DEMOGRAPHIC DETERMINANTS OF WORK PERFORMANCE OF EMPLOYEES OF HIMACHAL PRADESH POWER CORPORATION LIMITED

Reetika Thakur[*]

Abstract

The success and survival of an organization depends to a great extent on its employees' performance. If the employees perform satisfactorily, the organization also prospers. People are the most important asset in an organization as they are essential for the optimum utilization of all the other organizational resources (Sandrick, 2003).

The present study is focused on assessment of impact of demographic variables on the work performance of employees of Himachal Pradesh Power Corporation Limited (HPPCL). A sample of 200 HPPCL employees has been selected by using convenience sampling technique.

Results of the study show that age has a statistically significant impact on the work performance of employees. Gender, hierarchical level, income and marital status have, however, been found to have no statistically significant impact on work performance. The employees of HPPCL have been found to perform their duties satisfactorily. Task Performance and Contextual Performance have been found to contribute to the Overall Work Performance of an employee, whereas Counter-productive Work Behaviorhas been found to decrease the Overall Work Performance.

Keywords: *Work Performance, Task Performance, Contextual Performance, Counter-productive Work Behavior, Demographic Determinants.*

Doctoral Research Fellow, Himachal Pradesh University Business School, H.P. University, Summer Hill, Shimla-5, H.P., Mob.: 094189-29202, e-mail: reetikathakur2009@gmail.com

Introduction

People (employees or human resources) form an integral part of an organization. The success and failure of an organization is largely determined by its workforce (Sandrick, 2003). An organization having the right mix of people has a competitive advantage over other organizations (Aarthy & Nandhini, 2016). Satisfactory employee/work performance also ensures better and improved organizational performance. Hence, for ensuring overall organizational profitability and success, it is of immense importance to take into account the demographic characteristics of the employees, and to understand their influence on the performance of employees. An organization must make continuous efforts to enhance the employee/work performance in order to ensure its growth and prosperity.

Work Performance

Assessment of employee/work performance from time to time is of great importance for organizations as it facilitates them with the information regarding how good or bad the employees are performing, in which direction is the organization going; and that what needs to be done to improve the performance further.

By doing so, organizations can also keep a track of their available skill and competence pool. This also enables organizations to acknowledge the achievements of employees, and to discover their potential for further improvement. Moreover, the necessary corrective measures can be taken for improving the performance of those employees who did not perform well. The employees can also get a fair idea of their strengths, capacities, competencies, potentials, skills and weaknesses; and can further enhance their strengths and work on their weaknesses.

Employee/work performance implies the actions and behaviors of people in an organization, which are focused at achievement of the goals and targets decided by an organization, and the results or outcomes of such actions and behaviors.

According to Viswesvaran & Ones(2000), Work Performance can be defined as: "scalable actions, behavior and outcomes that employees engage in or bring about that are linked with and contribute to organizational goals."

Prawirosentono (2000) stated that performance signifies outcomes of an individual's or a group's work in an organization, exercising suitable authority and responsibility, complying with the laws, moral and ethical considerations, and with the aim of achieving the organizational goals.

Robbins (2001) pointed out that when employees are contented and happy with the work-related tasks, then their performance improves to a great extent and they perform better.

Mangkunegara (2005) defined employee performance as the work outcome in terms of both quality and quantity, which is achieved by someone in conducting his/her responsibility.

Employee Performance has also been defined by Cascio (2006) as the degree of fulfilment of the mission and targets of an organization by its employees. So, the extent to which the employees of an organization are able to achieve the mission, goals and targets decided for them by the organization can be referred to as employee performance.

Performance has also been explained by Prasetya & Kato (2011) as the outcomes of the work carried out by skilled workers in some specific situations.

Dimensions of Work Performance

Work Performance has been measured with the help of three dimensions: Task performance, Contextual performance, and Counter-productive Work Behavior.

(i)   Task Performance (TP): Task Performance can be understood as the effectiveness with which employees carry out those activities which contribute to the organization's technical core either directly by implementing a part of its technological process, or indirectly by lending to it the needed materials or services (Borman &Motowidlo, 1993). For

example, in a sales job, task performance might include knowledge about product details, sale closure, and time and organization management.

(ii)   Contextual Performance (CP): Contextual Performance can be understood as carrying out those activities which enable enhancement of organizational effectiveness by moulding the social, psychological, and organizational context which acts as a catalyst for task (performance) activities and processes. For example, volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally part of the job, and helping and cooperating with others in the organization to get tasks accomplished can be termed as contextual performance activities (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993).

(iii)   Counter-productive Work Behavior (CWB): Counter-productive Work Behavior can be understood as a voluntary behavior which violates crucial organizational norms, and, in so doing, threatens the well-being of the organization or its members, or both (Robinson &Bennett, 1995). Examples of individually-oriented CWBs include: being rude to others and misbehaving with others, and examples of organizationally-oriented CWBs include: taking office property without permission and deliberately performing poorly (Bennett & Robinson, 2000).

Review of Related Literature

Results of a study conducted by Wood (1987) revealed that heterogeneous gender group of employees performed better than the homogeneous gender group of employees.

Pelled (1997) examined the influence of gender diversity on group performance outcomes. Results of this study showed that gender diversity had negative effects on group performance outcomes when the sample had male dominance, whereas no effects were observed for a female dominated sample.

An inverted U-shaped relationship was found by Frink, et al (2003) between gender diversity and organizational performance. Gender diversity showed a positive effect on organizational performance in the service industry and a negative effect on organizational performance in the manufacturing industry. Thus, service industry must ensure gender diversity for enhancing

organizational performance. On the contrary, manufacturing industry should refrain from gender diversity as it may deteriorate its performance.

Richard, et al (2004) also found an inverted U-shaped relationship between management group gender heterogeneity/diversity and productivity. It was observed that management groups with moderate heterogeneity/diversity exhibited better performance as compared to the groups with gender homogeneity.

Findings of a study carried out by Gupta (2013) reported that a moderate level of gender heterogeneity/diversity increases competitive advantage while a higher level of gender heterogeneity/diversity deteriorates organizational performance.

Leonard & Levine (2003) observed in their study that the retail stores which had employees with greater diversity in age were less profitable as compared to the retail stores which had less age diversity among their employees.

Hamilton, Nickerson& Owan (2004) carried out a study discussing simple production technology. Findings of this study indicated that the productivity of teams with greater age diversity among employees was significantly lesser in comparison to the teams comprising employees with less age diversity.

Results of a study conducted by Ilmarinen (2005), however, showed that there was no relation between age and employee/work performance.

Studies show that many organizations fail to utilize the talents of aged and old workers/employees effectively and optimally due to certain conjectures and stereotypes that they are costly, more susceptible to health issues, rigid and less flexible in incorporating and adapting to changes (especially in technology), less enthusiastic and zealous, poor performers in contrast to their younger counterparts, and are a poor return on training and development investment (McGregor & Gray, 2002; Davey & Cornwall, 2003; Taylor, 2003; Davey, 2006).

Contrary to the aforementioned results of past research studies, many other studies reveal that even aged and older workers/employees are as productive

and skilled as their younger counterparts. Thus, a heterogeneous or more diverse age group of employees would be more productive than a homogeneous or less diverse age group (Williams & O'Reilly, 1998; Zenger& Lawrence, 1989).

Results of a study conducted by Hussain & Mujtaba (2012) revealed that employee performance was not affected by both gender and marital status of the employees.

Kaveri & Prabakaran (2013) discussed the relationship of various demographic variables with employee performance, and findings of this study showed that age, gender, educational qualification, income, experience, and job position have a positive relationship with the performance of employees.

Darwin& Palanisamy (2015) concluded in their study that age, ethnicity and gender of the employees have no influence on their performance.

Research Gap

A thoroughgoing review of literature related to Work Performance has been carried out for this study. This comprehensive review of existing and related literature brought to light that there is a paucity of research on the Demographic Determinants of Work Performance, especially in a Public Sector Undertaking (PSU) like Himachal Pradesh Power Corporation Limited (HPPCL), in the state of Himachal Pradesh. Moreover, no such study has been found to be carried out in the past, hence a need was felt to carry out a study to assess the impact of various demographic variables on the work performance of employees of HPPCL.

Objectives of the Study

1. To assess the Work Performance of employees of Himachal Pradesh Power Corporation Limited.
2. To assess the impact of some demographic variables, viz. age, gender, hierarchical level, income and marital status on the Work Performance of employees of Himachal Pradesh Power Corporation Limited.

Research Hypotheses

H_{01}- There is no significant difference in the Work Performance of the employees of HPPCL on the basis of gender.

H_{02}- There is no significant difference in the Work Performance of the employees of HPPCL on the basis of age.

H_{03}- There is no significant difference in the Work Performance of the employees of HPPCL on the basis of hierarchical level.

H_{04}- There is no significant difference in the Work Performance of the employees of HPPCL on the basis of income.

H_{05}- There is no significant difference in the Work Performance of the employees of HPPCL on the basis of marital status.

Research Methodology

Using convenience sampling technique, a sample of 200 employees of HPPCL was selected from various offices of HPPCL- the Corporate office (Shimla), Design office (Sundernagar) and various projects in the state of Himachal Pradesh. Data was collected through the use of primary as well as secondary sources of data collection. A questionnaire consisting of two parts- the first part consisting of Demographic Profile of the respondents and the second part consisting of a questionnaire developed by Koopmans in her study on "Measuring Individual Work Performance" was used for collecting primary data related to the work performance of the employees of HPPCL. Reliability of the questionnaire was checked with the help of Cronbach's alpha, which was .704. Journals, publications, internet etc. were used as a source of secondary data. Frequencies and percentages, descriptive statistics, independent samples t-test and one-way ANOVA (Analysis Of Variance) were used as tools for data analysis in SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) software.

Findings of the Study

Findings of the present study have been presented in the following section-

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents (N=200)

Demographic Determinant	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	169	84.5

	Female	31	15.5
Age (in years)	Below 30	32	16.0
	30-50	99	49.5
	Above 50	69	34.5
Hierarchical Level	W1-W5	15	7.5
	W6-W11	06	3.0
	S1-S4	57	28.5
	E0-E4	85	42.5
	E5-E9	37	18.5
Annual Income (in Rs)	<2 Lacs	11	5.5
	2-5 Lacs	52	26.0
	5-10 Lacs	109	54.5
	>10 Lacs	28	14.0
Marital Status	Single	29	14.5
	Married	171	85.5

Table 1 displays the demographic profile of the respondents for the present study. Frequencies and percentages have been used to understand the demographic profile of the respondents. Findings presented in Table 1 show that 169 (84.5%) out of 200 respondents were males and only 31 (15.5%) were females. This reveals that there is a gender disparity among the employees of HPPCL. Findings further show that almost half of the respondents (99 out of 200 employees, i.e., 49.5%) lie in the age group of 30-50, 34.5% (69 out of 200 employees) were above 50 years of age, and 16% (32 out of 200 employees) were below 30 years of age.

Findings exhibited in Table 1 also reveal that 7.5% of the respondents (15 out of 200 employees) were workers falling under W1-W5 levels, 3% (6 out of 200 employees) were workers working at W6-W11 hierarchical levels, 28.5% of the respondents (57 out of 200 employees) corresponded to S1-S4 supervisory levels, 42.5% (85 out of 200 employees) were executives falling under the executive levels ranging from E0-E4, and the remaining 18.5% executives (37 out of 200 employees) were from middle and top management.

Table 1 also presents the frequencies and percentages for the annual income of the respondents for the present study. Findings show that only 5.5% of the employees (11 out of 200 employees) earned less than Rs. 2 lacs per annum,

26% of the employees (52 out of 200 employees) had an annual income of Rs. 2-5 lacs per annum, majority of the employees, i.e., 54.5% (109 out of 200 employees) were found to have an annual income of Rs. 5-10 lacs per annum, and the remaining 14% of the employees (28 out of 200 employees) had an annual income of more than Rs. 10 lacs per annum.

Findings displayed in Table 1 also revealed that majority of the employees, i.e., 85.5% (171 out of 200 employees) were married whereas merely 14.5% of the employees (29 out of 200 employees) were found to be single.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Work Performance Dimension	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. Task Performance	200	4.06	.59
2. Contextual Performance	200	3.78	.56
3. Counter-productive Work Behaviour	200	2.32	.51
Overall Work Performance	200	3.45	.35
Valid N (list wise)	200		

Table 2 displays the findings of descriptive statistics which show that means of two dimensions of Work Performance, viz. Task Performance (4.06) and Contextual Performance (3.78) are greater than 3.5, which signifies that the employees of HPPCL often performed satisfactorily. Third dimension of Work Performance- Counter-productive Work Behavior, however, has a low mean score (2.32) which shows that the employees got frequently involved in those activities which deteriorated and negatively influenced their work performance.

Task Performance has, thus, been found to have the highest mean (4.06), whereas 'Counter-productive Work Behavior' has the lowest mean (2.32). Overall Work Performance has been found to have a mean value of 3.45 which reflects that the work performance of HPPCL employees was often satisfactory. The value of standard deviation has also been found to lie between 0.3and 0.6.

Table 3: Independent Samples t-test for measuring the impact of Gender on Work Performance of employees

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.* (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Overall Work Performance	Equal Variances Assumed	.951	.331	-.293	198	.770	-.01983	.06770	-.15334	.11368
	Equal Variances not Assumed			-.301	42.723	.765	-.01983	.06599	-.15293	.11327

Findings of Independent Samples t-test which has been used to measure the impact of Gender on Work Performance of employees of HPPCL are displayed in Table 3. Findings presented in this table reveal that there was no statistically significant difference in the work performance of male and female employees (t198=-.293, p=.770). As p>.05 in this case, therefore, it can be concluded that gender does not have a statistically significant impact on the work performance of employees. Hence, H01stating that there is no significant difference in the Work Performance of the employees of HPPCL on the basis of gender is accepted.

Table 4: One-way ANOVA for measuring the impact of Age on Work Performance of employees

Overall Work Performance					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.105	2	.552	4.799	.009
Within Groups	22.678	197	.115		
Total	23.782	199			

One-way ANOVA has been used to assess the influence of age on Work Performance of employees, the findings of which are exhibited in Table 4. In

this case, p=.009 which is less than .05 level of significance, hence, it can be inferred that there is a statistically significant difference in the work performance of employees of different ages (F = 4.799, p< .05). So, age has been found to have a statistically significant impact on the work performance of employees. Hence, H02stating that there is no significant difference in the Work Performance of the employees of HPPCL on the basis of age is rejected.

Table 5: One-way ANOVA for measuring the impact of Hierarchical Level on Work Performance of employees

Overall Work Performance					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.538	4	.135	1.129	.344
Within Groups	23.244	195	.119		
Total	23.782	199			

Impact of hierarchical level on Work Performance of employees has also been understood by the help of One-way ANOVA. Findings of this test have been presented in Table 5, which clearly show that hierarchical level of an employee does not have a statistically significant influence on his/her work performance as the p-value in this case is .344 which is greater than .05. Hence, H_{03} stating that there is no significant difference in the Work Performance of the employees of HPPCL on the basis of hierarchical level is accepted.

Table 6: One-way ANOVA for measuring the impact of Income on Work Performance of employees

Overall Work Performance					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.323	3	.108	.900	.442
Within Groups	23.459	196	.120		
Total	23.782	199			

The effect of income on Work Performance has also been assessed with the help of One-way ANOVA, the findings of which have been exhibited in Table 6. These findings reveal that in this case, p-value is .442 which is greater than .05. Thus, it can be concluded that income does not have a statistically significant impact on the work performance of employees. Hence, H_{04} stating that there is no significant difference in the Work Performance of the employees of HPPCL on the basis of income is **accepted.**

Table 7: Independent Samples t-test for measuring the impact of Marital Status on Work Performance of employees

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.* (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Overall Work Performance	Equal Variances Assumed	.671	.414	-1.962	198	.051	-.13522	.06893	-.27116	.00072
	Equal Variances not Assumed			-1.790	35.720	.082	-.13522	.07556	-.28850	.01806

Independent Samples t-test has been used to understand the influence of marital status of an employee on employee/work performance, the findings of which are presented in Table 7. It can be clearly seen that there is no statistically significant difference in the work performance of single and married employees (t198=-1.962, p=.051). As p>.05 in this case, therefore, it can be inferred that marital status does not have a statistically significant impact on the work performance of employees. Hence, H_{05} stating that there is no significant difference in the Work Performance of the employees of HPPCL on the basis of marital status is **accepted.**

Findings of this study, thus, show that majority of the employees in HPPCL are males, married, in the age group of 30-50 years, working at E0-E4 executive levels, and earning Rs. 5-10 lacs per annum.

Findings also reveal that the employees of HPPCL often performed their duties on the job satisfactorily. Employees have been found to often perform various task and contextual activities satisfactorily. However, they have also been found to be frequently engaged in Counter-productive Work Behavior. Results of this study also reveal that age of employees has a statistically significant impact on their work performance. Gender, hierarchical level, income and marital status of employees have, however, been found to have no statistically significant impact on their work performance.

Discussion

Results exhibited in Table 1 clearly show that the employees of HPPCL often performed various task and contextual activities satisfactorily though there is a great room for improvement. The employees have also been found to be frequently engaged in Counter-productive Work Behavior which deteriorates their Overall Work Performance. Also, the Overall Work Performance of employees was found to be often satisfactory.

Standard deviation lies in the range of 0.3 to 0.6, which means that the employees did not differ much in their opinions regarding the various dimensions of Work Performance.

Results of frequencies and percentages presented in Table 2 show that most of the respondents for the present study were young (30-50 years old), married, males falling under the E0-E4 executive levels, and having an annual income of Rs. 5-10 lacs per annum.

The demographic profile of HPPCL looks good in all other aspects except gender as a huge gender disparity appears to exist in this organization (84.5% males and 15.5% females).

Results of Independent Samples t-test used to measure the impact of Gender on Work Performance of employees of HPPCL displayed in Table 3 reveal that there was no statistically significant difference in the work performance

of employees on the basis of their gender. This signifies that there is no statistically significant difference in the work performance of male and female employees in HPPCL.

This result could be attributed to the fact that both males and females have equal opportunities, aptitudes, capabilities, skills, talents etc.

Results of One-way ANOVA used to assess the influence of age on Work Performance of employees exhibited in Table 4 show that there is a statistically significant difference in the work performance of employees of on the basis of their age. So, age has been found to have a statistically significant impact on the work performance of employees. This implies that the employees of different ages will perform their work differently.

This may be due to the difference in the enthusiasm and zeal to work, expertise, experience, knowledge, physical strength, memory and mental astuteness etc. among individuals of different age.

One-way ANOVA has also been used to understand the impact of hierarchical level on Work Performance of employees, the results of which have been presented in Table 5.These results clearly show that hierarchical level of an employee does not have a statistically significant influence on his/her work performance.

This could be because all the employees in this organization perform their work satisfactorily at their corresponding hierarchical levels as they have the required aptitudes, attitudes, knowledge, skills, and talents etc.

Table 6 displays the results of One-way ANOVA which has been used to measure the effect of income on Work Performance. These results reveal that income does not have a statistically significant impact on the work performance of employees.

This result could have been due to the fact that it is a government organization and unlike private organizations, the wages and salaries (income) of employees are higher, more stable and secure. Thus, it can be inferred that income does not play any statistically significant role in

increasing or decreasing an individual's work performance in this organization.

Results of Independent Samples t-test used to understand the influence of marital status of an employee on work performance presented in Table 7 clearly show that there is no statistically significant difference in the work performance of single and married employees. It can be, thus, inferred that marital status does not have a statistically significant impact on the work performance of employees.

This could be because of the reason that both the single as well as the married employees have equal opportunities at work, and have aptitudes, attitudes, knowledge, intellect etc. independent of their marital status.

Suggestions

- A huge gender disparity seems to exist in HPPCL. However, one of the findings revealed that gender has no statistically significant impact on work performance of employees, it is still suggested that efforts should be made to reduce this gender disparity by recruiting more females in future.
- Efforts should be made to check the Counter-productive Work Behavior among employees as they have been found to be frequently involved in such activities which deteriorate their performance. Certain measures like regular counseling, mentoring, establishing grievance redressal system, taking disciplinary action against individuals involved in counter-productive activities among others could be adopted.
- Task Performance and Contextual Performance should also be further improved in order to improve the Overall Work Performance. This can be done by encouraging and inculcating planning, completion of work with minimal time and effort, initiative, taking challenging tasks, actively participating in meetings and consultations, creative solutions etc.
- Age has been found to significantly affect the work performance of employees. Therefore, it is suggested that the employees should be given work on the basis of their age.

- Gender, hierarchical level, income and marital status have been found to have no significant effect on work performance. Therefore, it is suggested that there should be no discrimination while assigning work to employees on the basis of the aforementioned demographic variables.

Conclusion

Every organization is interested in knowing how well its employees perform, and what are the different factors or things which influence employee performance, so that various measures can be adopted to enhance and improve employee/work performance. One of these factors could be the demographic characteristics/variables of the employees which could have an impact on the performance of employees.

Therefore, the present study has been carried out to assess the impact of various demographic characteristics on work performance of employees. Results of the study reveal that age has a statistically significant impact on the work performance of employees. This finding is in consonance with the results of some previous studies (Zenger & Lawrence, 1989; Williams& O'Reilly, 1998; Hamilton, Nickerson& Owan, 2004; Kaveri & Prabakaran, 2013). However, this finding is inconsistent with the results of some studies conducted in the past (Ilmarinen, 2005; Darwin & Palanisamy, 2015). Gender, hierarchical level, income and marital status have, however, been found to have no statistically significant impact on work performance. This result is in tune with the results of some previous studies (Hussain& Mujtaba, 2012; Darwin& Palanisamy, 2015). However, this result is inconsistent with the results of some studies carried out in the past (Kaveri& Prabakaran, 2013; Gupta, 2013). The employees of HPPCL have been found to perform their duties satisfactorily. Two dimensions of Work Performance, namely, Task Performance and Contextual Performance have been found to contribute to the Overall Work Performance of an employee, whereas the third dimension of Work Performance, i.e., Counter-productive Work Behavior (as the name suggests) has been found to decrease the Overall Work Performance of an employee, and to cause a decline and deterioration in an employee's ability to perform well on the job assigned to him/her.

References

1. Aarthy, M., and Nandhini, M. (2016). A study on quality of work life among the engineering college faculty members in Coimbatore district. International Journal of Management Research & Review, 6(7): 1051-1057.
2. Bennett, R.J., and Robinson, S.L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance.Journal of Applied Psychology, 85: 349-360.
3. Borman, W.C., and Motowidlo, S.J.(1993).Explaining the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance, In N Schmitt and WCBorman(Eds.), Personnel selection in organizations, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
4. Cascio, W.F. (2006).Managing Human Resources: Productivity, Quality of Life, Profits, McGraw-Hill, New York.
5. Darwin, J.R.,and Palanisamy, C.S. (2015). The Effects of Workforce Diversity on Employee Performance in Singapore Organisations.International Journal of Business Administration,6(2): 17-29.
6. Davey, J. (2006). The labour market, In Boston and Davey (Eds.), Implications of Population Ageing- Opportunities and Risks, Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University, Wellington.
7. Davey, J. and Cornwall, J. (2003). Maximising the potential of older workers. NZIRA Future Proofing New Zealand Series, New Zealand Institute for Research on Ageing, Victoria University, Wellington.
8. Frink, D.D., et al (2003). Gender demography and organizational performance: A two-study investigation with convergence. Group and Organization Management, 28: 127-147. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1059601102250025
9. Gupta, R. (2013). Workforce diversity and organizational performance. International Journal of Business and Management Invention,2(6): 36-41.
10. Hamilton, B.H., Nickerson, J.A.,and Owan, H. (2004). Diversity and productivity in production teams. Working Paper, Washington University, St. Louis.
11. Hussain, R.I., and Mujtaba, B.G. (2012). The Relationship between Work-Life Conflict and Employee Performance: A Study of National Database

and Registration Authority Workers in Pakistan. Journal of Knowledge Management, Economics and Information Technology, 2(6):01-11.

12. Ilmarinen, J. (2005). Towards a longer work life! Ageing and the quality of work life in the European Union, Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Helsinki.

13. Kaveri, M.,and Prabakaran, G. (2013). Impact of High Performance Human Resource Practices on Employee's Job Performance in Leather Goods Manufacturing Companies at Vellore District. Bonfring International Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management Science, 3(1):07-12.

14. Leonard, J.S. and Levine, D. (2003).Diversity, Discrimination and Performance, Institute for Research on Labour and Employment, UC Berkeley, California.

15. Mangkunegara, A.A.A.P. (2005). Human Resources Evaluation, Reflika Aditama, Bandung.

16. McGregor, J., and Gray, L. (2002). Stereotypes and older workers: the New Zealand experience. Social Policy Journal of New Zealand, 18: 163-177.

17. Pelled, L.H. (1997). Relational demography and perceptions of group conflict and performance. International Journal of Conflict Resolution, 22(1): 54-57.

18. Prasetya, A., and Kato, M. (2011).The effect of financial and non financial compensation to the employee performance, 2nd International Research Symposium in Service Management.

19. Prawirosentono, S. (2000). Employee Performance Policy, Yogyakarta, BPFE.

20. Richard, O.C.,et al (2004). Cultural diversity in management, firm performance, and the moderating role of entrepreneurial orientation dimensions. Academy of Management Journal, 47(2): 255-266. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/20159576

21. Robbins, S.P. (2001).Organizational Behavior, Pearson Education International, New Jersey.

22. Robinson, S.L., and Bennett, R.J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. Academy of Management Journal, 38: 555-572.

23. Sandrick, K. (2003). Putting the emphasis on employees as an award winning employer, Baptist healthcare has distant memories of the workforce shortage. Trustee, January: 6-10.
24. Taylor, P. (2003). Global ageing- meeting the business challenges, Paper prepared for symposium: An Ageless Workforce- Opportunities for Business, Sydney, 27th August.
25. Viswesvaran, C., and Ones, D.S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. International Journal of Selection and Assessment,8 (4): 216-226.
26. Williams, K. and O'Reilly, C. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. Research in Organizational Behaviour, 20:77-140.
27. Wood, W. (1987). Meta analytical review of sex differences in group performance. Psychological Bulletin, 102: 53-71. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.102.1.53
28. Zenger, T.R., and Lawrence, B.S. (1989). Organizational demography: The differential effects of age and tenure distributions on technical communication. Academy of Management Journal, 32(2): 353-376. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256366