

Impact of Organizational Culture on Employee Performance

* *Neeraj Kumari*

** *Devi Singh*

Abstract

Culture is made up of the values, beliefs, underlying assumptions, attitudes, and behaviors shared by a group of people. Culture is the behavior that results when a group arrives at a set of - generally unspoken and unwritten - rules for working together. The culture of a company as a whole might be weak and very difficult to characterize because there are so many subcultures. Each department or work cell may have its own culture. The aim of the study was to analyze the impact of work culture on the performance of the employees in a leading plastic manufacturer company. Exploratory research was used to gather preliminary information which helped in defining the problems and suggest hypotheses. The relationship between work culture and performance management system (PMS) was studied and the effect of the work culture on performance management system was found out to be 3.1%. Companies should conduct seminars and different activities to develop team spirit amongst employees. HR should ensure that the job description clearly defines KRA's and employees should be involved in the process of goal setting.

Keywords : performance management system, organizational culture, KRA, attitude, rewards, innovation, teams

JEL Classification : M10, M12, M14, M19, O31

Paper Submission Date : November 2, 2017 ; **Paper sent back for Revision :** May 16, 2018 ; **Paper Acceptance Date :** May 25, 2018

Culture is something that you can't really observe, aside from its physical indications in your work. From numerous points of view, culture resembles identity. In man, identity is comprised of the qualities, convictions, basic suspicions, interests, encounters, childhood, and propensities that make a man's conduct. An association's culture is comprised of the greater part of the educational encounters every worker conveys to the association.

Work culture is regularly deciphered contrastingly by assorted representatives. Different occasions in individuals' lives influence how they act and cooperate at work as well. In spite of the fact that an association has a typical culture, every individual may understand culture with a better point of view. Culture might be solid or frail. At the point when work culture is solid, the vast majority in the gathering concur on the culture. At the point when work culture is feeble, individuals don't concede to the culture. Now and again, a frail authoritative culture can be the consequence of numerous subcultures, or the common esteems, presumptions, and practices of a subset of the association. For instance, the culture of an organization overall may be frail and extremely hard to portray on the grounds that there are such huge numbers of subcultures. Every office or work cell may have its own particular culture. Inside offices, the staff and directors may each have their own culture.

* *Associate Professor (Corresponding Author)*, Department of Management, FET, Manav Rachna International Institute of Research and Studies, Aravali Hills, Sector - 43, Faridabad - 121 001, Haryana. E-mail : neerajnarwat@gmail.com

** *Professor*, Department of Physics, FET, Manav Rachna International Institute of Research and Studies, Aravali Hills, Sector - 43, Faridabad - 121 001, Haryana. E-mail : drdevisingh.fet@mriu.edu.in

Octapace

The OCTAPACE profile is a 40-item instrument that gives the profile of an organization's ethos in eight values. These values are openness, confrontation, trust, authenticity, pro - action, autonomy, collaboration, and experimentation. The instrument contains two parts. In Part I, values are stated in items 1 to 24 (three statements of each of the eight values), and the respondent is required to check (on a 4 - point scale) how much each item is valued in his/her organization. Part 2 contains 16 statements on beliefs, two each for eight values, and the respondent checks (on a 4-point scale) how widely each of them is shared in the organization. In addition to checking the items on the extent of their importance or sharing in the organization, the respondent can also check how much they should be valued, or how much the beliefs are useful. Thus, present as well as desired and ideal profiles can be obtained.

The following processes are the dimensions of work culture :

(i) Openness : Openness can be characterized as an unconstrained articulation of emotions and considerations, and the sharing of these without protectiveness. Openness is in the two headings, accepting and giving. Both these may identify with thoughts (counting recommendations), input (counting feedback), and sentiments. For instance, openness implies getting without reservation, and finding a way to energize more input and proposals from clients, partners, and others.

(ii) Confrontation: Confrontation can be characterized as confronting as opposed to shying far from problems. It likewise infers further examination of relational problems. This includes taking up challenges. Employees face the problems and work jointly with others concerned to find its solution. They face the issues squarely without hiding them or avoiding them for fear of hurting each other. A superior term would be confrontation and exploration (CE).

(iii) Trust : Trust is not utilized as a part of the ethical sense. It is reflected in keeping up the classification of data shared by others, and in not abusing it. It is additionally reflected - it might be said of confirmation that others will help, when such help is required, and will respect shared duties and commitments. Trust is likewise reflected in tolerating what someone else says at confront esteem, and not hunting down ulterior intentions. Trust is a critical fixing in the foundation building processes.

(iv) Authenticity : Credibility is the compatibility between what one feels, says, and does. It is reflected in owning up one's slip-ups, and in open sharing of sentiments. Credibility is nearer to openness. This can be found in the correspondence between individuals in an association.

(v) Pro - Action : Pro - action implies stepping up, preplanning, making a preventive move, and ascertaining the settlements of an option course before making a move. Pro- action can be understood from the term 'respond.' For instance, if a person yells back at his/her companion's allegation, he/she demonstrates responsive conduct. Nonetheless, on the off chance that he/she doesn't utilize this example, yet reacts serenely and recommends that they examine the problem together, he/she is demonstrating proactive conduct.

(vi) Autonomy: Autonomy is utilizing and offering flexibility to plan and act in one's own circle. It creates shared regard and is probably going to bring about readiness to assume liability, singular activity, and better progression arranging. The primary marker of autonomy is compelling appointment in association and decrease in references made to senior individuals for approval of arranged actions.

(vii) Collaboration : Collaboration is offering assistance to and requesting assistance from others. It implies cooperating (with people and gatherings) to take care of problems and camaraderie. The result of collaboration incorporates sharing of encounters, improved correspondence, and improved asset sharing. The sign could be productivity reports, more gatherings, and inclusion of staff, more joint choices, better asset use, and higher nature of gatherings.

(viii) Experimenting : Experimenting implies utilizing and urging inventive approaches to take care of problems; utilizing criticism for improving, investigating things, and empowering inventiveness. We are so gotten up to speed with our day by day assignments that we regularly just utilize customary, attempted, and tried methods for managing problems.

Review of Literature

Mehralian, Nazari, Nooriparto, and Rasekh (2017) uncovered that total quality management (TQM) utilization can emphatically and fundamentally impact the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) and its four points of view. Considering the solid relationship amongst TQM and each of the four points of BSC, a boss ought to unequivocally utilize the utilization of TQM practices with a particular end goal to accomplish their vital destinations. Baumgartner and Rauter (2017) connected three distinct, but complementary dimensions of strategic management as viewed from the perspective of sustainability in order to encourage the integration of sustainability issues into corporate activities and strategies. These three dimensions are : strategy process, strategy content, and strategy context.

Bedarkar, Pandita, Agarwal, and Saini (2016) studied how organizational effectiveness was affected by the culture and knowledge management of an organization. The authors observed that organizational effectiveness can be improved by creating a culture which is customer centric and provides customer satisfaction. Andreeva and Kianto (2016) demonstrated that, dissimilar to what was hypothesized, strategic knowledge management (KM) did not moderately affect the relationships between other KM practices and innovation performance. However, strategic KM had the strongest direct impact, compared to other KM practices, on innovation performance and competitiveness.

Mishra, Patnaik, and Mishra (2016) indicated that the culture of optimism in an organization affected employee performance and led to job satisfaction. Sohal and Venkatesan (2016) suggested that maximum potential of the employees can be tapped by creating a congenial climate by human resource development which also leads to job satisfaction both in public and private banking.

Hladchenko (2015) contended that balanced scorecard provides a systemic perspective of the strategy of an advanced education institution. It guaranteed a full complex framework for implementation and controlling of the strategy and set a reason for further learning in the process of the strategic management of the advanced education institution according to the plan "design do-registration". Pandita and Bedarkar (2015) suggested that employees need to be considered as an integral part of the business organization. The study suggested that there was a huge impact of organizational culture and leadership on employee performance.

According to Kumari (2013), workers trust that the best administration offers significance to the human assets and every one of the representatives are dealt with compassionately in the association. The climate is likewise good as far as representatives being maneuvered carefully by seniors as they comprehend the slip-ups and don't make any strict disciplinary move, for example, rebuffing or demoralizing. There was additionally a decent amount of administration contribution in making work charming. A great piece of Spanco in regard to HRD was that the best administration comprehends the significance of human assets and really makes an interpretation of that acknowledgment into everyday practices and HR strategies. Taking everything into account, the general

HRD climate of Spanco was empowering. There was an unmistakable fascination of best administration in HRD, there was a high cooperation, and representatives considered preparing important. In spite of such positive base for HRD, the HRD component needs efficient extemporization.

White (2012) confirmed that an effective team improves the intellectual and creative thinking abilities, and additionally, the sociability of an individual. The formula empowered radical improvement in individuals, teams, and organizational performance. The formula was interesting and was the only methodology to empower a high-performing team to be built rapidly, delivering to any organization, a quantum jump in individual and team performance.

Kumari (2011) in her study estimated the level of worker fulfillment at Tata Steel. Preparing was the factor which added to representative fulfillment more than different variables. Alternate measurements crosswise over which worker fulfillment was estimated were : unrivaled subordinate relationship, part, culture, vocation advancement, objectives, and inspiration.

Davidson (2003) examined the authoritative atmosphere and progressive culture inside a motel industry structure. A contention was advanced that there was a causal connection between great progressive atmosphere and the level of administration quality in a motel. Authoritative atmosphere was moreover analyzed inside the administration quality system to investigate the impacts of its joining into quality activities.

Kur (1996) presented the faces model, another model of team development, which described teams utilizing five common patterns, called "faces." The model expected that teams wear one face, and then moved to wearing another in a somewhat random order, unless individuals proactively drive their teams to wear a face or take part in a pattern which they accepted was more desirable than the others. It described the "performance" look in detail, since it was the most desirable pattern for most teams in organizations. It also described approaches for moving typical teams from each of the other countenances to the performance confront. It took issue with numerous popular development models which described most groups as moving through a particular arrangement of patterns.

Margerison and McCann (1987) observed that all- round balanced teams would dependably outperform other teams which might have brilliant individuals, but as a team were deficient in one of the major team activities. Work carried out with chiefs to improve team performance was described. The standards involved and the route in which supervisors could develop effective team operations were described, including connecting, exploring, controlling, organizing, and advising.

Objective of the Study

To study the impact of work culture on the performance management system in a plastic manufacturer company.

Research Methodology

(1) Hypotheses

↪ **H0** : Working culture has no impact on the performance management system.

↪ **H1** : Working culture has an impact on the performance management system.

(2) Research Design

(i) Exploratory Research : The objective of exploratory research is to gather preliminary information that will help define problems and suggest hypotheses. The results of exploratory research are not usually useful for

decision-making by themselves, but they provide a significant insight into a given situation. The questionnaire was designed to examine the impact of working culture on the performance management system. Data was analyzed via SPSS.

(ii) Sample Design : The sample population comprised of employees working in a leading plastic manufacturer company. A total of 104 employees responded to the questionnaire. The sampling technique used is representative sampling, where all the employees at the corporate office in Gurgaon were considered on a probability basis, and from which information were obtained and statistical inferences or predictions were made about the entire population within the company. The study was conducted from April - August 2016.

(3) Data Collection

(i) Primary Data: The primary data were collected through the questionnaire method. A structured questionnaire was administered and employees were asked to fill it. A total of 104 employees responded to the questionnaire.

(ii) Questionnaire: The 4-point scale developed by Pareek (2003) has been used for the study. The tool OCTAPACE was used to measure the level of agreement employees had with respect to 40 questionnaire items, which represented potential factors that influenced employees' perception about the culture of the organization. The potential factors are : openness, confrontation, trust, authenticity, pro - action, autonomy, collaboration, and experimentation.

The survey was also designed to measure the level of agreement employees had with respect to 28 questionnaire items, which represented potential factors that influenced employees' perception about the performance management system of the organization. The potential factors are: benchmarking, goal setting, communication, feedback, transparency, and developmental focus.

(iii) Scale Used : Likert- type scaling technique was used for the analysis approach wherein a particular item was evaluated on the basis of how well it discriminates by adopting favorable or unfavorable attitude towards the given object. The respondents responded in any of the following ways: *strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly disagree*.

Data Analysis and Results

The analysis of the information provided by the employees is done on the basis of a few dimensions. Refer to Table 1 for mean and standard deviation, and Table 2 for the frequency of responses for various questions asked.

(i) Openness (W1) : Here, we can see that the mean of the parameter (openness) is 3.40. About 53% of the employees who responded to the questionnaire strongly agreed that the culture of the organization was open and around 36% agreed with it, while only small number of employees disagreed with this statement.

(ii) Confrontation (W2) : The mean of the parameter confrontation is 3.10, which shows that most of the employees agreed that they faced the problems rather than shying away from them and they conducted a deeper analysis of the interpersonal problems, while around 15% of the employees disagreed with this.

(iii) Trust (W3) : The mean of the parameter trust is 2.98, which means most of the employees in the organization agreed that they were offered moral support and help during crisis, while around 19% of the employees disagreed with this statement and felt that they could not trust seniors while sharing confidential information.

Table 1. Mean & Standard Deviation of the Factors of Work Culture

| | W1 (Openness) | W2 (Confrontation) | W3 (Trust) | W4 (Authenticity) | W5 (Pro- action) | W6 (Autonomy) | W7 (Collaboration) | W8 (Experimentation) |
|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Mean | 3.40 | 3.10 | 2.98 | 2.91 | 3.29 | 3.01 | 3.31 | 3.19 |
| Std. deviation | .730 | .721 | .653 | .710 | .707 | .770 | .739 | .628 |

Table 2. Frequency (%) of the Factors of Work Culture

| | Valid % | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| | W1 (Openness) | W2 (Confrontation) | W3 (Trust) | W4 (Authenticity) | W5 (Pro-action) | W6 (Autonomy) | W7 (Collaboration) | W8 (Experimentation) |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 5 | 1.5 | 0 |
| <i>Disagree</i> | 8.8 | 15.4 | 21.9 | 10 | 18.8 | 13.8 | 11.9 | 11.9 |
| <i>Agree</i> | 36.2 | 52.7 | 56.9 | 46.2 | 60.8 | 55.8 | 40.4 | 56.9 |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 53.1 | 30 | 18.5 | 42.3 | 19.2 | 25.4 | 46.2 | 31.2 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

(iv) Authenticity (W4) : The mean of the parameter authenticity is 2.91, which means most of the employees agreed that congruity existed between feelings and expressed behavior, they owned up the mistakes made, and believed that people are what they seem to be. Around 22% of the respondents disagreed with this. They believed in tactfulness and little manipulation to get the things done.

(v) Pro - Action (W5) : The mean of the parameter pro - action is 3.29, which shows that most of the employees agreed and believed in taking initiatives and preventive action and around 42% strongly agreed with this, while a certain percentage of the employees disagreed that seniors encouraged them to think about development and take action in that direction.

(vi) Autonomy (W6) : Mean of the parameter autonomy is 3.01, which means most of the employees agreed that they took independent action relating to their job, were provided with close supervision of action, and believed that they should be given autonomy to plan their own work. However, a small percentage of employees disagreed with this, and believed that freedom leads to indiscipline.

(vii) Collaboration (W7) : Mean of the parameter collaboration is 3.31, which shows that most of the employees strongly agreed with team work and team spirit, appreciating help by others, and believing in performing immediate task rather than being concerned about organizational goals, while 12% of the employees disagreed with this.

(viii) Experimentation (W8) : The mean of the parameter experimentation has come out to be 3.19, which shows that most of the employees who responded to the questionnaire agreed that they were encouraged to take innovative approach to solve problems and to take a fresh look at how things are done and that they made genuine efforts to change their behavior on the basis of the feedback received and believed that stability is more important than experimentation, while some of the employees disagreed with trying out new ways of solving issues.

Table 3. Mean & Standard Deviation of the Factors of Performance Management System

| | P1 (Benchmarking) | P2 (Goal Setting) | P3 (Communication) | P4 (Feedback) | P5 (Transparency) | P6 (Developmental focus) |
|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Mean | 2.9154 | 3.3077 | 3.0615 | 3.1058 | 2.9327 | 2.9346 |
| Std. Deviation | .80494 | .72247 | .61144 | .69999 | .64025 | .40177 |

Table 4. Frequency (%) of the Factors of Performance Management System

| | Valid % | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| | P1 (Benchmarking) | P2 (Goal Setting) | P3 (Communication) | P4 (Feedback) | P5 (Transparency) | P6 (Developmental focus) |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 3.1 | 0 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Disagree</i> | 27.7 | 15.4 | 11.2 | 13.9 | 24 | 11.5 |
| <i>Agree</i> | 43.8 | 38.5 | 66.9 | 55.8 | 58.7 | 83.5 |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 25.4 | 46.1 | 20.4 | 28.4 | 17.3 | 5 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Refer to Table 3 for mean and standard deviation, and Table 4 for the frequency of responses for various questions asked.

(i) Benchmarking (P1) : Here, we can see that the mean of the parameter benchmarking has come out to be 2.19, which shows that most of the employees agreed that benchmarking is done at the end of the year, their rating is based on competencies and KRAs, while 27% of the employees disagreed with this.

(ii) Goal Setting (P2) : The mean of the parameter goal setting is 3.30. Around 46% of the employees strongly agreed that goals were revised and well defined and 39% of the employees agreed with this. However, a small percentage of the employees disagreed that goals were mutually agreed upon.

(iii) Communication (P3) : The mean of the parameter communication is 3.06, which means most of the employees agreed that managers helped them in getting clear ideas, managers interacted with them about their performance, and the communication process was such that they felt free to express their disagreement regarding appraisal decisions, while around 11% of the employees disagreed with this and felt that the appraisal system did not provide for free interaction between the appraiser and appraisee.

(iv) Feedback (P4) : The mean of the parameter feedback is 3.10, which shows that most of the employees were satisfied with the feedback system and agreed that their manager provided them with feedback which helped them in improving their performance and to know their weak areas. However, a small percentage of the employees disagreed with it that they got proper updates regarding their case.

(v) Transparency (P5) : The mean of the parameter transparency is 2.93. Most of the employees agreed that the appraisal system gave them an idea of what is expected of them. However, a small percentage of the employees disagreed that the appraiser is known, factors against which they are rated are known, and comments shared by the appraiser are known to them.

Table 5. Model Summary

| Model | <i>R</i> | <i>R</i> ² |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | .175 ^a | .031 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), work culture

b. Dependent variable, PMS

Table 6. Hypothesis

| Model | <i>R</i> | <i>R</i> ² |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| | .175 ^a | .031 |

(vi) Developmental Focus (P6) : The mean of the parameter developmental focus is 2.93. Most of the employees agreed that job rotation was practiced to develop them, and the appraisal system brings out their training needs. However, 12% of the employees disagreed with the statement that training is provided to improve their performance.

✍ **Regression :** Regression analysis is a statistical tool for the investigation of relationships between variables. Usually, the investigator seeks to ascertain the causal effect of one variable upon another. For this, work culture has been assumed to be the independent variable and performance management system to be the dependent variable.

From Table 5, it can be inferred that the value of *R* is 0.17, which indicates a low degree of correlation. *R*² explains how much of the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variable. In this case, the value of *R*² is 0.031, which means for every 100% change in the independent variable - work culture, a 3.1% change will occur in the dependent variable - performance management system. Hence, we can say that there is not a very strong impact of work culture on the performance management system.

From the Table 6, we can see that the value of *R* is 0.17, which indicates that there is a low degree of correlation between the independent variable (work culture) and the dependent variable (performance management system). The value of *R*² is 0.031, which indicates that work culture does not have a strong impact on the performance management system of the organization. Even though 3.1% is a very small percentage, but the above results still affirm that there is an effect of work culture (though very small) on the performance management system. Thereby, the research accepts the alternate hypothesis H1, and rejects the null hypothesis.

Managerial Implications

A manager's part in a company's culture depends on how the business wants the manager to connect with different employees and how much expert advice the business gives the manager.

✍ **The Manager as a Disciplinarian :** A small business organizational culture may drive a manager into the part of a disciplinarian to police and right representative conduct. A manager in a disciplinarian part may have a troublesome time establishing interpersonal relationships with different employees because workers see the manager as an expert figure first and a colleague a distant second.

✍ **Interaction with Employees :** A disseminated leadership culture allows managers to fabricate better working relationships with employees while still supervising representative execution and answering to company owners. Managers in this model accomplish a more casual type of communication with subordinates because employees see them as real individuals and not simply the manifestation of the business's will.

✍ **Setting an Example :** Regardless of the organizational culture, a manager must serve as the model for that culture for different employees to copy. The speedier a manager can illustrate the correct model of a company's desired culture, the faster employees will receive it.

✚ **Rewarding Legitimate Conduct** : Compensating employees for propagating appropriate organizational culture shows workers that owners and administration esteem every specialist's place in the company and are serious about looking after standards.

Recommendations and Conclusion

The organization can focus on improving the following :

- ✚ The organization ought to urge its workers to help different representatives amid the season of emergency with goals so that they don't feel they took off alone.
- ✚ Conduct week by week gatherings amongst workers and administrators, where representatives get an opportunity to collaborate with the director. This will help in creating trust and representatives would have the capacity to impart data to the administrator with no dread.
- ✚ Supervisors ought to urge workers to consider their advancement and direct them in making a move.
- ✚ Employees ought to be urged to take up better approaches for tackling issues.
- ✚ The company should conduct classes and distinctive exercises to create camaraderie among representatives.
- ✚ HR should take a guarantee that the set of working responsibilities plainly characterize KRAs.
- ✚ Employees ought to be associated with the procedure of objective setting.
- ✚ HR should ensure that the representatives get enough criticism with respect to their case.
- ✚ Transparency ought to be there in the PMS of the association. HR can guarantee this by imparting remarks to representatives with respect to their exhibitions, by telling them who is evaluating them.
- ✚ Training ought to be given to workers in the wake of recognizing their preparation needs with the goal that they can defeat their weaknesses.

Different parameters were considered for work culture and execution of administration framework. The connection between work culture and execution administration framework was examined and the impact of the work culture on PMS was discovered to be 3.1%, which is less.

Limitations of the Study and Scope for Further Research

Since the whole population of employees was not considered in sampling and only a segment was considered, there was a probability of biasness. Misunderstanding of the questions could contribute to inaccuracies in the data. The responses might have been affected by the amount of work and working conditions.

It would be interesting to conduct another study within the same area of research, with the incorporation of more industries and more departments, which will give more integrated results to the topic and better utility to the consultants and management. It could be of interest to conduct a study on more areas of work and including the different levels of employees which would give a more comprehensive understanding and overview of the difference in the weak and strong organizational culture practices within different levels in the organizations.

Since the organization culture is pervasive to different departments, and even different organization related topics like, organizational socialization, organizational commitment, dual commitment, organizational climate, organizational stress, organizational efficiency, organizational reward system, organizational communication system, organizational citizenship behaviour, mergers and acquisitions, global changes, role of trade unions, trust,

etc, would ,therefore, be interesting to study. A study incorporating many socio-demographic and bio-socio variables would be interesting to find out the impact of organizational culture on occupational health, industrial safety, and hygiene etc.

References

- Andreeva, T., & Kianto, A. (2016, January). Does strategic management of knowledge matter for organizational performance ? An empirical test. *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2016, No. 1). New York : Academy of Management.
- Baumgartner, R. J., & Rauter, R. (2017). Strategic perspectives of corporate sustainability management to develop a sustainable organization. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 140 (Part 1), 81-92.
- Bedarkar, M., Pandita, D., Agarwal, R., & Saini, R. (2016). Examining the impact of organizational culture on customer centricity in organizations: An analysis. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, 9 (2), 19 - 28. doi:10.17010/pijom/2016/v9i2/87229
- Davidson, M. C. G. (2003). Does organizational climate add to service quality in hotels ? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15 (4), 206 - 213.
- Hladchenko, M. (2015). Balanced scorecard - A strategic management system of the higher education institution. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 29 (2), 167-176.
- Kumari, N. (2011). A live study of employee satisfaction and growth analysis: Tata Steel. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 3(10), 53 - 62.
- Kumari, N. (2013). Factors influencing the HRD climate of an organization. *International Journal of Management and Sustainability*, 2 (10), 156 - 171.
- Kur, E. (1996). The faces model of high performing team development. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 17(1), 32 - 41.
- Margerison, C., & McCann, D. (1987). High performing managerial teams. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 1 (1), 15 - 20.
- Mehralian, G., Nazari, J. A., Nooriparto, G., & Rasekh, H. R. (2017). TQM and organizational performance using the balanced scorecard approach. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 66(1), 111-125.
- Mishra, U. S., Patnaik, S., & Mishra, B. B. (2016). Role of optimism on employee performance and job satisfaction. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, 9(6), 35 - 46. doi:10.17010/pijom/2016/v9i6/94960
- Pandita, D., & Bedarkar, M. (2015). Factors affecting employee performance : A conceptual study on the drivers of employee engagement. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, 8 (7), 29 - 40. doi:10.17010/pijom/2015/v8i7/72347
- Pareek, U. (2003). *Training instruments in HRD and OD* (2nd ed). New Delhi : Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited.

- Sohal, A., & Venkatesan, M. (2016). HRD climate and job satisfaction of public and private sector banks. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, 9 (3), 7-18. doi:10.17010/pijom/2016/v9i3/89175
- White, R. E. (2012). Building high - performing teams rapidly. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 44 (7), 424 - 428.

About the Authors

Dr. Neeraj Kumari is presently working as an Associate Professor in the Department of Humanities & Management, FET, Manav Rachna International Institute of Research and Studies, NAAC Accredited 'A' Grade University, Faridabad, Haryana. She has done Ph.D. with distinction in Management. She has published and presented more than 110 research papers in international/national journals and conferences. She has also authored six books and is serving as an Editorial Team Member for 18 international Journals.

At present, Dr. Devi Singh is working as Professor & Head, Department of Physics, Faculty of Engineering & Technology, Manav Rachna International Institute of Research and Studies. He has done Ph.D. from Delhi University. He has received Fellowships from MHRD and CSIR. He has an experience of about 21 years in teaching and research and has published 23 research papers in international/national journals and conferences. He has also organized and attended conferences, workshops, FDPs, and short term courses. Five Ph.D. Scholars are also under his supervision.