CHAPTER II
Review of Literature

The review of literature has been divided into three parts, i.e., Job Performance and Personal Attributes (Self-esteem, Locus of control, Emotional intelligence and Self-efficacy), Job Performance and Work related Attitudes (Job involvement and Job satisfaction) and Job Performance and Organisational Climate.

1. Job Performance and Personal Attributes:

Self-esteem is a personal judgment of the worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes, the individual holds towards himself. Self-esteem is an attitude about the self and is related to personal beliefs about skills, abilities, social relationships and future outcomes. Korman (1970) suggested that individuals with high self-esteem are motivated to do well on the job to maintain cognitive consistency with their high self-evaluations, i.e., a main effect of self-esteem level. Self-esteem and other non-cognitive traits developed through education are important factors for job satisfaction and job performance. Brockner (1988) noticed that high self-esteem provides a buffer against role stressors that would otherwise impede workplace motivation and performance, i.e., a moderating effect of self-esteem level. Locke and Latham (1990) found that high self-esteem individuals are more likely to contributes to higher performance levels. Research has demonstrated that high self-esteem individuals are more strongly task-motivated, are less distracted by adverse role conditions and are more persistent when dealing with obstacles than their low self-esteem counterparts.

Persons high in OBSE have greater work motivation and intrinsic motivation achieve higher performance ratings (Gardner et al., 2000; and Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004) than do persons low in OBSE. A study conducted on young adults reveals that
higher levels of efficacy and esteem have been found to be associated with better performance and positive health-related behaviours (Phillips and Hall, 2001; Po Yin and Watkins, 1998 and Steptoe & Wardle, 2001). In a meta-analysis of the main effect of self-esteem level on job performance, the relation was highly variable (Judge and Bono, 2001). The level of self-esteem, i.e., one’s overall positive or negative evaluation of oneself should be related to job performance (Pierce et al., 1993).

Kalanzadeh et al. (2013) examined the impact of self-esteem on skill and performance. The participants of this study were selected by using a questionnaire in order to diagnose the high and low self-esteem ones. A standard oral proficiency test was used in order to measure five sub-skills. After analyzing the data, the results showed a statistically significant correlation between the participants' self-esteem and performance.

Uzonwanne and Uzonwanne (2014) in their study noticed that a significant relationship exists between self-esteem, self-efficacy and job performance of bankers. A significant difference exists in the self-efficacy of bankers with undergraduate degree and below with those possessing graduate degrees and above. A significant difference was found for self-efficacy of younger and older banker. It was also revealed that self-esteem is not a predictor of self-efficacy but is of job performance.

Self-efficacy is a person's conviction about his or her abilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources and courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context. Schaubroeck et al. (2006) reviewed the evidence from laboratory research supporting the role of self-efficacy in how people respond to control and demands. Specifically, they examined the three-way interaction between job demands, control and self-efficacy. Control perceptions capture an individual’s
appraisal of an objective situation whereas self-efficacy influences the individual’s evaluation of his or her personal ability to exercise control (Wood and Bandura, 1989). It was suggested that it is mostly the workers with high confidence in their abilities whose coping is facilitated by having a high level of control.

Sadri and Robertson (1993) presented a comprehensive review of studies on relationship between self-efficacy and work-related behaviour. The results of meta-analyses supported the view that self-efficacy is related to performance and they also found that self-efficacy performance links appeared weaker in field studies than in laboratory situation.

Gist and Mitchell (1992) investigated the effect of self-efficacy on performance and found that self-efficacy is a better predictor of performance than expected score or goals. They also concluded that assessment and monitoring of perceived self-efficacy will result in the improved occupational performance.

Orpen (1995) examined the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and job performance among black managers in South Africa. A significant positive correlation was obtained between self-efficacy beliefs and self-rating of performance.

The relationship between self-efficacy and performance is cyclic in nature; performance affects self-efficacy, which, in turn, affects performance, and so on. Lindsley et al. (1995) explored the possibility of efficacy performance spirals in individual groups, and organizations spirals, which were deviation amplifying loops in which the positive, cyclic relationship between perceived efficacy and performance builds upon itself. The study specifies the notion of upward (overconfidence) and downward (lack of confidence) spirals and consider how they occur, continue, and stop, as well as their consequences, using multiple levels of analysis. Consideration is given to compositional and cross level effects by proposing 5 factors (task inter-
dependence, task uncertainty and complexity, size, social-identity and inclusion) that moderate the relationship between spirals at different levels of analysis.

In a meta-analysis, Stajkovic and Luthans (1998) observed a high significant relationship between self-efficacy and performance in organizational settings. A stream of research studies has established a fairly clear association between self-efficacy and work-related performance. Similarly, they also conducted another meta-analysis in 1998 to examine the relationship between self-efficacy and work-related performance. They analyzed the results of 114 studies, and 21,616 subjects. The results of the primary meta-analysis indicated a significant weighted average correlation between self-efficacy and work-related performance G(r=) .38 and a significant within-group heterogeneity of individual correlations. The meta-analytically-derived average correlation of .38 also seems to indicate that self-efficacy may be a better predictor of work-related performance than much of the personality-trait-based constructs commonly-used in organizational research. When converted to the commonly used affect size estimate used in meta-analysis, the transformed value represents a 28 percent increase in performance due to self-efficacy.

Gardner and Pierce (1998) examined the intervening role of organization-based self-esteem in the relationship with generalized self-efficacy and explored two outcomes, employee’s job performance and job-related affect (job satisfaction). Self-report data were collected from 145 professional employees on generalized self-efficacy, organization-based self-esteem, satisfaction and commitment. Further, 8 months later, performance-rating data were collected from the supervisor-manager. Subjects also completed 3 measures of employee job related affect. Results show that organization-based self-esteem emerged as a stronger predictor and it acted as a
mediator in the relationship between generalized self-efficacy and employee responses.

Comparing the validity of self-efficacy with self-esteem for predicting performance, Mone (1994) conducted a study on 215 undergraduate subjects. It was observed that across three performance trials, self-efficacy had greater predictive validity than self-esteem in predicting performance.

Research in organizational literature have demonstrated consistently that self-efficacy positively predicts personal goals, task learning, direction and persistence of effort, task performance levels and attributions made for performance levels (e.g. Bandura, 1997; Button et al., 1996; Gist, 1987 and Locke and Latham, 1990).

Mone (1994) examined a model of self-efficacy, self-esteem and goals in relation to these variables in downsizing organizations. As in other studies (e.g., Locke et al., 1984 and Wood and Locke, 1987), it was found that self-efficacy significantly predicted goals; however, extending past work, he found that in a downsizing organization, self-efficacy was positively related to the intention to leave, suggesting that in such situations, those who consider themselves more capable may seek and be able to find work elsewhere.

In addition he found that self-efficacy was inversely related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment suggesting that in a downsizing organization, higher self-confidence and performance are not necessarily met with the commensurate rewards and job security that help create job satisfaction and affective commitment.

It is generally accepted that self-efficacy and performance are positively related, but questions have arisen over the validity of this conclusion (Vancouver et al., 2001). Stone (1994) found that inducing mild negative expectations improved performance as compared to those given positive expectation information. He found
that high self-efficacy led to overconfidence in one’s abilities. Instead of high-self-efficacy individuals contributing more of their resources toward the task, they contributed less. These participants were both less attentive and effortful than were their low-self-efficacy counterparts. Hence, authors found similar results. Using normative feedback, these authors induced high self-efficacy in a group of participants. In reviewing the effects of this manipulation on performance, they found that these participants’ performance did not increase. In fact, over time, the higher self-efficacy contributed to decrements in performance. Bandura (1991) explained self-efficacy’s negative effect by concluding, “Complacent self-assurance creates little incentive to expend the increased effort needed to attain high levels of performance.” In a creative task, Padsakoff and Farh (1989) found that a negative performance feedback, a common efficacy-manipulation led to better performance than positive feedback. On a cognitively complex task, Cervone et al. (1991) found negative correlations between self-efficacy and subsequent performance, which they explained as individuals being too confident in their abilities. Similarly, Waldersee (1994) found that those in the positive-feedback group had poorer performance on a highly routine work task than individuals in the control or corrective (i.e., negative) feedback groups.

Recently Vancouver et al. (2001) questioned the common interpretation of the positive correlation among self-efficacy, personal goals and performance. Using self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1977) it was predicted that cross-sectional correlation results were a function of past performance’s influence on self-efficacy, and using control theory it was predicted that self-efficacy could negatively influence subsequent performance. These predictions were supported with 56 undergraduate participants, using a with-in-person procedure. Personal goals were also positively
influenced by self-efficacy and performance, but negatively related to subsequent performance. A 2nd study involving 185 undergraduates found that manipulated goal level positively predicted performance and self-efficacy positively predicted performance in the difficult-goal condition.

Vancouver et al. (2002) examined the negative effect of self-efficacy on performance. They presented 2 studies to (a) confirm the causal role of self-efficacy and (b) substantiate the explanation. In study (a), self-efficacy was manipulated for 43 of 87 undergraduates on an analytic game. The manipulation was negatively related to performance on the next trial. In study (b), 104 undergraduates played the analytic game and reported self-efficacy between each game and confidence in the degree to which they had assessed previous feedback. As expected, self-efficacy led to overconfidence and hence increased the likelihood of committing logic errors during the game.

Shea and Howel (2000) examined the pattern of relationships between self-efficacy and performance in an experiment involving 148 students (with mean age of 27 yrs.) who worked on a manufacturing task over 4 trials. Task feedback and task experience, two variables that may influence the occurrence of efficacy-performance spirals, were investigated. The results indicated strong support for a significant relationship between self-efficacy and performance over time.

Endler et al. (2006) investigated the relationship between General self-efficacy and control in relation to anxiety and cognitive performance on eighty college students. The investigation employed a general measure of self-efficacy, a measure of perceived control and items relating to expectation and evaluation (pre and post). The study was intended to determine whether general self-efficacy or perceived-control best predicted the criterion variables of state anxiety and performance on a stressful
cognitive task under conditions of high vs. low control. These relationships were tested under the experimental conditions of high and low objective control. Results show that general self-efficacy, relative to perceived control is a better predictor of state anxiety in the high and low control conditions but neither predicts actual performance. Participant’s expectations of task difficulty, their own performance and their performance relative to the performance of others taken before the task were compared with their evaluations of difficulty and performance after completing the task. Participants indicated that the task was easier than anticipated, but rated their own performance more poorly after completion of the task.

Chen et al. (2001) examined meta-analytically whether self-efficacy mediates the cognitive ability-performance and conscientiousness-performance relationships, and whether task complexity moderates the extent to which self-efficacy mediates these relationships. Results indicated that cognitive ability and conscientiousness positively relate to self-efficacy, but that the magnitude of these relationships varies with task complexity. Furthermore, results showed that self-efficacy mediates the relationships of cognitive ability and conscientiousness with performance on simple tasks, but not on complex tasks.

Renn and Fefor (2001) conducted a field study on 136 sales and customer service representatives to examine the relationships among a set of feedback-seeking, social cognitive and goals setting constructs and the work performance. Authors’ hypothesized feedback-seeking and self-efficacy related to two dimensions of work performance (i.e., work quantity and work quality) through feedback-based goals. In addition, self-efficacy and feedback seeking mediated the relationship between two individual differences (viz., personal-control perceptions and external feedback propensity) and both dimensions of work performance. The findings extend research
on work performance by underscoring the importance of incorporating feedback into work-related improvement goals when investigating the relationship between feedback seeking and work performance. The findings also provide insight into the motivational processes underlying the relationship among personal control perceptions, external feedback propensity, and work performance.

Brown and Latham (2006) assessed previously unexplored processes by which information seeking and self-efficacy contribute to self-regulatory effectiveness in industrial selling. They assessed the synergistic interaction of inquiry and monitoring with respect to role clarity and tested whether this interaction was further moderated by self-efficacy. Results indicated that the role-clarifying effects of feedback inquiry and monitoring were contingent rather than independent. Role clarity increased as the combination of inquiry and monitoring increased. Furthermore, these joint effects were able to effectively use the combination of inquiry and monitoring to clarify role expectations, whereas low-self-efficacy employees could not.

Mangos and Steele-Johnson (2001) examined the role of subjective task complexity in goal-orientation effects on self-efficacy and performance on a computerized simulation of a class-scheduling task on a sample of 138 students. Results indicated that goal-orientation effects on performance were mediated by subjective task complexity. In addition, the results revealed that subjective task complexity was related to self-efficacy but not cognitive ability. Moreover, subjective task complexity effects on performance were mediated by self-efficacy. Goal-orientation effects on self-efficacy were mediated by subjective task complexity.

Bell and Kizlowski (2002) examined the direct relationship of goal orientation and the interaction of goal orientation and cognitive ability with self-efficacy, performance and knowledge in a learning context. The authors argue that whether a
particular type of goal orientation is adaptive or not adaptive depends on individuals’
cognitive ability. Further, learning orientation was found positively related to self-
efficacy, performance, and knowledge, whereas performance orientation was
negatively related to performance only. Learning orientation was generally adaptive
for high-ability individuals but had no effect for low-ability individuals. In contrast,
the effects of performance orientation were contingent to both individual’s level of
cognitive ability and the outcome examined.

Gahungu (2007) investigated the relationship between self-efficacy and task
performance. The data of the participants' self-efficacy were gathered through a
questionnaire with 40 questions to measure their level of confidence and a cloze test
to measure their level of proficiency. In the end he concluded that high level of self-
efficacy positively affects task performance.

Rahimi and Abedini (2009) in a study examined the relationship between self-
efficacy and performance of students. The results showed a statistically significant
correlation between high and low self-efficacious students and their rate of listening
comprehension. Furthermore, self-efficacy in listening was significantly related to
listening proficiency.

Ghonsooly and Elahi (2010) studied the effect of self-efficacy of learners in
their reading. The participants of this study were 150 sophomore Iranian university
students majoring in English literature. The instrument used in the study to meet this
goal was an author-designed scale on EFL learners' self efficacy in reading
comprehension. The results provided high self-efficacious participants achieved
higher scores in reading comprehension course than low self-efficacious participants.

Hetthong and Teo (2013) searched the relationship between self-efficacy and
performance and explored whether overall self-efficacy predicts overall performance.
The results showed that there was a significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and performance both at the section level and the sub-skill level. Furthermore, the overall self-efficacy predicts the overall performance.

Ebrhimzadeh *et al.* (2013) searched the impact of self-efficacy on performance. This study included both experimental and control group and each of them with 69 participants. The experimental group received treatment for task completion but the control group experienced it in the traditional way. Finally, the results indicated the direct influence of self-efficacy on the participants' task completion.

Locus of control refers to one’s belief in his or her abilities to control life events (Strauser, 2002). The concept of locus of control has an essential place in the management in helping employees who have difficulty in learning and attitude. Erdogan (2003) found that locus of control is one of the vital concepts in the context of learning difficulty and attitude change. This concept covers the idea that individuals, throughout their lives, analyses the events as their attitudes or they believe that those events result from chance, fate or outside forces. One’s control on his/her own life dependent on chance, fate and powerful people is explained as external control; maintaining the individual control over one’s life on his/her own is described as the internal control (Rotter, 1966). He studied the relationship between locus of control and task variability, task difficulty and job performance and found that persons with an internal locus of control were more satisfied, motivated and had a high level of participation within their jobs. Kesperson (1982) found that a high positive correlation between negative attitudes and external locus of control of employees which resulted in a low level of job satisfaction. Lefcourt (1984) found that externals require information on benefits of task structure before and during the
performance because they do not readily question the reason for carrying out tasks. Resultantly, they may not take part in the performance of tasks with enthusiasm. They also tend to show less interest in the entrepreneurial skills that might enable them to take greater control of situations or to produce new structures. Internals, on the other hand, tend to show much more curiosity in the reasons for task performance and to spend more time seeking information about the various tasks they are required to perform. Internals are inclined to use that information in a more advantageous way than externals. Internals also tend to have greater interest in entrepreneurial skills; and seem to be quicker and more willing in the extraction of cues from information and the different situations that they find themselves in, which makes it possible for them to produce new structures or organizations that might enable them to gain better performance from their efforts.

Phares (1976), Lefcourt et al. (1984), Skinner (1995) and Erbin et al. (1997) found that internals are more verbally fluent than externals and use verbal abilities to greater advantage. There is a clear tendency for internals to show a higher level of alertness in many cognitive activities than externals which results in higher level of performance. They also seem more willing to search for and find information that they interpret as helpful for controlling and coping with different situations and in the performance of tasks.

In the results found after reviewing research pertaining to job performance and its relation to locus of control by Hyatt and Prawitt (2001) and Spector (1982 & 1986) it has been concluded that internals tend to perform better job performance than externals.

Blau (1993) in a study on 146 bank employees found support for the proposal that an internal locus of control is related to higher initiative performance and that
externals exhibited a more compliant performance. Judge et al. (1998) found that locus of control is highly correlated with self-efficacy.

Salazar et al. (2002) investigated manager’s job satisfaction, internal & external locus tendencies and the relationship between two constructs. The results demonstrated that locus of control of managers is related to their job satisfaction.

The belief of locus of control is related to what reinforcements have happened throughout the individuals’ lives, namely the results, prizes, their success or failures. These attributions refer not only to chance, fate, and powerful people out of one’s control, but also to the results of his/her own attitudes (Basim and Sen, 2006).

Taylor (2006) noticed that when environmental conditions are not sufficient to explain individual’s success or failures then locus of control can facilitate in making these situations clear. For instance, individuals may sometimes perceive good and bad events in different ways. These different ways are based on external and internal forces.

Thomas and Mueller (2001) in a meta-analysis of the relationships between locus of control and a range of work outcomes categorised the outcomes according to three theoretical perspectives: locus of control and well being, locus of control and motivation and locus of control and behavioural orientation. It was concluded that internal locus of control was positively associated with favourable work outcomes, such as positive task and social experiences and greater job motivation.

Emotional intelligence is an ability to manage one’s own and others’ emotions. It has caught the attention of researchers in recent times. It has a significant impact on the personal and professional success of individuals. It has been empirically proven that Emotional Intelligence influences the performance, well-being
characteristics of individuals & teams, facilitates organizational effectiveness and competitive advantage.

Salovey and Mayer (1990) found that people who have developed skills relating to emotional intelligence understand and express their own emotions, recognize emotions in others, regulate, affect and use moods and emotions to motivate adaptive behaviours.

Work performance often depends on the support, advice, and other resources provided by others (Seibert et al., 2001). Hence, emotional intelligence add to work performance when people are enabled to nurture positive relationships at work, work effectively in teams and make social capital. Emotional intelligence contributes to work performance by facilitating people to regulate their emotions so as to cope effectively with stress, perform well under pressure and adjust to organizational change. Other emotional abilities, such as perceiving and understanding emotions also contribute indirectly to the quality of emotional experience by helping people to identify and interpret cues that inform self-regulatory action. Therefore, emotional intelligence should contribute to positive affect and attitudes at work.

Gillespie et al. (2001) conducted a study among 178 academic and general staff who were working in 15 Australian universities (Slaski & Cartwright, 2002) selected 320 middle managers of major retailers, Nikolau & Tsaosis (2002) selected 212 professionals of a mental health institution. Findings of these studies indicated that the ability of employees to deal with and use their emotions to control their colleague’s emotions, increases job performance by decreasing their psychophysiological stresses. Wong and Law (2002) found the significant relationship between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction and job performance.
Emotional intelligence has been observed as a predictor of performance in studies conducted on various samples like undergraduate students on a single task (Lam and Kirby, 2002), classroom performance of managers and professionals (Sue-Chan and Latham, 2004), the collection performance of account officers and sales performance and supervisory ratings of job performance (Law et al., 2008).

Lyons and Schneider (2005) examined the relationship of ability-based emotional intelligence facets with performance under stress. The authors expected that high levels of emotional intelligence would promote challenge appraisals and better performance, whereas low emotional intelligence levels would foster threat appraisals and worse performance. The authors found that certain dimensions of emotional intelligence were related more to challenge and enhanced performance and that some emotional intelligence dimensions were related to performance after controlling for cognitive ability, demonstrating incremental validity.

Cumming (2005) explored the relationship between emotional intelligence and workplace performance with a sample of workers from New Zealand. In addition, she studied the relationship among demographic factors, emotional intelligence and workplace performance. The results of her study suggested a significant relationship between emotional intelligence and workplace performance.

Turner (2006) examined the relationships among employees’ emotional intelligence, their manager’s emotional intelligence, employees’ job satisfaction and performance. Authors reported that employee’s emotional intelligence was positively associated with job satisfaction and performance. In addition, manager’s emotional intelligence had a more positive correlation with job satisfaction for employees with low emotional intelligence than for those with high emotional intelligence. These
findings remain significant after controlling for personality factors. A similar pattern was found for job performance.

Cote and Miners (2006) examined the relationship between emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence and job performance of 175 managerial, administrative, and professional full-time employees of a public university. Results indicated that cognitive intelligence moderated the association between emotional intelligence and job performance. Emotional intelligence was reported to be a stronger predictor of job performance and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour directed at the Organization (OCBO) (e.g., defend the organization when other employees criticize it) as cognitive intelligence decreased. Results suggested that using cognitive intelligence tests alone to predict job performance entails risk because employees with low cognitive intelligence can perform effectively if they have high emotional intelligence.

Shanker and Sayeed (2006) conducted a research on 139 managers working in various organizations in Western India. The purpose of the study was to establish a relation between emotionally intelligent managers and managers’ professional development. The managerial scores on various dimensions of emotional intelligence were correlated with professional development indicators of managers, conceptualized in terms of number of promotions attained and the rated job success. The assumption that the emotionally intelligent managers would tend to attain greater professional development than those who are less emotionally intelligent was tentatively supported in the findings.

Singh (2007) found that ultimately it is the emotional and personal competencies that we need to identify and measure if we want to be able to predict performance at workplace resulting in its effectiveness, thereby enhancing the worth
of the human capital. In this scenario the competencies possessed by the people will have a bearing on the extent to which they can actualize their emotional intelligence. Significant relationship between emotional intelligence and personal competencies of employees was observed. The variables of personal competency namely, people success, system success and self-success have a predictive relationship with emotional intelligence.

Fariselli et al. (2008) in their study found that in a sample of 68 professional and obstetricians in a large urban hospital, emotional intelligence is strongly predictive of performance (66%), stress is slightly predictive (6% to 24%), and emotional intelligence is predictive of stress management (6.5%).

Quoidbach and Hansenne (2009) investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence, performance and cohesiveness in 23 nursing teams in Belgium. Nursing team performance was measured at four different levels: job satisfaction, chief nursing executives’ rating, turnover rate and health care quality. The results did not support the generalization that all components of emotional intelligence relate to all measures of performance; however, the data clearly supported a relationship between emotional regulations as an important aspect of team performance (i.e., health care quality). Emotional regulation was also positively correlated with group cohesiveness. These results suggest that emotional regulation may provide an interesting new way of enhancing nursing teams’ cohesion and patient / client outcomes. The study suggested that including training on emotional regulation skills during team-building seminars might be more effective than focusing only on exercises to create long-term cohesiveness.

Khokhar and Kush (2009) in their study explained the performance of executives on different levels of emotional intelligence and provided a link between
emotional intelligence and effective work performance. 20 Male executives (out of 200) within the age range of 40 to 55 yrs from BHEL (Haridwar) and THDC (Rishikesh) of Uttarakhand State (India) were selected. T-tests for independent groups were used to measure the mean difference between groups. The findings of the study revealed that executives having higher emotional intelligence showed better quality of work performance as compared to their counterparts.

Ramo et al. (2009) assessed the relationship between emotional intelligence, personality and job performance of 223 employees working in Spanish organisation which was determined by superior and peer nominations. The results revealed that both emotional and social competencies and personality traits are valuable predictors of job performance. In addition, competencies seem to be more powerful predictors of performance than global personality traits.

Shoshtarian et al. (2009) determine the effect of labour’s emotional intelligence on job satisfaction, job performance and commitment in Fars Province industries in Iran. The results showed that employees' emotional intelligence was positively correlated with job satisfaction. Then, there was a significant relationship between the labour’s emotional intelligence and their job performance. In addition, there was not any relationship between labour’s emotional intelligence and their commitment. The results underline the important role of emotional intelligence and its effect on work situations.

Khurram et al. (2011) focused on the impact of four significant aspects of EI (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and relationship management) on employee's performance among Telecom employees in Pakistan. The results revealed a positive relationship between social awareness and relationship management and
employee's performance while self-awareness and self-management were not found significantly related to employee's performance.

Bahmanabadi and Jafari (2014), using Spearman correlation, determined a positive and meaningful relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance ($r = 0.796$, Sig. = 0.000). In addition, there were positive and meaningful relationships between four components of emotional intelligence, namely consciousness ($r = 0.642$, Sig. = 0.000), self-regulation ($r = 0.41$, Sig. = 0.000), self-awareness ($r = 0.552$, Sig. = 0.000) and social skills ($r = 0.524$, Sig. = 0.000).

Anbazhagan and Nagarajan (2014) found relationship between emotional intelligence and work performance. They concluded that there is a positive relationship between employee’s emotional intelligence and work performance. Also the dimensions of EI and work performance dimensions are positively correlated with each other.

2. **Job Performance and Work Related Attitudes:**

   Job involvement has a positive impact on the employee's motivation and efforts which leads to a high level of job performance (Brown, 1996).

   Job involvement is a general cognitive state of psychological identification with the job. Job involvement is believed to occur when the possession of certain needs, values or personal characteristics predispose individuals to become more or less involved in their jobs. Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) in their review of literature on job involvement found that individual characteristics such as age, education, sex, tenure, need strength, level of control and values were linked to job involvement.

   Kanungo (1979) observed that the employees who are having low degree of involvement are more likely to experience low job satisfaction and inclined to leave the organization. Besides this if they remain with the organization they put their
efforts towards non productive work or apply their energy in such activities that are not beneficial for the organization and hence the productivity decreases.

All employees who are involved with their jobs are also committed to their organisations. Similarly, the researchers have also found a positive relationship between organisational commitment and the performance of employees (Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991 and Meyer et al., 1989). The findings revealed that employees who are more committed to their employing organisations make a great effort to achieve their organisation's goals by performing their tasks better.

Brown and Leigh (1996) found a positive but weak relationship between job involvement and job performance, whilst the relationship with the mediation role of efforts was non-significant. The authors, further, argued that one reason for the weak and significant relationship between two variables, i.e., job involvement and job performance may be that job involvement is more likely to influence job performance in the presence of certain other variables (indirectly).

Kahn (1990) and Brown (1996) explained that different work behaviours of the employees are the consequences of job involvement and it is hypothesized that involvement ultimately impacts on employees’ efforts and motivation, which in turn explained performance.

People with high levels of job involvement tend to be satisfied with their jobs and highly committed to their careers, professions, and employing organizations (Brown, 1996, Carson et al., 1995). They rarely think about changing employers and generally believe that their personal goals and the organization’s goals are compatible (Chay and Aryee, 1999).

Meta analysis by Brown (1996) estimated that the population correlation is non-significant between the job involvement and overall performance but the
population correlation was reported to be significant between the job involvement and different combination measures of performance, although the coefficient was relatively small. In this situation, different researchers have tried to discover the reasons for the complex relationship between the job involvement and employee performance.

Lassak *et al.* (2001) argued that occupation specific measures of job involvement should be created and consequently developed a measure of ‘salesperson job involvement’. Their study uncovered a significant but positive relationship between one facet of their measure, ‘relationship’ involvement and performance.

Mudrack (2004) noticed that highly involved employees do not to give up easily, may feel almost a moral obligation to be involved with their jobs and may tend to be set in their ways.

Ali *et al.* (2005) examined the impact of job involvement on job performance and organizational citizenship behaviour. The results of the study revealed that job involvement was positively correlated with both job performance and Organizational citizenship behaviour. In addition to this, it was found that organizational commitment partially mediated the job involvement-performance relationship.

Job satisfaction is a set of favourable or unfavourable feelings and emotions with which employees view their work. It is an affective attitude - a feeling of relative like or dislike toward something. Brayfield & Crockett (1955) examined research relating to job satisfaction and job performance and concluded that there was virtually no evidence of any relationship between these two variables. Vroom (1964) concluded that job satisfaction determine performance. He found a median correlation
of 0.14 between the two variables, with a range of 0.86 to -0.3. Further, he has also examined the relationship between satisfaction and various other aspects of job behaviour such as turnover, absenteeism, accidents and job performance. Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson and Capwell (1957) have also presented an extensive review on the topic.

Attitudes such as involvement and satisfaction contribute to increase the performance of the employees which were proved by various existing studies (Vroom, 1964 and Lawler and Porter, 1967). Discussed three fundamentals of job satisfaction: (1) evaluating the characteristics of a job, (2) determining a value standard for comparison of satisfaction and determining the level of agreement among an employee’s perception of job satisfaction and employee’s value standard.

Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) surveyed blue and white collar workers and determined that completing interesting tasks was not as important as job security and compensation for blue collar employees. The findings also indicated that interesting and varied assignments were more important for white collar workers in comparison to blue collar workers.

In an influential meta-analysis, Iaffaldano and Murchinsky (1985) found no strong linkage between productivity and job satisfaction. After comprehensive meta-analysis of the research literature, they have reported only 0.17 average correlations between job satisfaction and productivity. On the same line in an analysis by Pdsakoff et al. (1996), it was observed that satisfied workers may not necessarily be the highest producers. They concluded that there are many possible mediating factors, the most important of which seems to be the reward. Ostroff (1992) present an analysis of the relationship between job satisfaction and performance. He concluded that it is not necessary that satisfaction of job may lead performance improvement on the job.
Witt and Nye (1992) concluded that employees want a fair unambiguous pay system and promotion policies. Satisfaction is not linked to the absolute amount one is paid; rather, it is the perception of fairness. Similarly, employees seek fair promotion policies and practices. Promotion provides opportunities for personal growth, more responsibilities, and increased social status. The authors opined that individuals who perceive that promotion decisions are made in a fair and just manner are likely to experience satisfaction from their jobs.

Keaveney and Nelson (1993) tested a complex model of the interrelationship among numerous attitudes (intrinsic motivation orientation, role conflict, role ambiguity, psychological withdrawal) and found a job satisfaction-job performance path coefficient of 0.12 whereas this value came out to be (0.29) in another model. Both values were found insignificant.

Solomon (1986) found evidence from previous studies suggesting that public sector managers experience lower levels of job satisfaction. Satisfied workers in most organizations contribute significantly to the effectiveness and success of the organizations.

McCue and Gianakis (1997) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and performance and concluded that satisfaction is a function of correspondence between expectations, aspirations, needs, and the degree to which the organization fulfills these needs and matches the expectations and aspirations.

Rose (2001) viewed job satisfaction as a bi-dimensional concept consisting of intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction dimensions. Intrinsic sources of satisfaction depend on the individual characteristics of the person (ability to use initiative, relations with supervisors, or the work that the person actually performs; these are symbolic or qualitative facets of the job). Extrinsic sources of satisfaction are situational and
depend on the environment (pay, promotion or job security).

Norris (2004) studied work values, experience and job satisfactions among government workers. He reported that private and public sector employees are motivated with different sense of accomplishment. Public sector employees have a stronger sense of fulfilling a useful role that contributes to society.

Ololube (2006) found that sources of job satisfaction (policies and administration, pay and fringe benefits, material rewards and advancement) seem to have a greater impact on employee’s performance.

Rotenberry and Moberg (2007) indicated that employees who were more involved in their jobs were good performers as compared to the employees whose attitude towards work was not good. Authors concluded that better attitude towards work resulted in enhanced performance.

Thomas (2011) examined the relationships among employees’ emotional intelligence, their manager’s emotional intelligence, employees’ job satisfaction, and performance for 187 food service employees from nine different locations of the same restaurant franchise and found that employees’ emotional intelligence was positively associated with job satisfaction and performance. In addition, manager’s emotional intelligence had a more positive correlation with job satisfaction for employees with low emotional intelligence than for those with high emotional intelligence. These findings remain significant after controlling for personality factors. A similar pattern was found for job performance.

Chaudhari (2012) opined that employees having favourable attitude towards their profession are generally successful, properly adjusted and well satisfied with their job.

Huang and Lai (2014) tested an integrative model of job performance by
conceptualizing that job performance is influenced by job satisfaction and incentive system. The results indicate that incentive system have an indirect relationship with job satisfaction and proved that job satisfaction is a mediator and locus of control is a moderator in the research framework. However, both contributed to high job performance.

Hafiz et al. (2014) indicated strong positive relationship between job satisfaction and performance whereas organizational commitment has strong positive relation with performance and attitude towards work. The study identified significant impact of organizational commitment on job satisfaction of employees working in educational sector.

3. **Job Performance and Organisational Climate:**

Forehand and Gilmer (1964) outlines the perception of organisational climate as being influenced by personality factors and their relationship with the satisfaction of one's needs.

Kaczka and Kirk (1968) demonstrated that an employee-centred climate yielded a higher sociological and psychological satisfaction than a task-centred climate. Litwin and Stringer (1968) noticed that a positive, supportive, incentive oriented organizational climate has positive effects on the job satisfaction as well as job performance.

Pritchard and Karasick (1973) found that organisational climate is more closely related to employees’ job satisfaction and job performance. Cawsey (1973) observed that Job satisfaction increases as the individuals perceive the climate is having more “opportunities for advancement” and that such persons also rate themselves as high performers.
Lyon and Ivancevich (1974) in a study of a hospital found that different climate dimensions influence facets of individual Job satisfaction for nurses and administrators. Roy (1974) compared the climate of organisations in public and private sectors as seen through the eyes of the urban elite of Delhi. The public sector was perceived to be less efficient because of nepotism, arbitrariness in union-management system and interference by government and political forces.

Payne and Pugh (1976) revealed that individual’s needs, satisfaction and goals influence his perception of organisational climate while climate in turn affects the same satisfaction, goals and behaviour.

Singh et al. (1977) in a study of organisational culture and its impact on managerial remuneration found that the demand for economic compensation varied significantly with the quality of organisational culture. The study suggested that by improving the quality of organisational culture the demand for money and remuneration could be substantially reduced.

Singh and Das (1978) in a study on managers found that the quality of organisational culture appeared to satisfy higher order needs through more autonomy, achievement, opportunities and self-actualisation and was found to produce a higher level of commitment to work. An organisational culture with a coercive authority system affected the level of commitment resulting in inaction, apathy and alienation.

Baskin and Arnoff (1983) in their study concluded that in an ideal climate, the factors and expectations such as credibility, reliability, openness, sincerity, helpfulness and participation are high which in return affect the job performance positively.

Singh (1985) revealed that the dimensions of organizational climate: aloofness, production emphasis, thrust, consideration, disengagement, esprit,
intimacy and hindrance were found to be significant correlated with organizational climate of high, average and low performance.

Borucki and Burke (1999) in a study of more than 30,000 employees at 594 stores of a large US retail company observed a positive relation between service climate, personnel service performance and store financial performance.

Hoy and Miskel (2001) in their study observed that employees who have high intimacy, know each other well and share personal issues with each other provide strong support to each other during difficult situations. When support and encouragement takes place employees are able to work with full enthusiasm and it is likely to contribute to positive climate in the organisation as a result of such positive relationship.

Baer and Frese (2003) investigated the relation between climates for initiative & psychological safety and performance and their results showed that climates for initiative and psychological safety are positively related to performance.

Gelade and Ivery (2003) in their study, conducted at the branch network of a retail bank among 14,390 employees found global climate to be positively related to sales against target, staff retention, clerical accuracy, customer satisfaction, and overall performance.

Rooney (2003) conducted a study on school climate and found that when the principals show their consideration and concerns to the needs of the subordinates and are willing to take personal efforts to solve the problems then teachers, students and parents also show keen interest with them. Adding to that when the needs of the subordinates are met, they are able to do their work smoothly and improve their job performance.

Bilir and Unal (2007) in their studies observed that a positive, supportive,
incentive oriented organizational climate has positive effects on the job satisfaction and job performance. Giri et al. (2007) studied the relationship between organizational commitment, organizational climate and job satisfaction among 380 junior, middle and senior management level employees across the country. The study reported that a positive correlation existed among job satisfaction, organizational climate and organizational commitment. They concluded that job satisfaction along with organizational climate plays a vital role in retaining the employees by enhancing their commitment towards organization.

Srivastav (2007) made an attempt to study the relationship of achievement climate with role stress and coping strategy variables in selected departments of two large multi unit, multi location telecommunication manufacturing industries in the public and private sector with a total sample size of 453 respondents. The research indicated that individual and organizational resistance to change is stronger in the public sector organization. The study further stated that individuals with strong achievement react positively when they are responsible for challenging but achievable goals and when their innovative entrepreneurial behaviours are rightly rewarded. Thus, individual need for achievement and organizational climate are significant determinants of individual performance in an organization.

Ahlawat and Thakur (2007) found that Job Satisfaction with respect to organizational climate with special reference to Private Professional Colleges in Western Haryana found that organizational climate plays a key and vital role in enhancing job satisfaction. The correlation analysis revealed a high significant positive correlation between organizational climate and job satisfaction. They further, found that conducive and employee favourable organizational climate enhances job satisfaction and it predicts job satisfaction.
In their research, George et al. (2008) found a few reasons contributing to low level of job performance such as inadequate pay, poor career structure, lack of promotion opportunities, poor school facilities, inadequate school disciplinary policy, principal’s leadership behaviour and students’ poor work attitudes and teachers’ behaviour.

Adeyemi (2008) conducted a study on 360 schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. The findings revealed that most of the schools run an open climate type of organization but the level of organizational climate in most of the schools was very low. The findings revealed that the level of the employees’ job performance was equally low. In terms of the relationship between organizational climate and job performance, the findings revealed that there was a significant relationship between organizational climate and employees’ job performance.

Raza (2010) in their study examined the impact of organizational climate on performance in colleges. The results of their study revealed that perceived behavior of employees and production emphasis behavior of employers were correlated to job performance of employees. Most of the principals perceived that their leadership behavior such as consideration and aloofness were negatively correlated to employees’ job performance while their intimacy behavior was slightly correlated to job performance and disengagement behavior was negatively correlated to teachers’ job performance.

Dash and Mohapatra (2012) and found that HRD climate having positive correlation with the employee satisfaction which will help a lot for individual performance development.
4. Cross Variables Studies:

Packard and Motowidlo (1987) in their research concentrated on relationship of subjective stress, job satisfaction and job performance, based on their results of exploratory path analyses, based on a general model, whereby standardized beta coefficients were used to estimate paths. The finding are that stress and job satisfaction are not directly related, and that stress, primarily acting through depression, is associated with lower levels of job performance. Job satisfaction is unrelated to job performance, and is based on depression and hostility which are affected by stress and personal characteristics.

While internal-locus-of-control individuals are able to work despite attempts at distracting them, the performance of external-locus-of-control students decreases when the same stressors are present (Wolk & Bloom, 1978).

Fisher and Ashkanasy (2000) explored the relationship between emotions experienced at work and job satisfaction, and proposed that as emotions in the workplace generally have a target (that is, being angry at someone, being proud of an achievement) then they are likely to be triggered by events in the workplace, are attributable to the job and will affect job satisfaction. It was suggested that interpersonal relations in the workplace might trigger more emotional responses than things like salary and chance of promotion. Using three measures of job satisfaction and the author’s own Job Emotion Scale, Fisher found a weak but significant relationship between emotions and some aspects of job satisfaction (pay, promotion and supervision). A weak negative relationship was reported between negative emotion and all aspects of job satisfaction, which suggest that employees who do not report or are unable to effectively manage negative emotions at work, will be more satisfied with their job than those who are not.
Several empirical investigations provide us with insight into the relationship between OBSE and employee attitudes. Satisfaction and organizational commitment are the two work-related attitudes that have received virtually all of the research attention. Individuals who value themselves at higher levels (higher self-esteem) have been shown to have higher job satisfaction and experience or focus on more positive aspects of their work (Judge and Bono, 2001).

Organization Based Self Esteem has been observed to have positive and significant relationship with generalized (trait) self-efficacy (Gardner & Pierce, 1998 & 2001 and Stark et al., 2000). Kark et al. (2003) observed a positive relationship between OBSE and collective efficacy in their study of a large Israeli banking organization. People with high OBSE possess higher global self-esteem and view themselves as being more efficacious than their low OBSE counterparts. Self esteem also has a positive relationship with internal locus of control (Stark et al., 2000). Pierce et al. (1989), in their development and validation of the OBSE scale, observed a positive correlation between OBSE and a measure of work motivation. Self-esteem is positively related to achievement and motivation (Pierce et al., 1993).

Self-efficacy is the individual’s belief that he or she is capable of performing a task (Robbins, 2003). Employees who believe in their abilities exhibit high levels of self-confidence. Studies examining self-efficacy have found it to be a major construct that may help explain and predict motivation and performance and to influence career success (Stajkovic and Luthans, 1998 and Day and Allen, 2004).

Patten, (2005) examined whether job performance and/or job satisfaction are related to differences in the personality variable locus-of control (LOC) and its relation to perceived audit structure. Findings suggested that those internal auditors
with more internal LOC tendencies appear to outperform cohorts with more external traits.

Kumar and Patnaik (2002) found a positive relationship between HRD Climate and job satisfaction, attitude and role efficacy.

Krishnaveni and Kumar (2006) in their study titled “Impact of developmental climate on individuals’ behaviour in organizations” reported HRD Climate to be associated positively with the level of role satisfaction of individuals in the organization.

Muhammad and Tracy (2006) conducted a study to determine whether a relationship existed between an individual’s emotional quotient and his or her level of job satisfaction. Regression analysis was conducted which indicated that individual’s emotional intelligence quotient was not a significant predictor of level of job satisfaction.

Law et al. (2008) demonstrated the utility of the emotional intelligence construct in organizational studies focusing on the effect of emotional intelligence on job performance. It was argued that emotional intelligence is a significant predictor of job performance beyond the effect of the General Mental Ability (GMA) battery on performance. In another study, investigation was done on whether emotional intelligence can predict external and internal job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Emotional intelligence was assessed using the Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test and it was hypothesized that emotional intelligence would be positively related to external and internal job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The dimensions of emotional management and emotional control emerged as the best predictors of these workplace variables.
Chen and Silverthorne (2008) examined the relationships between locus of control and the work-related behavioural measures of job stress, job satisfaction and job performance. Subjects were drawn from a pool of accounting professionals. The findings indicate that one aspect of an accountants’ personality, as measured by locus of control, plays an important role in predicting in the level of job satisfaction, stress and performance in CPA firms. Individuals with a higher internal locus of control are more likely to have lower levels of job stress and higher levels of job performance and satisfaction.

Strong relationship has been found among job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job involvement. Kacmar et al. (1999) examined positive and significant relationship between job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job involvement. They noticed that employees who are satisfied with their respective jobs are more involved and committed in their respective organizations.


Covin et al. (1992) for example, found significant relationships between OBSE and several dimensions of job satisfaction (e.g., kind of work, supervision, pay, and general). Along similar lines, Bowden (2002) observes a positive relationship between OBSE and feelings of personal fulfilment. High self-esteem people experience higher levels of job satisfaction (Robbins, 2003).
In general, review of the literature describe self efficacy as an individual’s judgment of his or her ability to successfully complete a chosen task (Bandura, 1997). Findings indicate self efficacy influence an individual’s choice among activities, persistence when problems arose (Bandura, 1986), a variety of work outcomes, including performance ratings (Gardner and Pierce, 1998) and attendance (Latham & Frayne, 1989).

Efficacy is positively correlated with job satisfaction, commitment (Riggs & Knight, 1994), and task performance (Prussia and Kincki, 1996).

Schyns and Von Collani (2002) found first evidence for its usefulness in organizational research and practice as indicated by the positive correlations between occupational self-efficacy and job satisfaction as well as organizational commitment. Introducing a short version of the occupational self-efficacy instrument, Rigotti et al. (2008) found positive correlations between occupational self-efficacy and job satisfaction.

Clear positive linkage have been observed between generalized self-efficacy and task performance and coping with change (Stajkovic and Luthans, 1998 and Judge et al., 1999), job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2000, Erez & Judge, 2001, and Luthans et al., 2006).

The relationship between self efficacy and job involvement has been observed by Yang et al. (2006). They observed that Self-efficacy and job involvement are significantly positively correlated. Kuang-Hsun et al. (2009) also found that there is a significant and positive correlation between self-efficacy and job involvement.

Research studies show that a person’s internal-external locus of control impacts his/her performance and job satisfaction (Dailey, 1980 and Kasperson, 1982).
The “core self-evaluation traits” (Judge et al., 1997) comprising of self-efficacy, locus of control, self-esteem and neuroticism show a consistently high correlation with job satisfaction (Judge et al., 1998) across samples with varied profiles. Generalized self-efficacy strongly predicted job satisfaction in a meta-analysis.

Ghazawi and Awad (2014) noticed that employees’ emotional intelligence was positively correlated with job satisfaction and there was a significant relationship between the labour’s emotional intelligence and their job satisfaction.

Kafetsios and Zampetakis (2008) tested the extent to which positive and negative affect at work mediate personality effects (Emotional Intelligence) on job satisfaction. Results indicated that positive and negative affect at work substantially mediate the relationship between EI and job satisfaction with positive affect exerting a stronger influence. In males, affect at work fully mediated the EI effect on job satisfaction. Among the four EI dimensions, use of emotion and emotion regulation were significant independent predictors of affect at work.

Sener et al. (2009) investigate the effect of the emotional intelligence of nurses and midwives on their job satisfaction and found that total emotional intelligence of the workers was low (X=22.54, SS=5.14), and average job satisfaction levels were middle level (X=15.62, SS=3.27). A positive association was found between the emotional intelligence and job satisfaction.

Alam (2009) investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence EI and job satisfaction among the administrative staff in higher education institution in Malaysia. Correlation statistics revealed that EI with its three dimensions, appraisal, utilization and regulation were associated significantly and positively with job satisfaction. The linear regression analysis result further confirmed the predictor
nature of the three dimension of emotional intelligence for the job satisfaction.

Mousavi et al. (2012) study the relationship between emotional intelligence as well as its five components and job satisfaction. The results showed that there is a significant positive relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction and between the components of social skills, empathy, and motivation and job satisfaction at level. Further, the results of stepwise regression showed that among the five components of emotional intelligence, social skills (0.442), empathy (0302) and motivation (0.235) were predictors of job satisfaction.

In the study conducted by Solkhe and Chaudhary (2011) found that a positive correlation exists between the HRD Climate and job satisfaction, further analysis was conducted to find the relationship between the sub factors or dimensions of HRD Climate with job satisfaction. The correlation analysis performed to analyse the relationship between HRD Climate Dimensions i.e. General Climate, HRD Mechanisms and job satisfaction. The study showed that there exists a positive relationship between different components of HRD Climate and job satisfaction.

Talebinezhad and Banihashemi (2013) examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and self-efficacy and concluded that there was a significant relationship between emotional intelligence and self-efficacy beliefs and this positive correlation is not affected by gender differences.

Platsidou (2010) investigated perceived emotional intelligence in relation to burnout syndrome and job satisfaction and reported fairly high scores in the specific factors and the overall EI. Moreover, it was revealed that perceived EI was significantly related to burnout syndrome and job satisfaction, indicated that employees of high-perceived EI was likely to experience less burnout and greater job satisfaction.
Salim *et al.* (2012) conducted a research to ascertain the role of emotional intelligence on job satisfaction and the effect of gender on the relationship between EQ and job satisfaction. Results of this study indicated a significant positive relationship between EQ and job satisfaction and no effect of gender on the relationship between the two variables.

Naderi (2012) examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction to determine the role of gender and age in EQ, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The results of the study indicated that there was a positive significant relationship between EQ and job satisfaction. The study also showed that there was no significant difference among employees of different genders and ages concerning their job satisfaction.

Seyed and Zahra (2015) showed that emotional intelligence was correlated significantly and positively with job satisfaction, and male employees were more satisfied with their job than females. Thus, emotional intelligence skills can be used in order to increase job satisfaction. It was revealed that gender can be a predictor of job satisfaction.

Gaus and Arianto (2014) in their study revealed that there was a significant correlation between internal locus of control and job satisfaction and job stress.

Benazir & Priya (2014) concluded that the good HRD climate was prevalent in the organizations surveyed. Thus, the extent of HRD climate prevailing in both the organizations seems to be different. For organizational and employees performance it is important to focus on various aspects of the HRD climate prevalent in the organization.

Dash *et al.* (2014) concluded that that HRD Climate has a significant relationship exists with the Job Satisfaction.
Cankar and Petkovšek (2014) concluded that organisational climate has an impact on employee satisfaction and also employee satisfaction affects perceptions of organisational climate.

Bapat et al. (2014) noticed that the sample organizations differ significantly in their OCTAPACE Culture and are having varying level of OCTAPACE culture. The role of management executives in any human resource development exercise is crucial and centres on creation of right environment for OCTAPACE culture, wherein people are free and attain new levels of performance for them and thereby for the organization as a whole.

Boateng et al. (2014) in their results of the study found that certain dimensions of organizational climate such as identity, conflict management and rewards do have relationship with job satisfaction. Thus employees in the manufacturing sector are more satisfied with the organizations whose mission and objectives are in congruence with the employees’ personal beliefs. Managers are encouraged to focus on articulating the mission of the organization but also stimulate dynamic and high sense of employees’ identification. Fairness in conflict handling procedures as well as equity and transparency in compensation systems is equally recommended as strategies to adopt to foster and increase job satisfaction.

Saragih (2011) the study showed that job autonomy significantly related to job satisfaction and performance, but not significant with job stress. It also showed that self-efficacy partially mediated the relationship between job autonomy and job satisfaction, and job performance. In addition, this research found that self-efficacy not mediated the relationship between job autonomy and job stress. There was no significant relationship between job autonomy and job performance but this research showed that job satisfaction significantly related to job performance. Finally, these results had an important implication to managers in designing job.