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THE PROBLEM

The success of an industrial enterprise irrespective of its size, ownership pattern and technological processes, depends on manning and thereafter maintaining their motivated behaviour almost for all of its members. It is in this context that the question relating to the enterprise promotional policy and practice has a vital role to play for they affect in a material manner in sustaining and utilising the motivated behaviour for the benefit of the organisation under reference via improvement in the existing levels of efficiency and effectiveness.

Saving those operating at bottom level and primarily employing their muscle power for the performance of the tasks assigned to them and/or possess inborn limited abilities and are imbued with the characteristics of Mc Gregor’s theory X, in the case of all others having inherent characteristics of theory Y, 'promotion' acts as a root instrument for employing their drive, energising forces apart boosting up their morale and enhancing job satisfaction.

Today it is widely admitted and rightly so, that if we wish top management to concentrate on strategic issues, the decentralisation via deligation of authority
should be encouraged. Needless to stress that a well thought promotion policy in the organisation can considerably provide an opportunity to shoulder steadily higher responsibility by those who might have been initially recruited either on the operative/supervisory cadre. Without reiterating in detail all the commonly known benefits of having a conducive promotion policy, let us close up the discussion by mentioning here that the Promotion Policy is a befitting instrument in finally placing the organisation on higher and higher echelons in terms of its corporate image for all those who might feel interested in its affairs. In explicit language the organisation would come to occupy a status towards which right people would like to seek their absorption even though to start with the initial salary and perks may be relatively less.

Precisely it is for these reasons that we have selected the problem of promotion policies and practices for this study in the context of Indian situation. If placed on right footing on this score, the Indian Organisations might contribute their share in resolving even the economic crises with which our country is confronted with as at the moment.
PROMOTION POLICIES AND PRACTICES: A BACKWARD GLANCE

Historically certain principles had always guided the promotion from one grade to another. In the good old days the head of a tribal society was appointed on the basis of his seniority. Similarly after the death of the king his eldest son used to succeed his father. Even in modern society certain traditional characteristics of this kind are found prevalent. In case of service, when the service was a method of patronage the principle of selection was usually based on privilege, heredity, prestige of office and so on. In other words, promotion was dependent upon the pleasure of the master. With the emergence of Civil Service as a supporting system of running the Government, the question of promotion and the determination of a systematic promotional policy has become a subject for debate.

Thus to start with, the rule of seniority was the predominant principle for promotion. Seniority has always been considered an important attribute for promotion as it is evident from the fact that even up to the later part of the Nineteenth Century the system which has been introduced in British Army Service to promote officers at various ranks was based on seniority and examination, tempered by selection.
The Seniority principle has always been favoured in all types of systems as it was felt that it is the only method which is not open to favouritism and other underhead influences. But the management experts and the behavioural scientists have not approved this system. In fact from the days of the Trevelyan North Cote Reports (1853) to the present days the principle of seniority has been assailed on the grounds as it leads to the placing of incompetent personnel in high positions; it leads to general inefficiency; discourages initiative and drive and encourages lack of enterprise among the staff.

Moreover, the advocates of merit system discarded the seniority and supported merit system on the basis that it helps the organisation in bringing out the best in a person and rewarding him for the qualities exhibited; encouraging initiative and efficiency; making the organisation effective and result oriented; boosting up general morale, etc. Additionally, the argument of school of merit system as quoted in the Report of the Play Fair Commission, 1875 runs as thus : "A man should be promoted, not because those above him are unfit but because he is the best man for the place".

In spite of all the arguments strengthening the base for merit, the debate over the issue, whether
seniority or merit should be the determinant for promotion is still raging the minds of management experts, as both have positive as well as negative points and made it difficult to have a clear choice.

Thus it could be inferred, obviously on the basis of the discussion presented in the preceding paras that both seniority and merit are complementary factors and a system that derives either is almost enviable; whereas the former causes stagnation and lack of enterprise, latter may be challenged because of the non-acceptability of the standards adopted by those to whom these are applied. It was realised that the biggest problem faced by the management is to convince the concerned employees about the impartiality and creditability of promotion mechanism created in the form of certain boards. The judgement of such board, albeit, are often taken as instances of favouritism and nepotism.

In England a step was taken to tackle this problem in the form of Federal Service Commission on the recommendation of Civil Service National Whitley Council as early as in 1921 to base the promotion system in each department. So far as India is concerned the Government enunciated a definite promotion policy and established appropriate machinery for the first time in January, 1946.
This was the first recorded document and an important landmark in the history of development of personnel management in India which laid down the official policy and the mechanism of application and implementation of the promotion policy in the form of Federal Public Service Commission. The aim of establishing this Commission was to have some permanent office particularly charged with the regulation of service matters and for protecting the public service from 'political influence' and 'ministerial control'. This was the recommendation as contained in the Government of India's first despatch on the Indian Constitution Reforms dated March 5th, 1919. Subsequently, after setting up of the Whitley Council in England in 1921, the Royal Commission, popularly known as the Lee Commission, 1924, also advocated that a Public Service Commission should be established in India as an integral part of the whole structure. Since its establishment in 1926, Federal Service Commission had been entrusted mainly with the task of recruitment to service but later it was decided to set up an apt machinery regulating promotions in Government on a just, impartial and objective manner to make Civil Service more effective and fascinating. This special machinery called Departmental Promotion Committee, was set up in 1946, to deal with all promotions to public sector services.
After the establishment of Departmental Promotion Committee, the rules framed by it are being followed, by and large, by all the public undertakings. By non private and cooperative sectors have also framed the rules for promotion with the consultation of employees and pressures of labour law. Evidently, the rules have been established for promotion in all the sectors of industrial undertakings, it is a different matter, whether the same are practised by them or not.

REVIEWING THE LITERATURE

On the subject of promotion policies and practices a good number of studies have been conducted both in and outside the country; while some of these have been empirical, others could be characterised as descriptive in terms of their research design. The various dimensions of promotion such as the different kinds of promotion policies and the practices observed in civil services, educational institutions and the variety of industrial undertakings have come to be emphasised in these studies.

STUDIES ACCOMPLISHED BY FOREIGN ACADEMICS

Pigors and Pigors (1950) in their article highlighted the problems related to policy formulation for promotion. They suggested that to get better results of
it supervisory staff too should be consulted. This consultation according to them should include both soliciting of ideas from the staff as well as their fruitful utilisation.

William (1954) is of a different opinion. He in his book titled "Personnel Administration" recommended that only high officials should administer the promotion procedure, or a committee of officials should be constituted for the very purpose.

Michael (1955) deliberately explained the term promotion along with its purpose, operational aspects of formal and informal promotion system. In the work entitled "Personnel Management" he emphasised on the contents of a complete promotion plan consisting of: plan of job relationship; plan for selection of the candidates and plan for maintaining proper reports and records. Limitations of such a plan also came to be discussed by the author.

Coates and Pellegrin (1957) highlighted favouritism, chance scheming and other extraneous factors influencing promotion decisions.

Yoder and Heneman (1958) discussed the various variables of promotion, promotion policy, seniority and
merit. They also focussed on the role of line and staff in the formulation of promotion policies.

Brain (1959)\textsuperscript{8} while picturising promotion in Government services, condemned seniority as the base of promotions.

Brown (1960)\textsuperscript{9} emphasised on promotion from within. He also enlightened on the consequences arising of insufficient promotion opportunities for the employees. The scholar tried to make it clear that the person loosers in promotion race will opt for leaving the organisation thus increasing the turnover rate. And this let-'em-compete approach entails not only a number of direct costs - incurring on hiring and training but also a certain social costs in the new adjustments that have to be made between individuals and groups.

Bender(1959)\textsuperscript{10} visualised the limitations of management authorities regarding promotions at high positions. As the number of posts become lesser and lesser at the top, all the deserving employees can not be promoted in one stroke. And it will be a point of frustration for the loosers resulting into the adoption of an indifferent attitude among them towards their respective jobs.
While studying the problems of recruiters Strother and Johnson (1960) \(^\text{11}\) observed that young and capable recruits in their early twenties are interested chiefly in promotional opportunities, even with the concomitant risk. The researchers also found the movement critical for the recruiter - when during recruitment process, the recruitee asks about promotional opportunities, and the recruiter on the other side is unable to make any promise in advance particularly when he does not know whether the bright young fellow will be any good for the organisation.

McConkey (1960) \(^\text{12}\) stressed that to give due recognition to the able employees and to provide them incentives the seniority criterion should be coupled with ability. For the judgement he suggested performance appraisals, warning issued, commendations given to the employees, age, experience, production records, education, training, physical fitness and merit-rating.

In his article titled, "What about Promotional Opportunities" Webber (1962) \(^\text{13}\) emphasised on the fast emerging awareness about advancement of their career among the youth. He had also thrown light on the impact of promotion on the leadership qualities of a person and on his overall industrial relations as well. He also discussed the limitations of the organisation in relation
to opportunities for promotion. In the latter part he suggested some ways of bridging the gap between the candidates' aspirations and the promotional opportunities available.

Jacoba (1964)\textsuperscript{14} in his article, "Why Promotions Cause Trouble - And How to Avoid it", explained the demerits of promoting from within, in relation to the theory of 'Cognitive Dissonance' developed by S.Festinger. According to him the motivational effect of such a policy are not always so positive as management imagines. In the latter part he suggested a system to reduce dissonance. It comprises of the steps: preparations of complete job description; drafting the list of aspirants; appraisal of all the listed employees; interviewing of each on the list and announcement of the decision.

While stressing on a promotion procedure and the path to be followed for the same, Felix (1965)\textsuperscript{15} stated that before 1959 in U.S.A. most Federal Agencies had no formal system of competition for filling promotion jobs. It was only in 1959 that the Civil Service Commission required Federal Agencies to establish formal promotion systems. In the process he further found that the prevailing practice both at centre and state level is merit in point of promotions. Written examinations are held and seniority is used as a decisive factor. He
further defined promotion from within and promotion from outside and stated that a proper balance between these two should be maintained. In last he urged that the existing practices being used are too long, accompanied by critical examination. Hence some sort of study concerning foreign experience and other researches in the area are highly desirable.

Webster Eric (1968)\(^1\) during his survey conducted in respect to the supervisors of George William College in U.S. found that offers and recommendations for promotion come first instead of cash incentives given as rewards for better work.

Labovitz (1968)\(^3\) conducted a study on the leading executives of 25 industries and concluded that more are the similarities in physical and socio-economic background of superior and subordinate, the higher will be the chances of subordinate's promotion. Further he added that this degree of favour to be enjoyed by a subordinate from his superior will be more or less due to the interaction which took place in them and is possible only when they are at par in physical and socio-economic status.

Maclain (1968)\(^4\) ordained a study to indicate the relationship of promotion and demotion with certain
variables. He found that promotion gives confidence to a person, smoothens his family life, develops leadership qualities in him, helps him to become a well known social figure and open chances of further promotion in other industries as well. Whereas demotion works totally opposite of all these.

Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick (1970) surveyed 33 industries and found that 96 per cent of these follow promotion from within to enhance and identify the managerial talent of their employees. They visualised that besides the factors like qualification, merit, personality and a person's own characteristics, similarities with superior affect the decision maker more than other things. Further they revealed that the employees more or less have to depend upon their immediate superior whose personal judgement seemed to be the prime criterion for promotion.

Zimmerer (1971) investigated the pattern of executive promotion through an analysis of both 'self-rating' and 'superior-rating' and found that rating system needs a review. He suggested that understanding of what is required for promotion, how to evaluate the performance by use of self-rating and superior rating is highly needed. Further he said that there must be a
provision of complete feedback of the procedure of evaluation.

Describing the formal and informal systems in promotion, Dukes, Carlton W.(1972) stated that promotions can also be done with the help of computers. He made a comparison between the practices adopted by human beings and computers, and concluded that no matter what ever system of policy is applied to the problem of promotion; whether the rules are stated or unstated, rigid or flexible, computer-oriented or manual, the human equation is paramount. Ultimately, it is people and not the systems who will determine proper promotion policy, practice and procedure.

Miller (1972) described the current dynamics in faculty promotions with the explicit objective of evaluating and improving the existing promotion practices. In the process he found that most of the institutions have their promotion statements in writing. Though he visualised actual practice consistent with promotion policy, yet this is more often influenced by Dean followed by Departmental Heads. In order to improve promotability he suggested that aside qualifications, academic activities should also be considered and factors like sex, religion and group alliances of a person should be avoided.
Christopher (1973) in his article "Promotion Policy", besides discussing the importance of promotion; the decisive criterion merit and seniority of it; open and closed promotion policy; training for the new promotees, also focussed on morale and job classification. According to him, by developing a position classification system the job requirement can easily be identified and the problem of favouritism and employee indiscipline can be solved. He emphasised that the promotion policy should be based on the prevailing values of the personnel system of the organisation and these values should be articulated and be kept open for discussion between management and staff. Lastly the learned author visualised the problem of implementation of promotion policy which will have to be negotiated with the aim of producing a balance between efficiency and all around satisfaction.

Myers and Pigors (1973) explained the impact of unions on promotion. In their endeavour they described two different situations relating to promotions viz., promotions in Unionized Firms and Non-Unionized Firms. Furthermore they said that promotion issues should be taken very carefully and fairly by the management. It should be based on records of performance rather than the 'pull' influence or discrimination. Otherwise it may be
unable to resist the demand that seniority be the governing factor or that certain minority groups be given preference in promotions.

Reed (1973)\textsuperscript{25} focussed his attention on the annual decision making process, determining promotions for officer members in American Foreign Service. During investigations he identified three models for the same: First being based on annual assessment of individual officer's society; second on pre-service background and history while the third on assignments given for decision making in the foreign service.

Fulmers (1974)\textsuperscript{26} interviewed Industrial Relations representatives from 10 major U.S. Corporations with the objective of testing the slogan of management for providing equal opportunities for promotion to them. Different ideas of employees and unions as to what should be the objective of selection system and what should be the various approaches to achieve this objective, had been cited. Attention had further been drawn on the Employee Request System for promotion adopted by Illinois Central Railway Board in 1901 for selection of conductors; finally recommending the same as the best potential in American Setting.

Stahl (1975)\textsuperscript{27} emphasised on a balanced policy for
promotion from within and promotion from outside. He strongly condemned the favouritism done in promotions and insisted that there should be a proper training of the employees promoted from inside or have been taken from outside.

While describing the long procedure of promotion, Halls (1976) focused his attention towards the difficulties of dual family career which pave the way for the non-acceptance of promotions by individuals selected for promotion, thus creating the problem for authorities.

Kothari (1976) undertook a study with a view to analyse the perceptions of management, the union and the employees as they relate to the importance of promotional criteria. The hypotheses were tested on 140 respondents including managers, union representatives and employees of three different Canadian Business Firms in New Brunswick, and noticed a few morale problems in each organisation, primarily because of the considerable agreements among the groups about the importance of the promotional criteria. He suggested that in order to avoid problems the organisations should establish and apply the mutually accepted criteria in point of promotions.

Gemmill and DeSalvia (1977) in their study cited the various problems related to promotion decision and
suggestions for improving the quality of the same. They suggested that there should be a standardised equitable promotion policy specifying the procedure and the different ways of using this policy in different situations. Then the policy should be accepted by all managers who are expected to use it. They also focussed that the policy should be clearly communicated to all employees in order to encourage their behaviour required for promotion.

Kanter (1977) found that the element of sycophancy also plays a significant role in promotions and at times even better candidates are left behind.

Stewart (1977) visualised the problems and cost of making a wrong decision in selecting or promoting the individuals.

Benson (1978) in his article, "Getting that Promotion", emphasized that for promotion, future has to be planned and objectives should be shared with the people whose judgement is respected by others. Further he advised to examine the events of each day, selecting wisely those situations that contribute positively to one's reputation. If it is followed, said Benson, future and eventual promotions would be within control.

Graham (1978) defined the term and discussed the
methods of promotion, namely, promotion by management decision on the basis of an employee's records available to the management and promotion via internal advertisement. The main thing, he stressed upon, is that promotion is related only to transfer of job of an employee within the same organisation. He also gave certain guidelines for a sound promotion policy.

Jackson (1978)\(^3\) hinted that some of the conscious and unconscious factors such as skin, colour, style of speech, articulativeness and life style do operate in the promotability of managers and constitute major barriers to the successful functioning of the fair system of promotion.

London (1978)\(^3\) drew the attention on the nature of various situations where supervisor influence the promotion decisions. He suggested that the validity of these decisions should be recognised by higher authorities. He also described the various problems which come in the way of promotion procedure.

Pratt and Bennett (1979)\(^3\) in their work while defining the term and the policy 'Seniority/Ability' also took into consideration the fact how these personnel should be promoted. Either management should determine
promotion itself and then announce it as a fait accompli or vacancies should be advertised internally. Besides the advantages and disadvantages of these two, the authors also stressed on the need of training for the personnel for the job on which they have been promoted. Further they stressed that equal opportunity, irrespective of sex, creed, colour, race or marital status, should be available for all the employees.

While testing the Equity Theory on the productivity of business faculty George (1979) established a relationship of pay, promotion and course assignment satisfaction with business instructor's productivity. He found the teachers satisfied with their promotion, tend to increase their own productivity and fellows, who perceived inequity in promotion, try to show their dissatisfaction by reducing their involvement in college affairs, and resulted that promotions have demonstrable influence on business instructors' productivity.

Hackett (1979) briefed the advantages and disadvantages of pursuing the policy of promotion from within the organisation and had also thrown some light on the factors which help in doing promotion fairly and effectively through nominations which should either be
done by the candidates themselves or the company should nominate them with the help of interviews and then they should be trained and adjusted properly.

Miller (1979) called promotion a real form of recognition of work of an employee, no matter whether it comes through additional responsibility represented by hierarchical change in position or through a real change in competence status. Further he stated recognition of promotion is valuable when it represents real change in job, job requirement, nature of job, level of responsibility, when it is timely and perceived by the members of the organisation as be in real and not a manufactured change or change of convenience.

Ree (1979) comments that promotion must be right and the policy for promotion should be an objective one based on personal progress. For this, he suggested a systematic stepwise promotion path comprising of performance appraisal followed by formulation of Personal Progress Plan and maintenance of Promotion Inventory file. He also stated that provision of training and job succession plan must be there.

Swinyard and Bond (1980) conducted a survey over 11000 executives and investigated into the reasons of those
executives who have been successful in securing promotions. They mentioned that its not the fate, politics and personality; but the better education, specialisation, age and prior experience which have contributed to their success.

Tony (1981)\textsuperscript{43} threw some light on the evils of undue promotions to employees and commented - companies which promote managers without full evaluation of their competence and potential are not only risking grave damages to the business but also to the executive himself.

Holley and Jennings (1983)\textsuperscript{45} defined the term and explained its importance. While explaining the policies and procedures, they emphasised on promotion from within alongwith its merits and demerits. They further explained the various systems associated with promotion such as; job posting, assessment centres, peer rating and nominations. Further they elaborated the problems of promotion decisions.

In his study Bowman (1984)\textsuperscript{46} while stressing the employer - employee relationship, made a comparison of American and Japanese system related to these relations. Finally, emphasising on promotion, he distinguished between status promotion (carrying additional prestige and
money) and position promotion (a change or transfer to a better job at the same rank).

**INDIAN ACADEMICS**

The prominent studies as completed by Indian Academics may now be reviewed.

Bhambhari (1960) favored promotion policy from within, based on exclusive merit criterion. He also made a comparison of promotion systems as found prevalent in England and India.

Chandra (1964) discussed in his article the impact of promotional practices on work efficiency. He described the factors and forces governing promotions, and the attitudes of employees to such practices. He concluded that promotion in India is mainly a prerogative of the employer.

Dhar (1965) examined the advantages and disadvantages of direct recruitment and promotion from within to fill the managerial jobs. He is of the opinion that the exclusive reliance on recruitment alone, causes morale problems, whereas promotions of employees from within give narrowness in outlook. In final analysis he recommended a combination of both the systems for better results.
Pai Panandikar (1966) launched a study with the objective of analysing the compatibility of personnel system with the general directions of development administration and assessing the support it lends to the achievement of programmatic values. He found seniority as a basis generally accepted since 1947, due to the unspecified nature of merit principle, which is least appreciated. Further he recommended for a rational system of promotion: discriminating between Civil Servants and others and redesigning of promotional practices to fit in the framework of the personnel system.

The National Commission on labour (1969) while discussing features of labour force in public sector undertakings and recommended: seniority at the lowest level; seniority-cum-merit at middle level; and exclusive merit at higher level as the criterion for promotion.

On the basis of the study of certain cases in different banks Bala (1970) opined that promotion is a function of top executives. The top management should reward the employees for good work. He observed that if promotions will be determined by seniority than these higher authorities will be deprived of rewarding the employees for their work.

The committee on Public Undertakings (1972)
stressed on seniority criterion for promotion in the case of lower level posts.

Dutt (1972)\textsuperscript{54} conducted a representative survey of Industrial and Commercial Units in Eastern India to have a glance at the procedure adopted and practices adopted in relation to personnel promotions in the aforesaid units. In the course of his study he found that in most of these units steps have already been initiated to follow a fair promotion policy and the rest are thinking on the lines in the light of the vital importance of personnel and emerging awareness regarding promotional rights.

Besides defining the concept of promotion and citing its importance, Kulshreshtha (1972)\textsuperscript{55}, focusses on 'In Built System' and 'Open System', the crucial issues related to promotion and concludes that a clear cut proportion of both should be taken. Further he added that there must be a definite criteria to determine merit and time fixed for promotion.

Stressing the importance of the concept of promotion, Prasad (1973)\textsuperscript{56} felt sorry on finding that there are no promotion policies in some public industrial undertakings in India as established as far back in 1948 or 1950. And even if some have policies, the process of implementation is very unsatisfactory. The only undertaking Hindustan
Steel (Ltd) India has certain rules being practised in all its three units. Promotion from within has been followed in this undertaking.

Dastidar (1974) emphasised that every organisation, big or small, must have a scientific promotion policy to maintain harmony in the organisation. Again, he points out that for effective implementation of promotion policy some essential techniques should be followed right at the time of recruitment of employees.

Observes and writes Bhattacharya (1974) that though seniority has long been the criterion for promotions, meritocracy as a modern trend is fast emerging. He discusses the pros and cons of seniority and merit as well, along with its various aspects in Indian Context. Visualising the importance of group activities in Industrial situations he favoured meritocracy in the last.

Suri (1974) discussed the merits and effects of promotional policy on Internal Labour Market. He threw light on the pattern of promotion policy adopted in Indian Industry. Elaborating the findings of his study he stated that labour favoured seniority-cum-suitability; middle management stressed on merit. Suggestions made during
investigation include: merit rating should be done in order to make employees aware of their performance; and, promotion policy should be linked to managerial resource, supply and development in an organisation.

Chakarvarty (1975) through his article, "Promotion to Whom, When and How", tried to develop a balanced criteria i.e. seniority coupled with ability for promotion in a simple mathematical way. The underlying principle of promotion stated by him through an example - 'promotion of an unskilled employee to skilled grade' can be applied in any trade from any job to next higher grade by suitably designing the test job.

Datar (1976) sketched in brief the evolution of promotion policies in Sahayog Cooperative Society. He disclosed that in the beginning there was no clearcut policy for promotion in the society, no doubt the promotion were made on the basis of seniority - cum - merit - cum - suitability. Later strong employee unions pressurised management to introduce some scientific merit rating systems to ensure objectivity in the selection as well as promotions.

Davar (1976) defined the term promotion and discussed its different systems at length: formal, informal, open, closed and the criteria of seniority and
merit. With a view to highlight the significance of these systems he described the system of promotions as found prevalent in three industrial concerns, namely, TELCO, National Machinery Manufacturing, and SANDOZ (INDIA) Ltd. In these units he noticed that while in TELCO promotion from within is adopted, Merit-cum-Potentiality factors are dominantly considered for higher grades in SANDOZ (INDIA) Ltd..

Gupta, Pillai, Ghose and Sinha (1976)\textsuperscript{63} in their article distinguished between promotion and upgrading and also discussed some remedies for a concrete promotion policy.

Thomas (1977)\textsuperscript{64} discourages deputationists and stresses on the promotion from within on the basis of merit accompanied by seniority. Further he suggests that recruitment in Indian Public Enterprises should be through a Personnel Commission set up on the lines of U.P.S.C. and a proper co-ordination must be established between these. He recommends the establishment of a public enterprise division by U.P.S.C. to concentrate on promotion policies in public enterprises specially below the second level.

After defining and discussing promotion, its significance and policies for its Chatterjee (1978)\textsuperscript{65}
focused elaborately on the criteria for promotion. Stressing on the point that a balance should be maintained between ability and seniority he highlighted the several facets of seniority, viz., categorywise seniority, plantwise seniority, experience and enterprise-wise seniority; and stated that all promotional procedures must have a provision of appeal by any aggrieved party. Finally concluding the impossibility of an ideal promotional policy to satisfy everyone, the author writes that these are the persons who donot want to be promoted for reasons of their own and not the faulty policies.

Kumar (1978)\textsuperscript{66} defined the term 'promotion' and elaborates the purpose and objectives of the same.

Mazumdar (1978)\textsuperscript{67} draws attention on the negative aspects of promotion such as false ego and superiority complexes developed in a person who gets undue promotion. Aside ; he picturises human nature and associate promotion with success in working life and failure of which leads to frustration. He favoured time bound promotion plan and stressed specifically on short range promotion planning because of the non-visualisation of changes in job contents over long periods.

Highlights Rajadhyaksha (1978)\textsuperscript{68} the importance of promotion policy in relation to sound training and
promotion schemes. While explaining the merits and demerits of merit - cum - seniority, he admits that most of the organisations have accepted the same. He concludes that the best people available and selected should be properly trained and promoted fairly.

Bhatnagar (1979) visualises a person's state of mind, who fails to get promotion when it was due. He also developed a set of yardsticks, to which one can test himself and come to know that why he has not been promoted.

Chaturvedi (1979) narrated a number of critical issues related to personnel management and suggested measures to tackle the same in a simple way. He writes that there is a relationship between mental attitude of a person and promotion and focussed that to get promotion one has to develop a positive mental attitude, for it is always necessary to do a little more than one is doing presently.

Ghosh (1979) is in favour of encouraging promotions from within. In order to avoid confusion, he made the significant recommendations like the ladder of promotion should be made clear to employees; method of assessment should be specified; promotions should be for a trial period and promotional plans should be followed up.
During their survey Goels (1979)\textsuperscript{72} found that though rules have been framed for the promotion of employees in co-operatives, still some individuals are openly favoured and there is no provision for appeals against this favouritism. Moreover there is no uniformity in policies fixed for time promotions. More or less politics is the only criterion and play vital role in promotions. To improve the system of promotions in cooperatives the scholars made certain suggestions such as selection should be of proper person followed by appropriate training, task allocation, appraisal and finally promotions as a reward. The system of appeals should also be developed.

Monappa and Mirza (1979)\textsuperscript{73} elaborated the term 'promotion', its objects and the bases of promotion along with their merits and demerits. They described the procedure for the implementation of these promotion policies in Indian context—where inspite of the systematic published rational system of promotion, policy and rules, several operating deviations such as 'political influence', 'social influence', play significant role. Further they suggested the various requirements for the effectiveness of a policy.

Rudrasawaraj (1979)\textsuperscript{74} describes the purposes of promotion and a systematic promotion procedure. Later he
discussed the seniority problem; Merit V/S Seniority; promotion from within and their relative merits and demerits.

While defining the term and citing the importance of 'Promotion' Scott, Clother and Spriegal (1979)\textsuperscript{75} emphasised on the seniority as its base, the oldest and largely accepted principle for it. To make it more useful and better they suggested that seniority should be straight plantwise; on all the jobs and promotion should go to the oldest employee provided he can do the work and secondly seniority should be occupational within the entire plant, division and within the department.

Verma and Mallick (1980)\textsuperscript{76} conducted a survey on 500 employees of the Hardwar Unit of BHEL with a view to examine the existing promotion policy, the main loopholes in it, and probable steps that could be taken to improve it. Survey results depicted that the existing policy, though based on sound theoretical concepts and guidelines lacks much in its, proper implementation resulting in frustration among employees. The existing promotion policy followed by this organisation, no doubt is quite motivating and boosts up the enthusiasm among employees and thereby benefitting the company, but the employees not considered under this scheme get frustrated. So in the
last it was suggested that there must be some criteria for defining outstanding performance, cadres should be increased to give quick promotions along with requisite authority, responsibility and monetary gains. And at worker level seniority basis should be adopted because BHEL is an unionized organisation.

Prasad and Benerjee (1981)\textsuperscript{77} are of the view that promotions should not be automatic, these should be rather earned and be related with the work and results achieved for which every organisation should follow a specific promotion plan.

During his investigations in Indian Telephone Industries Ltd., Banglore, and Heavy Electrical India Ltd, Bhopal, the two big public sector undertakings, Arya (1982)\textsuperscript{78} noticed personal favours by managers as a factor which dominated the scene of promotions in HEIL. He visualised the representatives being satisfied with the present system at management level, still unrest prevails among workers, resulting into several industrial disputes.

Verma (1982)\textsuperscript{79} conducted a study on promotional aspects in four electrical industries and found seniority subject to the rejection of unfit as the general criterion for promotion by these industries. As the term 'unfit' is difficult to be defined he observed that the
only criterion being practiced is that of seniority, which undoubtedly results into dissatisfaction among the employees.

Gopalji (1985) conducted a survey of 31 Indian Industries and found that only one-fourth of these have any written policy related to promotion of employees and these one-fourth of employees are unfamiliar with the same. Some of the industries have adopted merit and seniority as the bases, while others have no rational base for promotion. Though most of the employees were not satisfied with the existing system, at certain places an attempt to link promotion with an employee development programme, for supervisory and managerial personnel, had been made.

Recognising the importance of promotion as a basic condition of service Fourth Pay Commission (1986) in its reports stressed on a fair and well defined policy to be adopted by Government for promotion of its employees, being the largest employer. It stated that along with prescribed procedure, area considerations with due regard to the nature and level of post should also be demarcated well in advance in order to generate confidence in the method of selection and to provide degree of satisfaction to the employees. The Commission also pointed out the
criteria and procedures to be defined for the posts of all grades in every type of department and the measures to be taken to improve the promotional prospects.

Lakshman (1986) visited Indian Agricultural Research Institute and Indian Council of Agricultural Research at Delhi and National Dairy Research Institute at Karnal to examine the complexity of causes that compel the renowned Indian Scientists to commit suicide. In the course of his investigation he found in most of the cases the very reason of suicide was frustration resulting from failure in getting their due promotion, the reasons being the alleged injustice and favouritism.

Budhiraja (1987) stresses on manpower planning to be done for the implementation of promotion policy at enterprise level in Indian context. He also specified the areas to which this manpower planning should be related such as : growth; expansion; diversification of product line; manpower natural wastage; incentive means and ensuring job specification. He also suggested some measures for the proper implementation of promotion policy.

Chaturvedi Abha (1987) conducted a study covering six Indian Industrial Enterprises concluded that the policy for promotion from within dominates all the
enterprises with slight difference in point of importance attached to it. She found Venture, Telco and Hocest, the three, giving singular importance to merit while the other three Communis, Godrej and TISCO give lot of weightage to seniority as well. Further she stated that though theoretically there are no restrictions on the number of promotions a person can get, but observed that in Communis, however, there is now some reluctance on promoting a worker as supervisor. Further she discovered that these companies are making efforts to reduce the internal barriers to promotion, on the one hand and adopt an open policy for promotion, on the other.

Memorias (1987)\textsuperscript{85} opined that a sound promotion policy must comprise three traits: consistency; clarity; and impartiality and planned activity, and also recommended six steps to make the same more effective. The recommended steps being: Promotion Policy Statement; Basis for Promotion; Tracenment of Transfer Routes; Training for Promotees; Communication of Policy; and Maintenance of Records.

Viewing the importance of the higher posts dealing with decision making and policy formulation, Sexena (1987)\textsuperscript{86} conducted a survey of the Public Personnel Policies in the light of Indian Political System. The
study mainly focussed on the discrimination between the
criteria adopted for promotion of an IAS and IPS. He
commented that both IAS and IPS have to qualify the
identical examination but the criteria for an IAS
officer's promotion is seniority, thus he receives early
promotion, whereas performance of IPS is evaluated, so for
promotion he had to wait for long. Moreover, the control
process for these is also very unsatisfactory. They are
controlled by centre and work under State Governments.
State Governments are weak using their power to control
them because the same can only send reports and the
promotions will be done by Ministry of Home Affairs.

Bhardwaj (1990) draws the attention towards
expeditiously spreading the anti-reservation agitations
throughout the nation. He suggested that the criteria
for reservation should be based on economic factors rather
than caste or area, and these reservations should be
restricted only to some professions. Further he added
that at least in promotions there should not be any
reservation.

In his case study of Haryana Public Works
Departments and Engineering Departments Dutt (1990)
found political favouritism in promotions of officials
touching heights. He commented that the Haryana
Government seems to be keen on flouting even the instructions of the Supreme Court to promote the interests of the officers who are related to some senior political leaders, thus causing frustration among others.

CONCEPTUAL FRAME

PROMOTION AND PROMOTION POLICY:

The Dictionary\textsuperscript{89} meaning of the term 'promotion' refers to the advancement of an employee to a job carrying better terms and conditions of service, higher status, and honour besides higher emoluments. Panandikar\textsuperscript{90} defined promotion as a tool in the hands of management and a best practice offering opportunities to correct initial mistakes in appointments to 'freeze' inefficient personnel; to provide recognition and incentive to the better employee and to maintain minimum efficiency standards by matching personnel with demand of a job. For Holley and Jennings\textsuperscript{91} promotion is the most potent motivating factor and force in our industrialised society, being the means of prestige and money. Dutt\textsuperscript{92} viewed promotion as an individual incentive scheme to enable a favoured workman or an executive to obtain a prize post. And Torpey\textsuperscript{93} looked upon promotion as a method that facilitates the workforce flexibility and movements which
are required in the normal life cycle of dynamic enterprise.

On the basis of aforesaid discussion it can be concluded that promotion is an upward advancement of an employee to next higher post in the same concern carrying higher pay, prestige, challenges and status, in lieu of the recognition of his work done in past and as an incentive to work more efficiently in future.

But who should be promoted? a question, very crucial and important as well, sometimes raises the eyebrows of many and drives the authorities into marsh. In this regard Stewarts and Rees have stressed that only right person should be promoted. Tony too has commented that companies neglecting the factor of right promotion, not only risk grave damages to business but also to the employees. In this connection Prasad and Bennerjee opined that promotion should not be automatic rather earned by employees through hard work. To find and locate which employee is really hard working and deserves promotion, every organisation must have a well defined policy for promotion.

The phrase 'Policy' denotes the definite course or method of action selected from among alternatives and in the light of given conditions to guide and usually
determine present and future decisions. Charles Lindblom prefers a more general meaning and stated that policy is an output of any decision maker. While pondering over the connotation 'policy' Lowi emphasized the importance of the aspect of coercion. He treated policy as 'deliberate coercion' or in other words, statements intended to delineate the purpose, means, subject and objects of the exercise of coercion within the context of power relationships in organisational structure. Presthus defines policy in its most fundamental sense as a salient choice made by an individual or group of individuals that explains, justifies, guides or outlines a certain course of action, real or contemplated. On these bases the 'Promotion Policy' could be defined as a selected planned line of conduct regarding: what should be the standards to evaluate an employee's performance?, What should be the base of these standards?, By whom should these standards be determined and what line of action for the implementation of the same should be followed in order to give maximum satisfaction to individuals; on one hand, and enhance productivity and efficiency of the organisation, on the other?

**VARIENTS OF PROMOTION POLICIES:**

Number of scholars in the field have discussed
varied policies that may be followed for promotion. In
the subsequent paras an attempt has been made to briefly
describe the same.

(i) **A POLICY OF PROMOTION FROM WITHIN AND OUTSIDE:**

When an organisation promotes its own deserving
employees as soon as the vacancy occurs either
automatically or via adoption of a formal procedure, the
organisation is understood to have a policy of promotion
from within. The policy is known to be a policy of
promotion from outside when the existing deserving
employees of any concern have to compete with the outside
applicants and no special weightage is given to the
internal candidates.

Dhar\textsuperscript{102} and Thomas\textsuperscript{103} stressed on Promotion from
within, while the Promotion from outside has been favoured
by Chaturvedi\textsuperscript{104} and Varela\textsuperscript{105}. The former gained the
favour as it provides; individual satisfaction; develops
morale, loyalty and sense of belongingness in employees;
increases the productivity and efficiency of the
organisation, on one hand, and reduces the turnover rate
thus, decreasing the organisation's recruitment and
selection costs, on the other. While the promotion policy
from outside is appreciated as it gives wide choice of
candidates for selection, avoids stagnation in the work
group, workshirkness among the employees, personal differences as well and thus, generates more efficiency and competitive spirit in them. Gortner is also of the opinion that an outside system is more competitive, more closely represents the merit concept, allows 'fresh blood' to enter an organisation while the within system may lead to managers who are thoroughly socialised in the system and can not break out the pattern they developed, but at the same time guarantees them that bright, faithful employees will be rewarded thus boosting their morale and sincerity towards an organisation.

Promotion from within is not of course, confined only to the rank - and - file. It is also useful on the executive level. Promotion from within may not be an unmixed blessing, however, since the infusion of new blood from outside may at times be desirable in order to reduce the possibility of creative stagnancy.

Concluded Presthus that positions to be filled by promotion from within is essentially proper. When a Committee or Board does an effective job of promoting employees, it should have a pool of employees with potential for career advancement to most positions. The same, however, has to guard against the damages of inbreeding in positions above the entrance level where fresh view points and new ideas are necessary.
(ii) INFORMAL AND FORMAL PROMOTION POLICIES:

A policy of promotion is considered to be an informal one when the managers are authorised to choose and appoint an employee by requesting an individual whom they like or with whom they have had previous working experience, thus developing calm atmosphere at the workplace and better superior subordinate relationships with least co-ordination problem. As against it, under a formal policy proper procedure for selection is followed. Under the former managers or superiors can avoid the risk of subordinate's being inefficient as they knew all about, commented Jucius[^12], Duke[^13] and Davar[^14], the latter policy appraise the candidature of a candidate, subject to the objective evaluation of duties for a particular position, thus providing organisation, the best cream out of a big lot candidates.

(iii) OPEN AND CLOSED PROMOTION POLICIES:

In an Open Promotion Policy all individuals of the enterprise are considered as potential candidates, irrespective of their present departmental barriers, for a vacant position in any of its departments. As against this when the vacancies are not announced or disclosed to all the employees of the organisation but are restricted to those belonging to a specific department, the enterprise
is said to have a closed Promotion Policy. Such type of policy would help avoiding confusion, manipulations by the employees of various departments as also the conflicts among them on the one hand, and would lead to promoting of specialisation and reducing training costs, on the other. Whereas the former policy of promotion would aid the organisation in every field and develop harmony among its employees.

(iv) **WRITTEN AND UNWRITTEN PROMOTION POLICIES:**

When the selected planned line of conduct, determined to take the promotion decision, is specified in writing and is in a document shape, it is named as written promotion policy. As against this, if nothing is available in black and white and the authorities have the full discretion in matters of promotion the policy could be regarded as unwritten. A written policy is always considered better as compared to unwritten, as the same is more stable and authentic, provides clarity in the minds of employees and thereby ensuring the psychological satisfaction, and minimises the chances of misinterpretation. This apart can also be employed as a control tool. Visualising its superiority definite signs of preference among the employees, coupled with the pressures from the side of Government and unions, every
enterprise, irrespective of their size and ownership pattern endeavours to formulate a policy for promotion in writing.

From out of the above no single policy can however be considered either superior or an ideal one. Even so it may be observed that the policy which is guided not by the particular interests of individual employees but the higher interests of any enterprise can be deemed ideal. One more point even after discussing at length, the question, who should be promoted, remains unresolved. To find the most deserving person for promotion, policies based on employer's 'judgement', would not serve the purpose. As a matter of fact such judgements would normally be found arbitrary and subjective, leading to favouritism and discrimination based on factors unrelated to work productivity and thereby preventing the right individual from being selected. Thus policies in their ultimate analysis should be based on sound criteria. Hence, the following paras are being devoted to cover this aspect.

**CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION POLICIES:**

The policies for promotion can be based either on 'Seniority', or 'Merit', or on a composite formula
covering both 'seniority' and 'merit'. These criteria are discussed hereunder:

(i) **THE CRITERION OF SENIORITY:**

It is a system of granting preference in security and rewards to employees in accordance with their length of service. Length of service can be calculated from the date of joining a particular job. The criterion is simple, traditional, automatic, convenient, and is also favoured by unions. It develops security in employee's minds, increases their loyalty and sense of belongingness to the organisation and thus reduces the rate of employee's turnover and recruitment costs and augments the organisation's efficiency and productivity. Supporting 'seniority' as the basis for promotion Sloane and Witney argued that this is the only criterion to obtain objectivity and fairness. Since this criterion alone eliminates the need for managerial judgements and thereby managerial favouritism, it is always favoured by labour unions. However, seniority is not a simple length of service concept. While discussing the facets of seniority says Chatterjee that seniority can be Organisationwise, Departmentwise or Jobwise. In case of Organisationwise seniority a list of the employees of the whole organisation is prepared and then seniority of each employee is located; whereas in case of Departmentwise
seniority only the employees of a particular department are considered in the list for determining their seniority and in case of Jobwise seniority, the period of an employee working on a specific job in a particular department is considered for fixing the seniority. No matter, the lists of employees are prepared organisationwise, Departmentwise or Jobwise, the fixing of seniority can be quite a ticklish question as it is very difficult to satisfy all the employees. Even so this criterion can not be regarded as progressive one. It not only discourages talent and enthusiasm in employees, but also encourages laziness among them. Moreover, in this fast modern and innovative era of cut throat competitions this criteria is least appreciated.

Howbeit, it cannot be discarded in toto. 'Seniority as a basis for promotion is deeply rooted and favoured by most. It can prove far better if practiced carefully. It is in this context, Lapp\textsuperscript{121} warned against its universal application. He therefore suggested that a detailed study must be made to fit it according to ones own requirement in each case. He condemned the easy way of copying the seniority plan of other industries.

(ii) \textbf{THE BASIS OF MERIT:}

A determinant of an employees special worth or
value directs towards the qualifications, talent and his past performance. \(^{122}\) This criterion suits to the present day circumstance as it motivates employees to work harder and discard workshirkness. However, it has become controversial as the establishment of parameters to measure 'merit' is quite difficult and challenging task. Moreover, it is also opposed by employees for it is backed by an implicit fear it generates in their minds. In this light commented Bhambhari\(^ {123}\) that though arbitrary promotions do great harm to the smooth working of an organisation, leads to heart burning, frictions and conflicts among the employees, still merit should be the only base for promotion and to avoid favouritism the tests to judge merit should be objective enough to prove its fairness and justification.

(iii) **SENIORITY AND MERIT CRITERION:**

An organisation may design a most rational and 'scientific' promotion policy with a fair weightage to the claims of seniority, or merit and yet the policy may not work. No doubt merit promotion encourages initiative and if the policy is consistent and scrupulously fair, it would lead to efficiency and higher productivity. But such promotions do cause demoralisation and generate conflicts in the organisation. Moreover, those who
administer the policy, find that differences in merit in a good many cases are not readily measurable. On the other hand seniority certainly enhances loyalty to the organisation; but also creates conflict between long service people and short service but able people. So 'Seniority - cum-Merit' is the sole criterion that not only considers the qualification, talent and past performance of an employee but also his length of service. It enjoys the advantages of both 'merit' as well as 'seniority' criteria. Under this, when merit of an employee is evaluated first and seniority is employed as a decisive factor the framers name it as 'merit-cum-seniority' criterion. And when promotions are done according to seniority, and merit is evaluated as decisive factor it is called 'seniority-cum-merit' criterion. Whether named as 'seniority cum-merit or 'merit-cum-seniority', this criterion is regarded modest.

FOCUS OF THE STUDY:

Obviously as it should be from the preceding paras the studies so far accomplished have been quite restrictive in their nature and scope. While some of these have covered a specific industry, some others have defined the promotion function quite narrowly. Significantly enough none of the studies have studied the
impact of this strategic function on efficiency and productivity of organisations. The present study, therefore, intends to focus its attention, after having defined the phrase promotion so as to cover all of its aspects integratedly, primarily, on two major aspects: one, tracing out the various designs of promotion policies and the corresponding practices found prevalent in Indian industrial enterprises, and, two, attempting to assess the impacts on the efficiency and productivity. To identify the area where improvements can be affected is another focal point of this study. This is, however, not to deny the significance of earlier studies; they did help us in providing the necessary conceptual and structural design for the proposed study, apart assisting us in determining the major hypotheses which are intended to be tested.

**THE HYPOTHESES:**

In this study we have hypothesised as thus:

- $H_1$: more effective the promotion policy of the organisation, more likely are the chances of higher individual satisfaction; higher level of job satisfaction; higher level of loyalty, morale and sense of belongingness among employees;

- $H_2$: better the promotion policy existing in the
organisation, more likely one the chances of attracting efficient employees to the organisation reducing the employee's turnover rate and developing better superior - subordinate relationship;

- Sounder the promotion policy larger would be the chances of increasing the organisational efficiency and productivity.

THE UTILITY:

Ours is a developing country confronted with several challenging tasks. Effectively managing the country's resources - human as well as non-human, in a much better fashion vis-a-vis other developed counterparts is the most vital challenge. As a matter of fact we must register a rate of growth which is higher than the one being attained by developed countries of the world is an unavoidable compulsion for it would alone place our country at par with them. The resource constraint both from qualitative and quantitative angles, however, adds to the problem. It is in this context that the question how to register a rapid growth in the sector-industry, and for the purpose adapt our industrial enterprises to the most sophisticated technological developments, taking place these years in different parts of the world, has come to occupy
the minds of Indian planners in a significant manner. And, to us, it highlights the significance of the most sensitive resource by whom this sophisticated technology is going to be handled. If this resource is frustrated, the most advanced technology will convert into rubbish and if mentally satisfied the development can be diverted into any desired direction with or even without advanced technology. When frustrated there are not only the chances of its indifferent attitude towards work but the state of frustration may result into any drastic grave consequences. It is here lies the practical utility of the present study. The findings of the study would be of interest for all the sectors of Indian Industries as well. Aside, it would meet the need for building up a reliable data bank on the promotion policies and their practices as implemented in the industrial enterprises and the impact of the same on organisational efficiency and efficiency of the personnel as well.

THE LIMITATIONS:

The present study is a sincere effort, made with certain constraints of time, money, organisational resources and social confindings of the researcher, thus restricting the universe of the study only to four enterprises representing different ownership and
managerial patterns. Besides, the researcher had also faced the problem of passive, indifferent and fearful attitude on the part of respondents. This resulted into the concealment of several important facts, and thereby hampering the researcher's findings. Despite all these limitations, a diligent endeavour has been made by the researcher inorder to reach to the meaningful conclusions on chosen subject.

THE OBJECTIVES:

The present study is to accomplish the following main objectives:

- Examining the existing promotion policies as designed by the chosen industrial units for different levels of employees.

- Analyzing and contrasting the actual practices on certain judiciously selected bases like: industrial units, hierarchical levels and experience.

- Evaluating the impact of actual practices on such aspects as Job Satisfaction, morale, loyalty and sense of belongingness, employee's turnover rate and efficiency and productivity of the organisation, etc..
Suggesting a more conductive approach for promotions in the context of Indian environment.

ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY:

The present research endeavour has been arranged into Six Chapters. The First Chapter introduces the subject matter of the study by systematically defining the various concepts and the place which is occupied in it by the promotion policy. In the process of doing so, we have highlighted the various kinds of promotion policies, namely, Within, Outside, Formal, Informal, Open, Closed, Written and Unwritten and the criteria for promotions—seniority, Merit and Seniority-cum-Merit. A close review of the available Western and Indian literature on the subject, focus of the study, the major propositions and objectives have further been included in this chapter.

In Chapter, Second, 'The Setting and Methods of Study', after briefly describing the industrial potential of India, we have discussed in detailed the universe of this study and the procedure followed for the selection of Indian enterprise and the respondents and collection of informations for this work. It also covers a brief description of the bases, and the statistical
tools employed for analysing the raw data for drawing necessary inferences and examining the validity of the research hypotheses.

The Designs of Promotion Policies alongside their important ingredients, as formulated by the selected Indian enterprises have been highlighted in Chapter Third.

Chapter Four has been devoted to the description of the promotion practices found prevalent and criteria adopted for promotions to fill up the various categories of positions in the chosen enterprises.

The inferences as related to the overall satisfaction with the current promotion policies and the extent to which current promotion policies have contributed towards the employee's job satisfaction morale, their organisational loyalty and belongingness and also in enhancing the overall performance of the organisation in terms of respondents' perception, have been covered in Chapter Fifth.

Summary of the major inferences, the notable deficiencies in relation to the designs of promotion policies, criterion adopted by the enterprises in promoting employees occupying various levels of positions and the
impacts of the current promotion policies on selected individual and organisational variables, as drawn on the basis of critical examination and close observation have been included in the concluding Chapter Sixth. The last part of the chapter also covers strategic recommendations on the subject under investigation.
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