Professor in Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Calicut
Calicut University (P.O)
Pin: 673635

Abstract

The performance of the employee who is working with the industry is one of the major factors which influence the performance of any industry. Performance of the employee consists of all the observable behaviors of the employees related with their assigned work which is related with goals of the organization. From the reviews related with performance of the employees, three major variables have identified which influence the performance related behaviors. It includes- organizational culture, work engagement and work stress of the employees. From the reviews, the investigator hypothesized that, organizational culture, work engagement and work stress has a significant role in determining the performance of the employees. The participants of the study consist of 302 blue collar employees working in different spinning mills working in Kerala. Appropriate scales were used to collect data from the employees and collected data entered into a spread sheet for statistical analysis. Multiple regression (enter method) was used for analysis. The regression analysis found that most of the dimensions of selected variables were significantly predicted the performance. The review, method, analysis, result and discussion of the present study are explained in detail.

Keywords: Employees, Experience, Multiple regression, Organizational culture, Work Engagement, Work stress.

Introduction

The productivity/effectiveness of every organization is governed by the performance of employees who are working with it. “Performance” is a multidimensional construct which

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

represent all the behaviors of an employee in an organization which will assist to achieve the goal of the organization. Work performance can be interpreted as a system including three key elements arranged in sequence; inputs, human resource throughputs and outputs (Wright & McMahan, 1992; Wright & Snell, 1991). Here, 'inputs' includes employee knowledge, skills and competencies; the human resource 'throughputs' is related with activities that transform inputs into outcomes, such as work effort and other behavior; and the last one 'outputs' include outcomes from work behavior, that is result. All the process involved in the performance may be influenced by different factors- personal, organizational and environmental factors. As the individual performance of the employee will improve the performance of any organization, it is important to study the factors behind the performance of employees. Till the date, there are several studies in the literature which explored the factors that influence and predict the performance of employees. Among the factors, organizational culture, work engagement and work stress plays a prominent place in the literature.

Organizational culture

Organizational culture refers to the culture of an organization, which connects all the employees to work together, to achieve something and differentiates the organization from other organizations in method of working. The concept of 'organizational culture' received attention from the work of Katz and Kahn (1978), Pettigrew (1979), Hofstede(1980), Schneider (1987, 1990) etc., There are different viewpoints related with the concept- organizational culture. The Competing Values Framework (CVF) which was forwarded by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) explain organizational cultures along with two dimensions: structure and focus. The former one was related with flexibility of the organizations at one end and control at another end. The second one is related with individuals at one end and organizations function at another end. The models of Cameron and Quinn (2006), Denison and Spreitzer (1991) etc are also evolved from the CVF model.

Martin (2001) identified three theoretical perspectives (Integration, differentiation and fragmentation) from her extensive research. The integration perspective related with the collectivity wide consensus of the organizational culture which suggests the "shared values" of the employees. The differentiation perspective focuses on cultural manifestations that have inconsistent interpretations among the employees which may lead to either harmony or conflict in the organization. In the fragmentation perspective, interpretations of cultural manifestations are ambiguously related to each other which place ambiguity, rather than clarity, at the core of culture.

Schein (2004) forwarded that organizational culture can be expressed at three levels- Cultural artifacts- related with structures and processes in the organization such as dress, observable rituals and ceremonies; Espoused beliefs- formal organizational practices like strategies, goals and policies, which are formally developed; and Underlying assumptions- related with unconscious thoughts, beliefs, expectations and theories.

Work engagement

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

One of the important factors which evolved during the last decade is work engagement.Even though different scholars tried to define the term "work engagement" in their own words, the most suitable definition was given by Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma and Bakker (2002). According to them, work engagement is "a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind
that is characterized by Vigor, Dedication, and Absorption".Vigor is characterized by the strength or energy level of employee in his or her work. Dedication is the devoted effort of the employee to complete his/her work escorted by feelings of enthusiasm, a sense of pride and inspiration. Absorption is related with the fascination of an employee towards his or her work. Those who characterized by the absorption is being fully engrossed in there. Thus when an employee is engaged to his/her work, they are having vigor, dedication and absorption within them.

The term work engagement can be understand in detail by exploring the theories forwarded by different scholars. The needs-satisfying approach which is forwarded by Kahn (1990) was one of the earliest viewpoints of work engagement. The model assumes that employees become engaged when the job is challenging and meaningful to the employee, when the social environment at work is safe, and personal resources like mental and physical energy are available. Saks (2006) suggests that when employees receive a decent salary, recognition etc, they feel obliged to respond in kind and repay the organization by engaging in their work. As, there emerges an exchange of organizations response and employees repay, the process were known as social exchange theory of work engagement.

Job-Demands Resources (JD-R) model which is forwarded by Bakker and Demerouti (2008) assume that the 'work engagement' is influenced by both job resources (eg- social support from coworkers, performance feedback, skill variety etc) and personal resources (eg- optimism, self-efficacy,resilience etc). The work of Sonnentag, Dormann, and Demerouti (2010) extended the model of work engagement by proposing the role of proximal day-level personal resources (self-efficacy, self-esteem, optimism, positive affect, and energy) and the day-level demands plays an important role in determining the performance of the employees. They suggest that day-level demands interact with day-level personal resources in predicting state work engagement (SWE). Recently, in an article, Bakker and Albrecht (2018) also pointed that; work engagement may also fluctuate within persons – across time and situations. According to them, "daily engagement refers to dailylevels of vigor, dedication, and absorption that may fluctuate as a function of dailydemands, resources, and proactive behaviors."

Work stress

Rollinson (2005) defined workplace stress as the condition of an individual which emerge from the working environment that is different from normal working condition of him/ her. A minimum stress may not negatively influence the performance of the employee. But when it becomes excessive in nature, it will negatively influence the performance of the employee. In these circumstances, the stress which emerges from the work environment became one of the essential areas of organizational research. As work stress is one of the important topics in the

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

area of organizational behavior, various scholars were tried to explain the nature of work stress in organizational context.

Lewin (1951) hypothesized the interaction between the person and environment (PxE) is a significant determinant of people's cognitive, affective and behavioral reactions. This concept was developed into the most popular theory of stress and known as "Person-Environment fit model" (French, 1973) which postulates the stress in terms of similarity between the need of the people and what they receive in turn, as well as the similarity between their abilities and the demands they have. Any mismatch between them will create some kind of stress in people which will negatively affect the health of them. Like the P-E fit model, The Michigan Model (French & Kahn, 1962) also places much importance on the individual's own subjective perceptions of stressors like role ambiguity, conflict, lack of participation, job security, workload, lack of challenge etc. The Conservation of Resources (COR) theory was forward by Hobfoll (1989) which is similar to P-E fit model but one key difference is that the P–E fit model emphasis mainly on people's perceptions of fit, while COR theory incorporates more objective indicators of actual fit. Lazarus's Transaction model was another famous model of stress (Lazarus &Folkman, 1984) based on person and environment. Hackman and Oldham's (1980) explained the stress at work in terms of job characteristics like skill variety, task significance, task identity, autonomy, and feedback. As the theory focus on these job characteristics, the theory was popularly known as "the job characteristics model". The theory proposed the negative job characteristics will lead to negative cognitive and behavioral outcomes.

A somewhat different, but more popular theory was proposed initially by Karasek (1979) and later expanded by Karasek and Theorell (1990). The initial model of Karasek known as Job Demands–Control (JDC) Model, which states that, to a certain extent excessive job demands or pressures have an impact on stress, these demands are not only the important contributors to stress, but also the ability of the employee to control the demands that they have to deal within. Later, Karasek and Theorell (1990) added social support in the model and termed their model as Job Demands–Control–Support (JDCS) model. The inclusion of support was based on extensive evidence which stated that support can play a significant role in alleviating stress among workers.

Palmer, Cooper, and Thomas (2004) in their model, identified that work stress is the product of different sources such as 'work demands' which is related with workload, work patterns and work environment; 'control' which is related with the involvement the employee has in the way they do their work; 'support from colleagues and the organization' in the form of encouragement, sponsorship and resources provided by the organization, line management and colleagues; 'relationship with others' related with positive working to avoid conflict within the working environment; 'role' which refer to the nature of role of the employee within the organization; and 'change' which is related with how the organizational change is managed and communicated in the organization. Maladjustment with these factors may cause coronary heart disease, anxiety, depression, burnout etc in the individual which will result in reduced profit, increased accidents, etc.

Importance of organizational culture, work engagement and work stress in determining performance in organizational research

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

As the ‘‘performance’ of employees determine the productivity of any organization, various scholars were tried to explore the various factors which influence the performance of employees. Among the factors, organizational culture, work engagement and work stress has a special role in organizational research while addressing the performance of employees. Organizational culture includes everything in the organization which influences the employee directly or indirectly. Depending upon the extent to which how the employee perceives their organizations culture determine the performance of the employees. Studies of different scholars identified that, organizational culture and its dimensions has an important role in determining the performance of the employees (Ritchie, 2000; Giri, Nimran, Hamid, and Musadieq (2016). Regarding the work engagement, various studies were found that work engagement is a positive factor which will positively influence the performance of employees (Crawford, LePine, & Rich, 2010; Anitha, 2014).Several studies reported a negative relationship between the work stress and employee performance (Bashir &Ramay, 2010; Karunanithy&Ponnampalam, 2013).

From the various literatures, it is observed that, most of the studies related with organizational culture, work engagement and work stress where happened outside Kerala, India. But studies related with the variables were limited within the Kerala context (Nair., Sarath, & Manikandan, 2014; Sarath, & Manikandan, 2016; Sarath, & Manikandan, 2015), where the nature of work force were different from other states of India. Hence, the role of organizational culture, work engagement and work stress in determining the performance of employees working in industrial context of Kerala were designed.

Need and significance f the study

The industries working in this modern world has to produce more quality based products in order to survive. The quality and quantity of the industrial output is determined by different factors. Human related factors such as work engagement, job satisfaction, work stress, etc., are one of the major determinants of industrial output. Thus there is a need for studying such human related factors to increase the performance of the individual employees as well as the industrial output. The present study investigates the role of organizational culture, work engagement and work stress in determining or predicting the performance of employees. Organizational culture is refers to a shared meaning held by all the members of organization which influence the behaviors of them. Work engagement is the emotional attachment of an individual towards his or her work which may influence the performance of the employees. Work stress is the stresses that arises from the work-related tasks, workload, politics etc., and have a significant influence the performance of the employees. In the state like Kerala, where the industrial performance is very low compared with other states of the country, uncovering the influence of organizational culture, work engagement, work stress on performance of the employees will help authorities to take necessary steps to improve the performance of industrial employees in the state. Thus, the study will be significant in taking necessary actions to improve the effectiveness of individual employees as well as the organization or industries in the competing world. The result will be magnificent for both the industrial sector and for the government.

Objective

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

1. To find out the relative contribution of organizational culture, work engagement and work stress in the prediction of performance of industrial employees.
2. To find out the combined effect of organizational culture, work engagement and work stress on performance of industrial employees.

Method

Participants

The participants of this study consist of 302 (Male= 266 & Female= 36) employees working in spinning mill industries located different part of Kerala state (Northern Kerala= 164, Central Kerala= 93 and Sothern Kerala= 45), India. All the participants were belong to three major religious communities (Hindu= 122, Islam= 169 & Christian = 110). Most of the employees were studied up to SSLC (N = 212), some of them were attended higher secondary education (N = 52) and some of the employees were completed some professional courses (N = 38). Among the participants, 263 were married and 39 were unmarried.

Instruments

1. Organizational Culture Inventory (OCI): is a 39-item instrument developed by George and Jayan (2010) which is designed to understand an organization's culture. The OCI consist of six vital dimensions like organizational glue (6 items), organizational leadership (5 items), organizational mission (7 items), organizational group (11 items), organizational adaptability (6 items) and organizational autonomy (4 items) which make the organizational culture. The authors claim that, these dimensions of organizational culture are related with values and beliefs of the organization that help or hinder the performance of the organization. The reliability coefficient of the organizational culture inventory is 0.802 and the content validity score of organizational culture inventory is 0.945. The reliability and validity of the scale ensures the measurement quality of the tool.
2. Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES); developed by Schaufeli and his colleagues (2002) to measure work engagement of employees. This scale consists of 17 items with three dimensions- vigor (6 items), dedication (5 items) and absorption (6 items). The authors claim that, the work engagement (work-related state of mind) of an individual employee can be assessed by measuring the vigor, dedication, and absorption of that employee towards work. The reliability of the scale established through the method of Cronbach Alpha and was found to be 0.92. The authors claim that, the scale has reasonable construct validity.
3. Work Stress Scale (G): is a five point Likert scale developed by Sarath and Manikandan (2018). This is a one-dimensional scale specifically developed to estimate an individual employee's general stress in the work place with a limited number of items. The items included both positive items and negative items to measure the stress of individual employees at work place. The item numbers 16 and 21 negatively worded, and the remaining items in the scale are positively worded. Reliability of work stress scale was

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

established by calculating the internal consistency Cronbach Alpha which is found to be .91. The authors claim reasonable face validity to the scale.

4. Performance Rating Scale: developed by Jayan and Dharmangadhan (1995) to measure the performance of employees. It consist of two rating scales - (Performance rating scale I and Performance rating scale II). Performance rating scale I included self-rating (absolute and relative rating) and coworker rating (absolute and relative rating). Performance rating scale II included supervisor rating. As a whole, the performance rating scale consist of five scales with one statement each to rate the performance of employees viz., Self-rating (absolute rating), Self-rating (relative rating), Rating by coworker (absolute rating), Rating by coworker (relative rating), and Supervisor rating. The average of these five rating constitute the performance of an individual worker.

Procedure

After getting an appointment, the investigator met the authorities of selected organizations formally and explained the importance, purpose and application of the research work. Then the investigator fixed a convenient date to collect data from the organization and informed the authority. With the assistance of supervisor in charge, investigator contacted the employees in the organization personally and explained the importance of research work undergoing. After getting consent from the employees, all the standardized instruments along with background information schedule were given to the employees individually and requested them to respond to the instruments. They were assured that, the given information will only use for research purpose and will protect their privacy. All the doubts related with the instruments were cleared. After responding to the instruments, the instruments were collected back and checked for omissions and errors. The scoring of each scale was done as per the instructions in the manual. Then the scored data was entered into a spread sheet for further statistical analysis.

Results and Discussion

Performance of the employee in any organization is the product of different factors. Organizational culture, work engagement and work stress are some of the important factors which are reviewed by different scholars in earlier researches. Here, the investigator has performed multiple regression analysis to know the joint effect (overall fit) as well as the relative contribution of organizational culture, work engagement and work stress in determining the performance of the industrial employees in Kerala.

To know the relative contribution of organizational culture in determining the performance of the employees, investigator considered organizational glue, organizational leadership, organizational mission, organizational group, organizational adaptability, and organizational autonomy as dimensions of the variable. Vigor, dedication, and absorption were considered while analyzing the predictive capacity of work engagement. In addition to organizational culture and work engagement, the investigator also included the work stress to know its contribution in determining the performance of the employees. The results of the regression analysis are presented in two separate tables (Table 1 & 2).

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

Table 1 show the calculated R, R^2, adjusted R^2, standard error of the estimate and F-ratio which is used to find whether the overall regression model is a good fit for the data.

Table 1

Model summary and statistical significance of overall regression

R = .568 R Square = .323 Adjusted R Square = .299 Std. Error of the Estimate = .7213				
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Regression	72.12	10	7.21	13.86**
Residual	151.41	291	0.52	
Total	223.53	301		

**p< .01

From table 1, estimated R value (multiple correlation coefficients= 0.568) which was found indicates a good level of prediction. The "R Square" (coefficient of determination= 0.323) suggests that, 32.3% of the variance in the performances was accounted by the linear combination of independent variables- organizational glue, organizational leadership, organizational mission, organizational group, organizational adaptability, organizational autonomy, vigor, dedication, absorption and work stress. The table also shows the statistical significance of the data. The calculated 'F' value (F= 13.86, p<.01) advocates that, the selected independent variables- dimensions of organizational culture, dimensions of work engagement and work stress together significantly predict the performance of employees.

Based on the calculated R, R^2, adjusted R^2 and F-ratio, it can assume that, the overall regression model is a good fit for the data. In addition to overall prediction which is shown in table 1, the analysis also found the relative contribution of each independent variable under study in predicting the performance of the employees and presented in the table 2.

Table 2

Relative contributions of the independent variables under study on the performance of employees

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	't'
	B	Std. Error	Beta(β)	
Constant	5.763	.404		14.260**
Vigor (V)	-.039	.009	-.232	-4.146**
Dedication (D)	.029	.017	.163	1.782
Absorption (A)	-.016	.008	-.121	-2.007*
Organizational glue (OGL)	.057	.024	.285	2.357*

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

Organizational leadership (OL)	.107	.023	.490	4.685**
Organizational mission (OM)	-.139	.019	-.892	-7.368**
Organizational group (OGR)	-.004	.010	-.026	-.361
Organizational adaptability (OAD)	-.094	.014	-.425	-6.671**
Organizational autonomy (OAU)	.174	.027	.626	6.473**
Work stress (WS)	.002	.003	.035	.627

*p< .05. **p< .01

The table 2 shows the contribution of each selected independent variables in predicting the performance of the employees. the 't' value observed from the table suggests that, independent variables- vigor (t=4.146, p< .01), absorption (t = 2.007, p< .05), organizational glue (t = 2.357, p< .05), organizational leadership (t = 4.685, p< .01), organizational mission (t = 7.368, p< .01), organizational adaptability (t = 6.672, p< .01) and organizational autonomy (t = 6.473, p< .01) significantly predict the performance of the employees. The unstandardized coefficients presented in the table indicate how much the dependent variable varies with an independent variable when all other independent variables in the model are held constant. From the table 2, it can be seen that, for every unit changes in the vigor, absorption, organizational glue, organizational leadership, organizational mission, organizational adaptability and organizational autonomy, predicting the performance of the employee in certain degrees; either positive or negative. A positive regression weight indicate that, an increase in every unit of independent variable will be accounted for an increase in performance of participants and the negative regression weights indicate that, an increase in independent variable will be accounted for a decrease in the performance of employees.

When the variable organizational culture taken into consideration, it can be seen that for every unit change in the organizational glue, organizational leadership and organizational autonomy, the performance of the participants increased by 0.057, 0.107, and 0.174 units respectively. When considering positive regression weightage of the organizational glue, it can interpret that, when an employee perceiving their organizations have positive atmosphere of loyalty, mutual trust, innovation, confidentiality, commitment, etc., their performance can be boosted. In respect to positive weightage of organizational leadership, it can suggest that, when the employee perceive the leaders related with coordination ability, facilitating capacity, nurturing personality etc in a positive way, it may bring some kind of energy in them to go beyond their limits. It can also conclude that, when an employee perceives autonomy from the organization which is related with innovation, freedom, self-expression and self-sufficiency, their performances are positively increased. From these results, it is clear that, the positive perception of the organizations culture by the employees will positively influence the performance of them. In brief, when an employee is attached with the organization, when the

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

leadership of the organization stimulate them and when they enjoys enough freedom in the organization, an employee will perform better in any organization.

Supporting to the present result, different studies also reported the influence of organizational culture in determining the performance of working employees. For example, Biswas (2009) in a study reported that culture is a significant predictor of intention to quit and employee performance. Ritchie (2000) stated that supportive culture is a motivational instrument which encourages employees to show their maximum productivity in the organization. Similarly, Giri, Nimran, Hamid, and Musadieq (2016) also found the significant influence of organizational culture on employee performance in their study. Even though studies like this support the present result, it is also observed that, for every unit change in organizational mission and organizational adaptability, the performance of the employee decreased by .139, and .094 units respectively. Regarding the organizational culture, it can say that, when the employees know more about organizational mission like vision, openness, motivation etc., of the organization, their performance may likely to decline. In addition to this, the analysis also revealed that, when the employee know what changes are going to happen in the organization, the perception of these changes may negatively reflect in the performance of the employees. In addition to this positive and negative prediction the analysis also reported that Organizational culture dimension-organizational group does not significantly predict the performance of the employee in the work setting. Similar to this, Ginevicius and Vaitkunaite (2006), in their study stated that organizational culture dimensions- involvement, cooperation/collaboration, transmission of information, care about clients, adaptability, system of control, communication, agreement, coordination and integration has not much related with performance of the employee.

When the variable work engagement taken into account, it can be seen that, for every unit change in vigor and absorption, the performance of the employee decreased by .039, and .016, units respectively. The analysis suggests that, when the employee shows work engagement dimensions vigor and absorption to their work, it may negatively predict the performance of them. So the management should consider different strategies to restrict the level of vigor and absorption of the employees to an optimum level. In conclusion, when an employee's shows high vigor and absorption which extends to the maximum and when an employee know more about the organizations mission and changes, the management has to take necessary actions to limit them in an optimum level to improve the performance of them. But the study found that, the performance of the employee is not predicted by the work engagement variable dedication of the employee. Even though present study reported that work engagement not have a positive influence over the performance of the employees, different other studies suggests that, the work engagement and its dimensions has a major role in determining the performance of the employees. For example, Crawford, LePine, and Rich (2010), the employees will find their work to be easier and interesting, and even committed when they are engaged in their work. Similarly Mokaya and Kipyegon (2014), stated that engagement is a very powerful factor used to measure an organization's vigor and direction towards superior performance

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

One interesting result of the analysis observed in the present study is- the performance of the employee is not predicted by the variation in the work stress. It means that, the stress at work does not have a significant role in predicting the performance of the employee when it stands alone. Supporting to the present result, Manzoor, Awan, and Mariam (*nd*), reported that stress arise in the working environment is not related with performance of the employees. But several studies happened in the organizational field are reported that, stress and performance have a negative relationship. Karunanithy and Ponnampalam (2013), reported that stress of an employee is negatively correlated with performance of the employees negatively predict the performance of them. Similarly various studies also suggested that there exists a negative relation between work stress and performance of the employees (Ahmed &Ramzan, 2013: Warraich, Ahmed, Nawaz, &Khoso, 2014).

In a nutshell, the prediction of performance by the selected independent variables can be summarized as-

PERFORMANCE = 5.763(constant) + (-.039*V) + (-.016*A) + (.057*OGL) + (.107* OL) + (-.139* OM) + (-.094*OAD) + (.174*OAU)

(Where V=Vigor, A=Absorption, OGL=Organizational glue, OL=Organizational leadership, OM=Organizational mission, OAD=Organizational adaptability, and OAU= Organizational autonomy)

From the above mentioned equation, it can understand that, the performance of the employees was predicted by the organizational variables- organizational culture (Organizational glue, Organizational leadership, Organizational mission, Organizational adaptability, and Organizational autonomy), work engagement (vigor and absorption) and work stress. Further studies can be conducted to know more about prediction.

Conclusion

Performance of the employee in any organization is the product of different factors. The present study was done to know the predictability of organizational culture and its subdimensions- organizational glue, organizational leadership, organizational mission, organizational group, organizational adaptability, and organizational autonomy; work engagement and its sub dimensions- vigor, dedication, and absorption; and work stress in determining the performance of industrial employees working in Kerala state, India. The overall regression model suggests that, the model is a good fit for the data to predict the performance of the employees.The regression analysis also suggests that, for every unit changes in the perception of organizational glue, organizational leadership and organizational autonomy, the performance of the participant and for every unit change in vigor, absorption, organizational mission and organizational adaptability, the performance of the employee decrease. It was also found that; organizational culture dimension- organizational group does not significantly predict the performance of the employee in the work setting. When the work stress was considered for prediction of performance in the analysis and found that, work stress doesn't have a significant role in predicting the performance of the employee independently.

References

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance.*International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3), 308-323.

Ahmed, A., &Ramzan, M. (2013). Effects of job stress on employees job performance: A study on banking sector of Pakistan. *Journal of Business and Management,* 11 (6), 61-68.

Bakker, A. B., & Albrecht, S. (2018). Work engagement: current trends. *Career Development International*, 1(23), 4-11.

Bakker, A, B., & Demerouti, E (2008).Towards a model of work engagement.*Career Development International,* 13(3), 209-223.

Bashir, U., &Ramay, M. I. (2010). Impact of stress on employee's job performance: A study on banking sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Marketing Studies,* 2(1), 122-126.

Biswas, S. (2009). HR Practices as a mediator between organizational culture and transformational leadership: Implications for employee performance. *Psychological Studies*, 54, 114–123.

Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2006).*Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hofstede, C. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. California. Sage.

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

Denison, D. R., &Spreitzer, G. M. (1991). Organizational culture and organizational development: a competing values approach. In R. W. Woodman., & W. A. Pasmore (Eds). *Research in organizational change and development*, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 5, 1-21.

French, J. R. P. (1973). Person role fit. *Occupational Mental Health*, 3, 15-20.

French, J. R. P., & Khan, R. L. (1962).A programmatic approach to studying the industrial environment and mental health.*Journal of social issues*, 18 (13), 1-47

George, R., & Jayan, C. (2010).*Organizational culture inventory*, Department of Psychology, University of Calicut, Kerala.

Golden, S. A. R., Regi, S. B., & Franco, C. E. (2014). A study on Impact of Information Technology (IT) in Modern Banking Sector. *Golden Research Thoughts*, *3*(11), 1.

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

Ginevicius, R., &Vaitkunaite, V. (2006). Analysis of organizational culture dimensions impacting performance. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 7(4), 201–211.

Giri, E. E., Nimran, U., Hamid, D., &Musadieq, M. A. (2016). The Effect of Organizational Culture and Organizational Commitment to Job Involvement, Knowledge Sharing, and Employee Performance: A Study on Regional Telecommunications Employees of PT Telkom East Nusa Tenggara Province, Indonesia. *International Journal of Management and Administrative Sciences*, 3(4), 20-33.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44, 513–524.

Jayan, C., &Dharmangadhan (1995).*Performance rating scale*.Department of Psychology, University of Kerala.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978).*The Social Psychology of Organizations, 2nd ed*., John Wiley & Sons, New-York, NY.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work, *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 692-724.

Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, *285*-307.

Karasek, R.A., & Theorell, T. (1990).H*ealthy work, stress, productivity and the reconstruction of working life.* New York. Basic Books.

Karunanithy&Ponnampalam (2013).A study on the effect of Stress on performance of employees in Commercial Bank of Ceylon in the Eastern Province.*European Journal of Business and Management*, 5 (27), 87-95.

Lazarus, R. S., &Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York: Harper and Row.

Manzoor, A., Awan, H., & Mariam, S. (nd).Investigating the impact of work stress on job performance: A study on textile sector of Faisalabad.*Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, 2(1), 20-28.

Martin, J. (2001). *Organisationalbehaviour*. (2nd ed.). London: Thomson Learning Pettigrew, A. (1979). Studying organizational culture.*Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 570-581

Mokaya, S. O., &Kipyegon, M. J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement in the banking industry in Kenya: Case of cooperative bank. *Journal of Human Resources*, *2*(2), 187-200.

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

Nair., Sarath, P., & Manikandan, K. (2014). Work Engagement and Burnout among University PG Students, *Business Sciences International Research Journal*, 2(1), 99-104.

Palmer S, Cooper C., & Thomas, K. (2004).A model of work stress to underpin the Health and Safety Executive advice for tackling work-related stress and stress risk assessments.*Counselling at Work*, 2–5.

Quinn, R. E., &Rohrbaugh, J. A. (1983). Spatial model of effectiveness criteria: towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Management Science*, 29, 363–77.

Ritchie, M. (2000). Organizational culture: an examination of its effect on the initialization process and member performance. *Southern Business Review*, 25, 1-13.

Rollinson, D. (2005). *Organisational Behaviour and Analysis: An Integrated Approach*. London: Prentice-Hall.

Regi, S. B., & Golden, S. A. R. (2014). A Descriptive Study On The Role Of Consumer Psychology And Behaviour In Product Purchasing. *Indian Streams Research Journal*, *3*(12), 1-6.

Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, 600-19.

Sarath, P., & Manikandan, K. (2016). Organizational culture and work stress among bank employees. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3(3), 14-20.

Sarath, P., & Manikandan, K. (2015). Work engagement and work stress among University employees. S*cholars World-International Refereed Multidisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research.* 3(3), 109-116.

Sarath, P., & Manikandan, K. (2014). Construction and validation of work stress scale in Kerala context. *International Journal of Academic Research and Development*, 3(2), 62-66.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71–92. doi:10.1023/ A:1015630930326

Schein, E. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership, 3rd edn*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40: 437-453.

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

Sonnentag, S., Dormann, C., & Demerouti, E. (2010).*Not all days are created equal: The concept of state work engagement.* In A. B. Bakker, & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), Work engagement: Recent developments in theory and research. New York: Psychology Press

Warraich, U. A., Ahmed, R. R., Nawaz, A., &Khoso.I. (2014). Impact of stress on job performance: an empirical study of the employees of private sector universities of Karachi, Pakistan. *Research Journal of Management Sciences*, 3(7), 14-17.

Wright, P. M., & McMahan, G. C. (1992), 'Alternative theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management', *Journal of Management*, 18, 295–320.

Wright, P. M., & Snell, S. (1991). Towards an integrative view of strategic human resource management,*Human Resource Management Review*, 1(3), 203–25

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors