In the previous chapters, research objectives have been outlined; theoretical framework for the research has been described; methodology adopted for the research has been discussed; and the data collected for research has been analyzed. Based on the data analysis, the research hypotheses have been either rejected or not rejected.

The research had three main variables namely Self Efficacy, Growth Need Strength and Performance. Self Efficacy and Growth Need Strength were the predictor variables while Performance was the criterion variable. Performance construct comprised of five dimensions namely Job performance, Career performance, Team performance, Innovator performance and Organizational performance. In addition to the predictor and criterion performance, demographic variables such as gender, age, education level, management level and work experience were also taken into consideration.

The main research question was to explore into the relationship between Self Efficacy, Growth Need Strength and Performance. The findings presented and discussed in this chapter will be used to answer the main research question. In this chapter the focus will be to summarize the key findings of the research and discuss their interpretation.

5.1 Findings Related to Self Efficacy Construct

According to (Berntson, Näswall, & Sverke, 2008), the construct of employability has been conceptually related to self-efficacy in different ways. Employability has sometimes been regarded as an equivalent to self-efficacy, or as a distinct but related phenomenon. Thus the research findings related to Self Efficacy have practical implications related to employability of the individuals.
Hypotheses $H_01 - H_05$ explored the Self Efficacy construct and how the chosen demographic variables affected it. Based on the data analysis, it was found that Self Efficacy did not differ significantly based on the Gender, Age, Education level and Work Experience; while a change in Management level corresponded with a significant change in Self Efficacy.

5.1.1 Self Efficacy and Gender

The results of this study indicate that there is no significant difference in the Self Efficacy of an employee based on Gender.

(Pajares, 1997) states that the relationship between gender and self-efficacy has not been explored very thoroughly. To the best of researcher's knowledge, previous research on Gender differences in Self Efficacy has mainly explored technical task related Self Efficacy or specific skills of a person e.g. (C. Stevens, Bavetta, & Gist, 1993) studied the negotiation of salaries as a skill and found that females had lesser negotiation skill, (Pajares & Miller, 1994) found that math self efficacy of males was greater than that of the females, (Cassidy & Eachus, 2002) reported that males showed significantly higher computer use self efficacy than females (Busch, 1995) too had reached the same conclusion.

However, in this study, the scope of Self Efficacy was broad i.e. beyond a single task to the work domain. This could be the reason that the results indicate no difference in Self Efficacy of males and females.

5.1.2 Self Efficacy and Age

The results of this study indicate that there is no significant difference in the Self Efficacy of an employee based on Age.

The concept of enactive mastery indicates that as we gain experience and overcome obstacles, feelings of self-efficacy are developed (Bandura, 1997). Therefore, this
concept can be broadened to point to the idea that as we age, we gain more life experience and therefore gain self-efficacy. However, (Bandura, 1997) also states that at midlife, many individuals begin to question their own self-efficacy and reevaluate the progress and mastery they have achieved. Previous research has indicated that Age is not significantly related with Self Efficacy (Banks & Jackson, 1982; Hannan & Whelan, 1997). The results of this study therefore support the previous research findings.

5.1.3 Self Efficacy and Education Level

The results of this study indicate that there is no significant difference in the Self Efficacy of an employee based on Education level.

The concept of vicarious experience (Bandura, 1997) suggests that when individuals have the opportunity to observe and learn from others who have a higher level of experience, those individuals are more likely to develop a greater level of Self Efficacy. He further mentions that higher the educational level an individual has attained, the greater the number of obstacles the individual has generally achieved to be successful. This implies higher level of education should result in greater level of Self Efficacy. In this study the educational background of the employees ranged from Diploma to PHD but the results indicate that the Education level was not significantly related to Self Efficacy.

One possible explanation for this could be the interaction effect between the education level and work experience where one factor is compensating for the other i.e. employees who had higher education level had lesser work experience which reduced the enhancing effect of the education level.
5.1.4 Self Efficacy and Management Level

The results of this study indicate that a change in Management level corresponds to a significant change in the Self Efficacy of an employee.

When the effect of Management level was explored further, the findings indicate significant differences in the Self Efficacy of First level managers as compared to Middle level managers; First level managers as compared to Senior level managers. However, the difference in the Self Efficacy level of the Middle level managers as compared to the Senior level managers was not significant.

It could be an indication of the non linear nature of Self Efficacy i.e. after a period of growth, the Self Efficacy plateaus. Especially in Middle East context it can be interpreted that there is paucity of challenges at the Senior management level thus moving from Middle Level Management to Senior Level Management does not contribute significantly towards Self Efficacy enhancement of the employee.

5.1.5 Self Efficacy and Work Experience

The results of this study indicate that there is no significant difference in the Self Efficacy of an employee based on Work Experience.

Work experience not having a significant effect on the Self Efficacy is contrary to the literature which predicts that work experience has a significant effect on Self Efficacy. Employees derive efficacy information primarily through performance accomplishments, persuasive feedback from significant others and social comparative information. Specifically successful performance experiences appear to enhance perceptions of self-efficacy more than information derived from any other source (Anyster, Goodman, & Wallis, 2006).

In this study, possibly it can be explained by the fact that the context of study was UAE where the turnover rate is very high and the employees had not stayed at any organization for long enough to gain high Self Efficacy. Alternatively it could also
indicate the lack of feedback mechanism because of which the employee is not aware of the level of his/her performance.

5.2 Findings Related to Growth Need Strength Construct

(Jenkins, 1987) states, previous research has demonstrated that achievement motivated people perform better under working conditions of challenge, autonomy, and rapid feedback. This description matches with our Growth need strength construct, and indicates the practical implications of the findings related to Growth Need Strength.

Hypotheses H06 – H010 explored the Growth Need Strength construct and how the chosen demographic variables affected it. Based on the data analysis, it was found that Growth Need Strength did not differ significantly based on the Age, Management level and Work Experience. Growth Need Strength varied with Gender and also a change in Education level corresponded with a significant change in Growth Need Strength.

5.2.1 Growth Need Strength and Gender

The results of this study indicate that the Growth Need Strength of the male employees was significantly different from the Growth Need Strength of the female employees.

However, the effect of Gender on Growth Need Strength was in the opposite direction to what the theory predicts e.g. (Green, 1995) in her study found that a person’s gender exerts an influence upon his/her intrinsic achievement motivation; (Adsul & Kamble, 2008) in their study conducted in India indicated that males had a higher achievement orientation compared to the females; (De Pater, Van Vianen, Fischer, & Van Ginkel, 2009) also found that in an achievement situation, women chose to perform fewer challenging tasks than men.
Contrary to previous research, this study reveals that the Growth Need Strength of females was higher than that of the males. A possible explanation for this could be that many of the previous studies have used students as sample and not the working professionals; whereas this study has taken a sample of working professional and therefore the females represented here are those working on managerial positions. The result could be also be due to the lower representation of the females at managerial level positions and the desire to be there is fuelling higher Growth Need Strength in them. Alternatively it could be a characteristic specific to this region. In all situations, it is a very interesting finding and needs to be explored further.

5.2.2 Growth Need Strength and Age

The results of this study indicate that there is no significant difference in the Growth Need Strength of an employee based on Age. Previous research too does not have much to say on this aspect.

5.2.3 Growth Need Strength and Education level

The results of this study indicate that the Growth Need Strength of the employees varied significantly with the different education levels.

Education level tends to influence the development of a person’s need for achievement (Carland Jr & Carland, 1997). The level of education achieved by technical entrepreneurs was found to be directly related to the level of their achievement motivation (Roberts & Wainer, 1966). Supporting these research findings, in this study too, Education level had a significant effect on Growth Need Strength.

However a point to ponder is on the direction i.e. whether a person's level of Growth Need Strength motivates them to gain more education, or does education drive the Growth Need Strength. More research is required to look into the causality and direction of the driving force.
When the effect of Education level on Growth Need Strength was explored further, the findings indicated a significant change in the Growth Need Strength of individuals as their qualification changed from Diploma to Bachelor’s Degree or from Diploma to Master’s Degree. However no significant change in the Growth Need Strength was indicated when the educational qualification changed from Bachelor’s Degree to Master’s Degree or from Master’s Degree to PHD.

This can probably be due to the fact that a Diploma is a very low qualification for the position of the managers. Those who have this qualification and are in the managerial position could be there due to the vast work experience they have accumulated. They consider their lack of formal education a serious limitation in their career path and thus don’t have strong Growth Need Strength because they assume that they cannot grow.

5.2.4 Growth Need Strength and Management level

The results of this study indicate that there is no significant difference in the Growth Need Strength of an employee based on Management level. Previous research too does not have much to say on this aspect.

5.2.5 Growth Need Strength and Work Experience

The results of this study indicate that there is no significant difference in the Growth Need Strength of an employee based on Work Experience. Previous research too does not have much to say on this aspect.
5.3 Findings Related to Performance Construct

Hypotheses H₀11 – H₀15 explored the Performance construct and how the chosen demographic variables affected it. Based on the data analysis, it can be said Performance did not vary significantly with the change in Gender, Age and Education level. However a change in Management level and Work Experience corresponded to a significant change in the Performance.

5.3.1 Performance and Gender

The results of this study indicate that there is no significant difference in the Performance, including its dimensions (Job/Career/Team/Innovator/Organizational), of an employee based on Gender.

Although previous literature indicates gender differences on performance, they are mostly reported on specific technical task related performance or under highly competitive situations e.g. (Gneezy, et al., 2003; Paserman, 2007).

The research findings are that Gender does not play a significant role in the performance could be because this research ensured a balanced mix of occupations so as not to have a bias in favor of a particular type of industry / task therefore strengths and weaknesses pertaining to specific skill sets compensated to ultimately indicate a similar level of composite performance.

This sends a positive note to the organizations and has implications for the recruitment function. The result is especially useful for the organizations with the glass ceilings e.g. (Bertrand & Hallock, 2001) found that only 2.5 percent of the five highest paid executives in a large data set of U. S. firms are women.
5.3.2 Performance and Age

The results of this study indicate that there is no significant difference in the Performance, including its dimensions (Job/Career/Team/Innovator/Organizational), of an employee based on Age.

The research findings that Age does not have a significant effect on the Performance while work experience has a significant effect, support the findings of (Avolio, et al., 1990) who conducted a study to examine the relative prediction power of age and total work experience for predicting work performance. Their results indicated that work experience was a better predictor of performance as compared to age. The same was corroborated through this research study too since the findings indicate that age is not having a significant relationship with performance while work experience is having a significant relationship with performance.

5.3.3 Performance and Education Level

The results of this study indicate that there is no difference in the Performance, including its dimensions (Job/Career/Team/Innovator/Organizational), of an employee based on Education level.

Thus the findings indicate that formal degrees that an employee earns correspond to no significant change in the performance of the Employee. Therefore this study presents that in addition to the education, there are many other skills that are required for efficient performance.

However interestingly Education significantly affects Growth Need Strength which in turn significantly affects Performance therefore the significance of education cannot be ruled out completely. This indicates that although Education does not have a direct effect on Performance, it yields an indirect effect on Performance through the variable Growth Need Strength. Also it is point worthy to note that education has no effect on Self Efficacy and Performance but it is still affecting the Growth Need Strength of the employees i.e. highly educated employees are having higher achievement need. More
research on this effect of education will be very useful for the organizations since Education level is considered as one of the most visible symbol of enhanced performance.

5.3.4 Performance and Management Level

The results of this study indicate that a change in Management level corresponds to a significant change in the Performance of the employees.

When the effect of Management level on individual performance dimensions is further analyzed, it can be seen that not all dimensions of performance are affected by Management level. The performance dimensions on which Management level caused a significant effect are Career; Innovative; and Organization. Amongst these three dimensions also, Career performance was the most sensitive. This is as expected since the employees who are a part of the higher level management consider their career oriented performance better than those on lower level of management who are in the process of honing their career performance by imbibing different skill sets.

Effect of Management level on the Innovative performance can be explained due to the fact that the higher up a person is on the managerial hierarchy, more is his/her role oriented towards higher level and unstructured work rather than routine performance of tasks. Therefore the senior level employees get more opportunity to be innovative and experimental which in turn improves their performance on this dimension of performance.

Management level is expected to affect the organizational performance too because the employees at higher level of management are expected to perform not only in their specific roles but also contribute towards the enhancement of the organization in general. Therefore their performance on this dimension improves.

These above mentioned dimensions of performance that were significantly affected by the Management level were explored further. It was found that for overall Performance index, Innovative performance and Organizational performance; there
was a significant change as the Management level changed from First level to Middle level or First level to Senior level. However there was no significant change as the Management level changed from Middle to Senior level management.

Thus it can be inferred that there is a change in the overall performance level of the employees as they move from first level management to the middle level management. Their innovative performance also improves as well the organizational performance too becomes more honed. However this study indicates stagnation in performance (Total, Innovative and Organizational) at the Middle management level showing not a significant change as the employees move from middle level management to senior level management. This could be an indication of the limited nature of challenges available to the senior management in this region.

In case of Career performance, on the contrary, there was a significant change as the management level changed from Middle to Senior level while the career performance remains unchanged as the employees moved from lower level management to middle level management. Thus the employees at higher levels of the managerial hierarchy had evaluated their career performance to be higher while the employees at first line level had not experienced much career growth and therefore did not rate their career performance as very high.

The practical aspect of the above findings and their interpretation especially with respect to the human resource function is that the performance of the employees improves on those dimensions where they get more opportunity to practice. Therefore to groom the employees, the organization should provide them ample opportunities to perform on those performance dimensions which are crucial for that organization.
5.3.5 Performance and Work Experience

The results of this study indicate that a change in Work Experience corresponds to a significant change in the Performance of the employees.

The research finding that Work Experience has a significant effect on the performance validates extant previous research which has shown that level of work experience is positively related to job performance (McDaniel, et al., 1988; McEnroe, 1988; Shea & Howell, 2000; Tesluk & Jacobs, 1998).

When the effect of Work Experience on performance was explored further, the research findings were that Job Performance, Team Performance and Innovative Performance did not change significantly with the variation in the work experience. On the other hand, Career performance and Organizational performance changed significantly corresponding to a change in the Work Experience.

This is in line with the expected results since the higher the work experience, more an employee will have the chance to move up the career ladder and greater work experience makes employees more confident where they focus not only on the routine performance but also on their overall contribution to the organization.

(Schmidt, et al., 1986) tested a causal model of work performance that included the length of work experience as a factor in the prediction of performance and reported that work experience had a direct causal effect on the degree of job knowledge which in turn positively affected work experience. As the individuals spend more time in their work place, they tend to develop greater knowledge about how to perform their jobs more effectively and more quickly (Tesluk & Jacobs, 1998). In this case the research findings do not indicate enhanced job performance with greater work experience.

This could be due to the operationalization of the work experience variable in this study as the total number of years that an employee has worked. If the study measured the number of years an employee spent in the current organization then probably the result may have been different. Previous research has a mixed precedent of using both
the versions of work experience i.e. total number of year versus total number of years spent with the current employer.

The above operationalization also explains the finding that Team performance is not significantly affected by work experience because the work experience is overall experience of the employee and not within the same organization with the same team.

Similarly the finding that Career performance was significantly affected by work experience can also be attributed to above operationalization because the employee could have moved across different organizations while accumulating this work experience. This movement could have resulted in a steep career growth path and therefore the employees with greater work experience rate their career performance better.

More research is required to clarify and provide more information on the operationalization of the work experience variable.

Research findings that Work experience does not significantly affect the Innovative performance can be interpreted using the explanation provided by (C. Ford, 1996) who proposed that task familiarity associated with greater work experience could lead to a more habitual performance and therefore lower rating on the Innovative performance.
5.4 Findings Related To the Relationship between the Research Variables

This study had three main variables; Self Efficacy and Growth Need Strength were the main predictor variables while Performance (including the five dimensions of Job; Career; Innovative; Team; Organizational) was the criterion variable. Relationship was explored between these different variables and following sections present the findings.

5.4.1 Self Efficacy-Growth Need Strength Relationship

The results of this study indicate that there is a significant relationship between Self Efficacy and Growth Need Strength.

According to (Cohen, 1988) a correlation of 0.5 is large, 0.3 is moderate, and 0.1 is small. (Hopkins, 2000) elaborates on this and interprets that a correlation coefficient greater than 0.5 is large, 0.5-0.3 is moderate, 0.3-0.1 is small, and anything smaller than 0.1 is insubstantial or trivial. Since the correlation between Self Efficacy and Growth Need Strength is r = 0.306, it indicates moderate correlation between Self Efficacy and Growth Need Strength; which is highly significant since p<0.01.

Self Efficacy and Growth Need Strength having a highly significant moderate strength correlation validates the choice of predictor variables and formulation of the construct wherein it was proposed that Self Efficacy and Growth Need Strength are complementary variables and therefore they were chosen to study the composite effect on the Performance. It also lends credibility to the treatment of Growth Need Strength as a distal variable sharing synergy with Self Efficacy and being taken as an independent variable for studying its role in explaining performance.

Since there is a positive correlation, it can be said that an increase in Self Efficacy is expected to accompany the increase in Growth Need Strength. In terms of performance management, this is an important finding. If the human resource policies of the organization are geared towards enhancement of Self Efficacy of employees then they should anticipate increased levels of Growth Need Strength. They should
therefore complement Self Efficacy boosting policies with proper growth plans for the employees.

5.4.2 Self Efficacy-Performance Relationship

The results of this study indicate that there is a significant relationship between Self Efficacy and Performance.

The correlation between Self Efficacy and Performance is $r = 0.391$ which according to (Cohen, 1988; Hopkins, 2000) is moderate relationship. (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998a) conducted a meta-analysis of 114 studies ($N=21,616$) and found the weighted average correlation between Self Efficacy and Performance to be $r = 0.34$ ($p < 0.01$). (Judge, et al., 2007) conducted a meta-analysis of 217 studies ($N=32,123$) and found the correlation between Self Efficacy and work related Performance to be $r = 0.37$ ($p < 0.01$). In this study the calculated value of $r = 0.39$ ($p < 0.01$), therefore these results are in line with the previous exhaustive studies conducted to explore the relationship between Self Efficacy and performance.

This is a major finding of the study especially since the sample was from the UAE where to the best of the researcher’s knowledge, a similar study has not been conducted. Earlier in support of choosing Self Efficacy as a variable for study in this research, it was discussed that Self Efficacy is a widely researched variable because of its potential for valuable work performance related inputs. This study has reinforced and supported the previous research findings through its similar result.

The strongest relationship of Self Efficacy is with Total performance ($r=0.391$) followed by Innovative performance ($r=0.387$), Job performance ($r=0.348$), Career performance ($r=0.316$), Team performance ($r=0.276$), organization performance ($r=0.245$). Thus Self Efficacy shows a moderate relationship with job performance, career performance and innovative performance while it shows weak relationship with Team performance and Organizational performance.
5.4.3 Growth Need Strength – Performance Relationship

The results of this study indicate that there is a significant albeit weak relationship between Growth Need Strength and Performance.

Initially when the concept of Growth Need Strength was introduced through the Job Characteristic Model, it was conceived as a moderating variable influencing the performance. As discussed at length in the Literature review, main focus of the previous research exploring Growth Need Strength is on its role as a moderating variable. This past research on Growth Need Strength has reported mixed findings and thus raised a question mark at the moderating role of Growth Need Strength.

This study explores Growth Need Strength as an individual predictor variable and results indicate that Growth Need Strength has a significant albeit weak relationship with performance. Growth Need Strength has a significant relationship with all dimensions of performance. The strongest relation of Growth Need Strength is with Total performance \( (r=0.234) \) followed by Innovative performance \( (r=0.227) \), Job performance \( (r=0.221) \), Team performance \( (r=0.199) \), Career performance \( (r=0.168) \), organization performance \( (r=0.133) \). Therefore although the relationship is significant, it is a weak relationship since all correlation coefficients were lesser than 0.3.
5.4.4 Impact of Self Efficacy and Growth Need Strength on Performance

Multiple Regression Analysis was conducted on data to understand the impact of Self Efficacy and Growth Need Strength on Performance. The results indicated that since $R^2 = 0.167$ therefore the variance explained in Performance by Self Efficacy and Growth Need Strength together is 16.7%.

ANOVA conducted to assess the overall significance of the model reported highly significant figures. This validates the initially proposed model of both Self Efficacy and Growth Need Strength as independent predictors for the performance of the employees.

The Standardized $\beta$ Coefficients give a measure of the contribution of each variable to the model. A larger value indicates that a unit change in this predictor variable has a larger effect on the criterion variable. The values of $\beta$ obtained above, Self Efficacy ($\beta = 0.352$) and Growth Need Strength ($\beta = 0.126$) indicate that Self Efficacy has a larger effect on Performance as compared to Growth Need Strength since the $\beta$ value of Self Efficacy is almost three times the $\beta$ value of Growth Need Strength.

The “$t$” and Significance ($p$) values give a rough indication of the impact of each predictor variable; a big absolute $t$ value and small $p$ value suggests that a predictor variable is having a large impact on the criterion variable. The values obtained in this study indicate that Self Efficacy has a larger impact on Performance as compared to Growth Need Strength since the “$t$” for Self Efficacy = 6.159 is greater than the “$t$” for Growth Need Strength = 2.212. Also the $p$-value for Self Efficacy = 0.000 is much smaller than the $p$-value for Growth Need Strength = 0.028.

Thus the results indicate that although both the predictor variables have a significant impact on Performance, comparatively Self Efficacy has more influence than Growth Need Strength. (Bandura, 1997) argued that because performance is inherently conditional, the influence of self-efficacy (as a conditional state) should overwhelm that of the distal variables in predicting performance (Judge, et al., 2007). In this study also the influence of Self Efficacy is greater than Growth Need Strength on Performance therefore this validates previous studies.
Results of Hierarchical regression analysis show the individual contribution of Self Efficacy and Growth Need Strength in explaining the variance in Performance. The values of $R^2$ for Self Efficacy = 0.153 and $R^2$ for Growth Need Strength = 0.014 indicate that Self Efficacy explains around 15.3% of variance in performance while Growth Need Strength explains around 1.4% variance in performance. Although the predictive power of Growth Need Strength is very small compared to Self Efficacy, this is an important finding because it validates the fact that Growth Need Strength has incremental or additional value addition towards explanation of performance. This further strengthens this study’s proposed model of taking Growth Need Strength as an individual predictor variable.
5.5 Proposed Model Relating Self Efficacy and Growth Need Strength to Different Dimensions of Performance

Based on the above findings, researcher proposes the following model (Figure 5.1) to depict the relationship between the research variables. The contribution of Self Efficacy and Growth Need Strength on different dimensions of Performance is conceptualized through the standardized β values as suggested by (Judge, et al., 2007) who performed a similar analysis with Self Efficacy as the dependant variable.

Figure 5.1 Model Depicting Relationship between the Research Variables

Source: Researcher
It can be seen from the above figure that Self Efficacy has a significant impact on all dimensions of performance but Growth Need Strength does not impact all the dimensions of performance. It does not have an impact on the Organizational Performance (the effect is insignificant). Also since the magnitude of $B$ is indicative of the proportional strength of the impact, it can be seen that Self Efficacy has a greater impact than Growth Need Strength on Total Performance as well as all individual dimensions of Performance.

This chapter has presented the main findings of the research and discussed their theoretical as well as practical implications. The next chapter will conclude the research and provide recommendations based on the practical implications of the findings. The limitations of the study as well as directions for future research are also provided in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 6 – CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

The previous chapter has presented the research findings and discussed their theoretical as well as practical implications. This chapter will conclude the research and provide recommendations based on the practical implications of the findings. The limitations of the study as well as directions for future research are also provided in this chapter.

6.1 Conclusion & Recommendations

This study provided some useful insights with respect to the role of chosen variables in performance. These findings are a humble contribution to the extant performance research literature and have various practical implications as well. The recommendations based on the research findings are listed below.

1. This relationship of Self Efficacy and Performance has very relevant practical implications. Given the strong theoretical background for the concept of Self Efficacy and the close matching of this study’s findings with a research of the scope conducted by (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998a), the region’s human resource managers should have enhanced confidence in the Self Efficacy – Performance relationship. They should therefore focus on specific strategies to increase the Self Efficacy of their personnel since it will lead to enhanced performance. The suggestions in this regard are:

   a. Design training modules that emphasize on the existing skills of the employees and therefore increase their efficacy levels further leading to improved performance. Since the focus will be on reinforcing current skills rather than developing new skills therefore this will be a relatively inexpensive strategy for performance improvement.

   b. Develop proper performance appraisal mechanisms with regular feedback to the employees. This will keep the employees posted on the
level of their performance and therefore contribute towards enhancement of their Self Efficacy.

c. Provide more task control to enhance Self Efficacy level due to increased level of responsibility and autonomy.

d. Complement Self Efficacy boosting policies with proper growth plans for the employees to increase their motivation and reduce the turnover rate.

2. The organizations' human resource policies need to be devised to take into account that the higher educated employees will seek more growth in their career. This can turn out to be a crucial factor in retaining such employees.

3. Educational qualifications should not be considered as sole measures for career enhancement of employees. Focus should be more on application of those qualifications by providing opportunities to practice the learned skills thereby improving the performance.

4. Since there is no difference in the performance of females as compared to the performance of the males, the organizations should provide equal employment opportunities at all managerial levels irrespective of the gender. This will help removing the lopsided gender distribution especially at the senior managerial level and ensure more balance and diversity in the organizations.

5. There is a strong case for assessing non-task domains in performance management. If good performance within these domains is valuable to the organization then they should be recognized. This will motivate the employees to indulge in multifarious performance aspects and thus contribute richly towards organization effectiveness through their enhanced individual performance.
6. To groom the employees, the organization should provide them ample opportunities to perform on those performance dimensions which are crucial for that organization.

7. The organizations should strive to reduce the turnover rate and increase the duration of an employee’s stay at the organization. Thus the research supports nurturing of talent and enhancing longevity of the employees within the organization.

6.2 Limitations of the Study

➤ This study needed to collect data on employee performance. The nature of the data is such that most of the organizations treat it as confidential. They are not very willing to share the details of their employees. This is especially applicable for this region where the study was conducted i.e. the UAE. Therefore since it was not possible to obtain the appropriate databases required for random sampling, judgmental sampling was employed in this research study. Random sampling is a statistically more robust procedure and would have yielded more reliable results.

➤ The data collected on Performance was subjective data while objective data could have lent more strength to the findings. Although with respect to the subjectivity of performance evaluations, this is the nature of virtually all performance criteria in organizational settings e.g., a number of the criteria in the (Barrick & Mount, 1991) personality-job performance meta-analysis were subjective. Other researchers too agree that Subjective measures are more frequently used ((Dierdorff & Surface, 2007; Pulakos, et al., 1996).

➤ In this study the performance data was collected through self evaluation of the employees. If the data could have been collected both from the Supervisor
rating as well as through Self rating; the performance rating would have been a more balanced rating and therefore would have improved the quality of the result. However due to various constraints introduced because of the confidentiality of the performance data, organizations were not willing to release performance related data of their employees. Thus the researcher had to rely only on the self rating.

6.3 Directions for Future research

There is a paucity of research on Performance in the Middle East region. Keeping in mind the unique nature of the employee demographics here i.e. majority of the work force constitutes of expatriates; more research should be performed in this area to validate the performance research findings of other regions not showing such a work force mix. Within the limited scope of the study, this research has revealed some very interesting findings which if explored further will provide valuable results and add to the performance research literature. They are as follows:

➢ This study has revealed a research gap that exists on the study of gender difference in Self Efficacy. Most of the previous studies on Self Efficacy are done with respect to specific task related self efficacy rather than general self efficacy that covers the work domain. Therefore more research should be focused in this area.

➢ Higher level of education is not contributing towards enhancement of Self Efficacy More research is required to check if this could be the interaction effect between the education level and work experience where one factor is compensating for the other i.e. employees who had higher education level had lesser work experience which reduced the enhancing effect of the education level.
Contrary to the previous literature findings, work experience is not significantly contributing towards enhancement of Self Efficacy. Further research is required to look into reasons and whether it is indicating the lack of feedback mechanism because of which the employee is not aware of the level of his/her performance.

There is a mixed opinion in the previous research about the operationalization of the work experience variable. In this study it was conceived as total work experience of the employee and not the work experience in the current organization. Therefore further research which incorporates different measures and differentiation of the Work Experience will shed more light and provide useful information.

Moving from Middle Level Management to Senior Level Management is not significantly changing the Self Efficacy or Performance of the employee; while there is a significant change from First Level Management to Middle Level Management. More research is required to understand the reasons for this stagnation and whether is due to paucity of challenges available at the Senior management level; thus providing valuable input to the performance research especially with respect to the Middle Eastern region.

A very interesting finding of this study which contraindicates the previous literature is that the Growth Need Strength of females is more than the Growth Need Strength of the males. It needs to be corroborated through other independent research. Investigation of this phenomenon will lead to valuable insights in the work psychology of the region.
Another point to ponder is whether a person's level of Growth Need Strength motivates them to gain more education, or does education drive the Growth Need Strength. More research is required to look into the causality and direction of the driving force.

Change in the Education level did not correspond with a significant change in Self Efficacy or Performance but Growth Need Strength was found to vary significantly with the Education level; and Growth Need Strength in turn was found to significantly affect performance. Thus further exploration on these lines is required to elucidate the role of education level in performance. This research may reveal latent relationships especially the moderating or mediating effects that have not been explored in this study.