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4.1 INTRODUCTION
This chapter is on the analysis of data, and interpretation of the results. Initially the chapter explains about the various statistical tools used for analyzing the primary data obtained from the Manufacturing and IT firms of Mysore district.

- Section I: Statistical tools used for the research
- Section II: Profile of the respondents
- Section III: Hypotheses related analysis

Section I

4.2 STATISTICAL TOOLS USED FOR THE RESEARCH

- Descriptive statistics
- Independent Sample T test
- Contingency coefficient
- Two-way ANOVA

4.2.1: Descriptive statistics
The descriptive procedure displays uni-variate summary statistics for several variables in a single table and calculates standardized values. Descriptive statistics provides general description of the sample in the form of central tendencies and measures of variability. In the present study mean values were calculated for each of the retention strategies along with standard deviation values to get an idea regarding measures of central location and scatteredness of scores.

4.2.2: Independent Sample T test
The independent sample t-test compares two means. It assumes a model where the variables in the analysis are split into independent and dependent variables. The model assumes that a difference in the mean score of the dependent variable is found because of the influence of the independent variable. Thus, the independent sample t-test is an analysis of dependence.
4.2.3: Two-way ANOVA:

The two-way ANOVA compares the mean differences between groups that have been split on two independent variables (called factors). The primary purpose of a two-way ANOVA is to understand if there is an interaction between the two independent variables on the dependent variable. In statistics, the two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is an extension of the one-way ANOVA that examines the influence of two different categorical independent variables on one continuous dependent variable. Further the two-way ANOVA not only aims at assessing the main effect of each independent variable but also if there is any interaction between them.

4.2.4: Contingency Coefficient Analysis:

The contingency table analysis or crosstabs procedure forms two-way and multiway tables and provides a variety of tests and measures of association for two-way tables. The structure of the table and whether categories are ordered determine what test or measure to use. In the present study, contingency table analysis was employed to see the association between groups of respondents (employer and employee) with their responses on various aspects of Employee Retention Strategies.

Section II

4.3 PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Respondents: Employers and Employees

The total sample was stratified on the basis of employers and employees taken from Manufacturing and IT firms. Taking into considerations the gender, education, age, company type, experience, the sample was divided as follows:
Table 4.1: Distribution of the Total sample (employers and employees) of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>83.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>306</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Figure 4.1: Distribution of the Total sample (employers and employees) of Respondents

Taking into consideration the employers, the total sample chosen was 100 out of which, 50 respondents were from manufacturing firms and 50 respondents belong to IT firms. Further a total sample of 510 employees were chosen of which 256 respondents were from manufacturing firms and 254 respondents belong to IT firms.
Employers: Gender

Table 4.2: Distribution of the sample (employers) by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Figure 4.2: Distribution of the sample (employers) by gender

As far as gender was concerned 70 respondents out of 100 were male employers representing 70% and 30 female employers representing 30%. Further 37 male employers were from Manufacturing and 33 from IT firms; among female employers 26 were from Manufacturing and 34 were from IT firms respectively.
### Employees: Gender

#### Table 4.3: Distribution of the sample (employees) by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

#### Figure 4.3: Distribution of the sample (employees) by gender

As far as gender was concerned, 337 respondents were male employees representing 66.1% and 173 female employees representing 33.9% of which 197 male employees from Manufacturing firms and 140 from IT firms; 59 female employees from Manufacturing firms and 114 female employers from IT firms respectively.
**Employers: Education**

*Table 4.4: Distribution of the sample (employers) by education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph. D</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

*Figure 4.4: Distribution of the sample (employers) by education*

Of the 100 respondents, 1 diploma holder (1.0%), 47 were graduates (47.0%), 49 were postgraduates (49.0%), 2 were PhD holders (2.0%), and 1 was from the category ‘others’ (1.0%). Among them 1 diploma holder, 22 graduates, 26 postgraduates, and 1 person from category others belong to Manufacturing firms; 25 graduates, 23 postgraduates, 2 PhD holders belong to IT firms respectively.
Employees: Education

Table 4.5: Distribution of the sample (employees) by education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation</td>
<td>Frequency 5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent 2.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Frequency 69</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent 27.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Frequency 121</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent 47.3%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Frequency 37</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent 14.5%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Frequency 0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent .0%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Frequency 24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent 9.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency 256</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent 100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Figure 4.5: Distribution of the sample (employees) by education

Of the 510 respondents, 256 respondents were from Manufacturing firms; 9 respondents were matriculation (1.8%), 96 diploma holders (18.8%), 290 were
graduates (56.9%), 69 were postgraduates (13.5%), 1 PhD holder (.2%), and 45 were from the category ‘others’ (8.8%). And 254 were from IT firms; 5 matriculation, 69 diploma holders, 121 graduates, 37 postgraduates, and 24 others belong to Manufacturing firms; 4 matriculation, 27 diploma holders, 169 graduates, 32 postgraduates, 1 PhD holder and 21 was from the category ‘others’.

Employers: **Designation**

**Table 4.6: Distribution of the sample (employers) by Designation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP, VP,</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

**Figure 4.6: Distribution of the sample (employers) by Designation**

Taking into consideration the designation, of the total sample of 100 respondents, 81 were Heads of several departments (81.0%) and 19 were AVP, VP &
Directors (19.0%). Among them 39 heads were from manufacturing firms and 42 heads from IT firms; 11AVP, VP and Directors of Manufacturing firms and 8AVP, VP & Directors were from IT firms.

Employees: **Designation**

**Table 4.7: Distribution of the sample (employees) by Designation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>53.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>38.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

**Figure 4.7: Distribution of the sample (employees) by Designation**

Taking into consideration the designation, of the total sample of 510 respondents, 256 were executives (50.2%) of which 137 respondents were from Manufacturing firms and 119 respondents were from IT firms, 51 were managers (0.2%) of which 20 were from manufacturing firm and 31 were from IT firms, further
253 belonged to others (49.6%) of which 99 respondents were from the Manufacturing firms and 104 were from IT firms.

Employers: Company Type

Table 4.8: Distribution of the sample (employers) by company type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNC</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Figure 4.8: Distribution of the sample (employers) by company type

The sample was chosen from Indian companies and MNC’s, 50% of the respondents were from Indian companies and 50% of them were from MNC’s.
Employees: **Company Type**

**Table 4.9: Distribution of the sample (employees) by company type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

**Figure 4.9: Distribution of the sample (employees) by company type**

Of the total sample chosen, 256 respondents Indian companies (206 manufacturing and 50 IT), and among 254 respondents were from MNC’s of which 50 were manufacturing and 204 from IT firms.
Employers: Age

*Table 4.10: Distribution of the sample (employers) by Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30 yrs.</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35 yrs.</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40 yrs.</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;40 yrs.</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

*Figure 4.10: Distribution of the sample (employers) by Age*

The total sample of 100 respondents was divided into four age groups, less than 30, 30-35, 35-40 and above 40. Of the total sample, 10.0% were from the age group of less than 30 years of which 6 respondents were from Manufacturing firms and 4 respondents from IT firms, 44.0% were from age group 30-35 of which 21 respondents were from Manufacturing firms and 23 respondents from IT firms, 26.0% from age group of 35-40 of which 7 respondents belong to Manufacturing firms and 19 respondents belong to IT firms and 20.0% from age group of above 40 years of age.
which 16 respondents belong to Manufacturing firms and 4 respondents belong to IT firms.

Employees: Age

Table 4.11: Distribution of the sample (employees) by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30 yrs.</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35 yrs.</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40 yrs.</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;40 yrs.</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Figure 4.11: Distribution of sample (employees) by age

The total sample of 510 respondents was divided into four age groups, less than 30, 30-35, 35-40 and above 40. Of the total sample 276 (54.1%) were from the age group of less than 30 years of which 104 respondents belong to Manufacturing firms
and 172 respondents belong to IT firms, o 139 (27.3%) from age group 30-35 of which 68 respondents belong to Manufacturing firms and 71 respondents were from IT firms, 58(11.4%) from age group of 35-40 of which 49 respondents belong to Manufacturing firms and 9 respondents belong to IT firms and 37 (7.3%) from age group of above 40 years of which 35 respondents belong to Manufacturing firms and 2 respondents belong to IT firms.

Employers: Experience

*Table 4.12: Distribution of the sample (employers) by Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5yrs</td>
<td>Frequency 7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent 14.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 yrs.</td>
<td>Frequency 20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent 40.00%</td>
<td>38.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 yrs.</td>
<td>Frequency 8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent 16.00%</td>
<td>42.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15 yrs.</td>
<td>Frequency 15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent 30.00%</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency 50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent 100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

*Figure 4.12: Distribution of the sample (employers) by Experience*
As far as the experience is concerned 11.0% of the respondents had an experience below 5 years of which 7 respondents were from Manufacturing firms and 4 respondents were from IT firms, 39.0% of the respondents had an experience ranging from 5-10 years of which 20 respondents were from Manufacturing firms and 19 respondents were from IT firms, 29.0% of the respondents had an experience which ranged from 11-15 years of which 8 respondents were from Manufacturing firms and 21 respondents were from IT firms, and 21.0% of the respondents had an experience above 15 years of which 15 respondents were from Manufacturing firms and 6 respondents were from IT firms.

Employees: Experience

*Table 4.13: Distribution of the sample (employees) by experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5 yrs.</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 yrs.</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 yrs.</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15 yrs.</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
As far as the experience is concerned 256 (50.2%) of the respondents had an experience below 5 years of which 82 respondents were from Manufacturing firms and 174 respondents were from IT firms, 156 (30.6%) of the respondents had an experience ranging from 5-10 years of which 83 respondents were from Manufacturing firms and 73 respondents were from IT firms, 47 (9.2%) of the respondents had an experience which ranged from 11-15 years of which 41 respondents were from Manufacturing firms and 6 respondents were from IT firms and 51 (10.0%) of the respondents had an experience above 15 years of which 50 respondents were from Manufacturing firms and 1 respondent were from IT firms.
Section III

4.4 INFERENTIAL STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

4.4.1: H0₁ Employers and employees of Manufacturing and IT firms do not differ in their perception on the reasons for employees leaving the firms

H₁ Employers and employees of manufacturing and IT firms differ in their perception on the reasons for employees leaving the firms.

4.4.1.1: PERCEPTION OF EMPLOYERS

*Table 4.14: Frequency and percent responses from employers on statement “reasons for employees leaving the organization in Manufacturing and IT firms” and results of contingency coefficient analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>P value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair salary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of career development opportunities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor appraisal systems</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Employee engagement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Training and development</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Motivation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low morale</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Team building</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor employer-employee relationship</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unfair Salary: When the respondents were asked whether ‘unfair salary’ was the reason for employees leaving their present jobs, 43% of the respondents opined ‘yes’ and 57% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.020; p=.840), indicating similar opinions from the respondents irrespective of the firms.

Lack of career development opportunities: The respondents when asked whether ‘lack of career development opportunities was the reason for employees leaving their present jobs, 60% of the respondents said ‘yes’ and 40% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.122; p=.221).

Poor appraisal system: When the respondents were asked whether ‘Poor appraisal system’ was the reason for employees leaving their present jobs, 40% of the respondents opined ‘yes’ and 60% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.161; p=.102).
Lack of employee engagement: The respondents when asked whether lack of employee engagement was the reason for employees to leave the present jobs, 30% of the respondents said ‘yes’ and 70% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.087; p=.383).

Insufficient training and Development: When the respondents were asked whether insufficient training and development was the reason for employees leaving the present jobs, 10% of the respondents opined ‘yes’ and 90% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a significant association (CC=.258; p=.008), where we find higher levels of agreement from IT firms compared to Manufacturing firms in which the ‘yes’ responses were 18.0% and 2.0% respectively.

Job dissatisfaction: The respondents when asked whether ‘job dissatisfaction’ was the reason for employees to leave the present jobs, 36% of the respondents said ‘yes’ and 64% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.164; p=.096).

Lack of Motivation: When the respondents were asked whether ‘lack of motivation’ was the reason for employees leaving the present jobs, 47% of the respondents opined ‘yes’ and 53% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.060; p=.548).

Lack of morale: The respondent when asked about ‘lack of morale’ was the reason for employees to leave the present jobs, 25% of the respondents said ‘yes’ and 75% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.023; p=.817).

Lack of Team building: When the respondents were asked whether ‘lack of team building’ was the reason for leaving the present jobs, 8% of the respondents opined ‘yes’ and 92% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between
Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.000; p=1.000).

**Poor employer and employee relationship:** The respondents when asked whether ‘poor employer-employee relationship’ was the reason for them to leave the present jobs, 31% of the respondents said ‘yes’ and 69% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.191; p=.052).

**4.4.1.2: PERCEPTION OF EMPLOYEES**

*Table 4.15: Frequency and percent responses from employees on statement “reasons for leaving the organization in Manufacturing and IT firms” and results of contingency coefficient analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair salary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of career development opportunities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor appraisal systems</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Employee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Training and development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Motivation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low morale</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Team building</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor employer-employee relationship</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unfair Salary: When the respondents were asked whether ‘Unfair salary’ would be the reason for leaving their present jobs, 51.8% of the respondents opined ‘yes’ and 48.2% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.012; p=.788), indicating similarity in their responses.

Lack of career development opportunities: The respondents when asked whether ‘lack of career development opportunities would be the reason for leaving their present jobs.36.7% of the respondents said ‘yes’ and 63.3% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.009; p=.835), indicating similar opinion from the respondents.

Poor appraisal system: When the respondents were asked whether ‘Poor appraisal system’ would be the reason for leaving their present jobs, 37.5% of the respondents opined ‘yes’ and 62.5% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.056; p=.208), indicating similarity in their responses.
Lack of employee engagement: The respondents when asked whether lack of employee engagement was one of the reason for them to leave the present jobs, 33.7% of the respondents said ‘yes’ and 66.3% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a significant association (CC=.142; p=.001), where we find higher levels of agreement from the employees of IT firms as compared to Manufacturing firms, in which yes responses were 40.6% and 27.0% respectively.

Insufficient training and Development: When the respondents were asked whether insufficient training and development was one of the reason for employees leaving the present jobs, 15.7% of the respondents opined ‘yes’ and 84.3% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.023; p=.599), indication similarity in their opinions.

Job dissatisfaction: The respondents when asked whether ‘job dissatisfaction’ was one of the reason for employees to leave the present jobs, 22.2% of the respondents said ‘yes’ and 77.8% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.045; p=.597), indicating similar responses irrespective of their firms.

Lack of Motivation: When the respondents were asked whether ‘lack of motivation’ was one of the reason for the employees to leave their present jobs, 28.2% of the respondents opined ‘yes’ and 71.8% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a significant association (CC=.182; p=.000), where we find that higher levels of agreement from the employees of IT firms (36.6%) as compared to the employees of manufacturing firms (19.9%).

Lack of morale: The respondent when asked about ‘lack of morale’ as one of the reason for employees to leave their present jobs, 24.7% of the respondents said ‘yes’ and 75.3% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a significant association (CC=.167; p=.001), where we find that the higher levels of agreement from the respondents of IT firms as
compared to the respondents of Manufacturing firms, in which yes responses were 31.9% and 17.6% respectively.

**Lack of Team building:** When the respondents were asked whether ‘lack of team building’ was one of the reason for leaving their present jobs, 13.9% of the respondents opined ‘yes’ and 86.1% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.047; p=.575), indicating the pattern of responses from the respondents to be similar.

**Poor employer and employee relationship:** The respondents when asked whether ‘poor employer-employee relationship’ was one of the reason for them to leave their present jobs, 36.9% of the respondents said ‘yes’ and 63.1% of the respondents opined ‘no’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.093; p=.109), indicating similar opinions from the respondents.
Further with the help of the above analysis, the reasons for employees leaving the organization in the opinion of respondents of both Manufacturing and IT firms were ranked in the order of their importance. This is explained with the tables that follow:

**4.4.1.3: Employers’ responses**

*Table 4.16: Percent responses and ranking from employers on the reasons for “employees leaving the organization” and based on results of contingency coefficient analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Manufacturing firms</th>
<th>IT firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Ranks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unfair salary</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lack of career development opportunities</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poor appraisal systems</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lack of Employee engagement</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Insufficient Training and development</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lack of Motivation</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Low morale</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lack of Team building</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Poor employer-employee relationship</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the employers the reasons for performing employees leaving the organizations in Manufacturing and IT firms are as follows:

‘Lack of career development opportunities’ was the major reason for employees leaving the firms in both manufacturing and IT firms, of which 66.0% of the respondents in manufacturing firms and 54.0% of the respondents in IT firms say Yes and this reason has been ranked First.

According to the respondents of manufacturing firms the next possible reason was lack of motivation, having a percentage of 50.0% and in the IT, firms the respondents have said poor appraisal system, having a percentage of 48.0% for the employees to leave the organizations and has been ranked second.

The respondents of Manufacturing firms have said Unfair salary was the next reason, having a percentage of 44.0% and among IT firms lack of motivation & job dissatisfaction are the next two reasons for employees leaving the firms, having the equal percentages 44.0% and ranked third.
The fourth possible reason for performing employees leaving the organizations in Manufacturing firms was lack of employee engagement with the percentage of 34.0% and in IT firms the reason was insufficient salary having a percentage of 42.0%.

Poor appraisal systems was the fifth possible reason for employees leaving the Manufacturing firms according to the respondents, with the percentage of 32.0%. And according to the respondents of IT firm’s poor employer-employee relationships was the reason for leaving, having a percentage of 40.0%.

According to the respondents of manufacturing firms the sixth possible reason for the performing employees leaving the organizations was job dissatisfaction having a percentage of 28.0% and among respondents of IT firms the reasons, lack of employee engagement & low morale with are equally ranked sixth with the percentage of 26.0%.

The respondents of the Manufacturing firms have ranked seventh for the component Low morale as the reason for performing employees leaving the firms and having a percentage of 24.0%. Among the IT firms the respondents have said insufficient training and development was the reason to employees to leave with the percentage of 18.0%.

The eighth possible reason for the performing employees leaving the organizations in manufacturing firms was poor employer-employee relationships and in IT firms it was lack of team building, having a percentage of 22.0%, 80% respectively.

Lack of team building was the ninth reason for the performing employees leaving the firms in manufacturing firms with the percentage of 8.0% followed by insufficient training and development having a percentage of 2.0%.
### 4.4.1.4: Employees’ Responses

*Table 4.17: Percent responses and Ranking from employees on the reasons for “employees leaving the organization” based on results of contingency coefficient analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Manufacturing firms</th>
<th>IT firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Reasons]</td>
<td>[Percent]</td>
<td>[Ranks]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unfair Salary</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lack of career development opportunities</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poor appraisal systems</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lack of Employee engagement</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Insufficient Training and development</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lack of Motivation</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Low morale</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lack of Team building</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Poor employer-employee relationship</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4.17: Percent responses and Ranking from employees on the reasons for “employees leaving the organization”*
‘Unfair salary’ was the major reason for the employees who consider leaving the firms in both manufacturing and IT firms, of which 51.2% of the respondents were from manufacturing firms and 52.4% of the respondents were from IT firms, and this reason has been ranked First.

According to the respondents of manufacturing firms the next possible reason was lack of career development opportunities, having a percentage of 37.1% and among IT firm the respondents have said poor employer-employee relationship, having a percentage of 40.9% of the employees would consider the reason to leave the organizations and has been ranked second.

The respondents of Manufacturing firms have said poor appraisal system was the next reason, having a percentage of 34.8% and among IT firms lack of employee engagement was the next reasons for the employees who consider leaving the firms, having a percentage of 40.6% and ranked third.

The fourth possible reason for the employees who consider leaving the organizations in Manufacturing firms was poor employer-employee relationship with the percentage of 32.8% and among IT firms the reason was poor appraisal system, having a percentage of 40.2%.

Lack of employee engagement was the fifth possible reason for employees who consider leaving the Manufacturing firms, with the percentage of 27.0%. And according to the respondents of IT firms lack of motivation was the reason who consider leaving and having a percentage of 36.6%.

According to the respondents of manufacturing firms the sixth possible reason for the employees who consider leaving the organizations was job dissatisfaction having a percentage of 22.7% and among the respondents of IT firms the reason, lack of career development opportunities was ranked sixth with the percentage of 36.2%.

The respondents of the Manufacturing firms have been ranked seventh for the component Lack of motivation, as one of the possible reason for employees who consider leaving the firms and having a percentage of 19.9%. Among the IT firms the
respondents have said low morale was the reason for employees who consider to leave the firms and with the percentage of 31.9%.

The *eighth* possible reason for the employees who consider leaving the organizations in manufacturing firms was low morale and in IT firms it was job dissatisfaction, having a percentage of 17.6%, 21.7% respectively.

Insufficient training and development was the *ninth* reason for the employees who consider leaving the firms in manufacturing firms with the percentage of 14.8%, among IT firms Job dissatisfaction would be the possible reason for employees who consider leaving, having a percentage of 16.5% and ranked *Ninth*.

Lack of team building was the *tenth* reason among manufacturing and IT firms who consider leaving the firms, having a percentage of 13.3% & 14.6% respectively and ranked *tenth*.
4.4.2: H0₂ Employers and employees do not differ in their perception towards retention strategies

H₂ Employers and employees differ in their perception towards retention strategies.

Table 4.18: Mean scores of perceptions of Employers and employees towards various Employee Retention Strategies and results of T-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisal system</td>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32.84</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.354</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>30.38</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31.76</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>3.279</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>29.83</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Development</td>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32.27</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>3.065</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>30.51</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31.76</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>2.602</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32.34</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>3.174</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>30.67</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31.40</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>2.205</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>2.768</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>29.38</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30.25</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31.75</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>2.397</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer-employee Relationship</td>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31.48</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.824</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>30.39</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance appraisal system: A significant difference was observed for performance appraisal system, where t value of 4.354 was found to be significant at .000 level. The mean scores was significantly higher for employers than employees. Further the mean scores were found to be 32.84 and 30.38 respectively.

Motivation: Employers scored significantly higher than employees for motivation strategy, where t value 3.279 was found to be significant at .001. Further, the mean scores for employers and employees were found to be 31.76 and 29.83 respectively, indicating that the employers scored comparatively higher when compared to employees.

Training and Development: For the training and development as a strategy employers scored significantly higher than employees, where t value of 3.065 was found to be significant at .002 level. Further, the mean scores for employers and employees were found to be 32.27 and 30.51 respectively.

Morale: A significant difference was observed for the component ‘morale’, where t value of 2.602 was found to be significant at .009 level. Further, the mean scores for
employers and employees were found to be 31.76 and 30.34 respectively, indicating that employers had higher mean scores as compared to employees.

**Job satisfaction:** Employers scored significantly higher than employees for the component ‘job satisfaction’, where the ‘t’ value of 3.174 was found to be significant at .002 level. Further, the mean scores for employers and employees were found to be 32.34 and 30.67 respectively.

**Employee engagement:** For the component ‘employee engagement’, employers scored significantly higher than employees, where t value of 2.205 was found to be significant at .028 level. Further, the mean scores for employers and employees were found to be 31.40 and 30.13 respectively.

**Career development:** The t value of 2.768 was found to be significant at .006 level for the component ‘career development’, where employers scored significantly higher than employees. Further, the mean scores for employers and employees were found to be 31.12 and 29.38 respectively.

**Compensation:** A non-significant difference was observed for the component ‘compensation’, where the t value of 1.078 was found to be non-significant at .281 level indicating that the perception of the respondents was found to be similar irrespective of their positions.

**Team building:** Employers scored significantly higher than employees for the component ‘team building’, where the t value of 2.397 was found to be significant at .017 level. Further, the mean scores for employers and employees were found to be 31.75 and 30.36 respectively.

**Employer-employee Relationship:** For the component ‘employer employee relationship’, a non-significant difference was observed with a value of 1.824 at .069 level, indicating that the pattern of response from the respondents were similar.
4.4.3: H0: Manufacturing and IT firms do not differ in adoption of employee retention strategies

H3: Manufacturing and IT firms differ in adoption of employee retention strategies.

Table 4.19: Mean scores of perceptions of respondents of Manufacturing and IT firms towards adoption of various Employee Retention Strategies and results of t test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisal system</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>-2.020</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>31.21</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>30.25</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Development</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>30.64</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>-0.722</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>30.95</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>30.66</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>30.49</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>31.19</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>30.83</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>30.30</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>29.38</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>-1.193</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>29.94</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>29.32</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>-1.901</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>30.19</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>-1.064</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>30.81</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer-employee Relationship</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>30.71</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>30.42</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Performance appraisal system:** A significant difference was observed for the component ‘performance appraisal system’, where t value of -2.020 was found to be significant at .044 levels. The mean scores of IT firms and Manufacturing firms were 31.2138 and 30.3595 respectively in which IT firms had significantly higher scores.

**Motivation:** A non-significant difference was observed for the component ‘motivation’, where the t value of .371 was found to be non-significant at .711 level, indicating that the adoption of the strategy was found to be similar irrespective of different firms.

**Training and Development:** For the component ‘training and development’, a non-significant difference was observed with a t value of -.722 at .470 level, indicating that the adoption was similar between the manufacturing and IT firms.

**Morale:** A non-significant difference was observed for the component ‘morale’, where the t value of .419 was found to be non-significant at .675 level, indicating that the adoption of the strategy was found to be similar irrespective of different firms.
**Job satisfaction:** For the component ‘job satisfaction’ the ‘t’ value of .883 was non-significant at .377 levels. This indicates that the adoption was similar between the manufacturing and IT firms.

**Employee engagement:** A non-significant difference was observed for the strategy ‘employee engagement’, where the t value was .297 at .767 levels indicating that the adoption was similar irrespective of different firms.

**Career development:** The t value of -1.193 was found to be non-significant at .234 level for the component ‘career development’, where the adoption of the strategy was similar among Manufacturing and IT firms.

**Compensation:** For the component ‘compensation’, where the t value of -1.901 was found to be non-significant at .058 levels, indicating that the adoption of the strategy was found to be similar irrespective of different firms.

**Team building:** The t value of -1.064 was found to be non-significant at .288 level for the strategy ‘team building’. Further, the adoption of this strategy was found to be similar among Manufacturing and IT firms.

**Employer-employee Relationship:** A non-significant difference was observed with a t value of .641 at .522 levels for the component ‘employer employee relationship’, indicating that the adoption was similar irrespective of different firms.
4.4.4: H04 Respondents of Manufacturing and IT firms do not differ in their opinion on the ‘strategies that are important for retaining employees’

H4 Respondents of Manufacturing and IT firms differ in their opinion on the ‘strategies that are important for retaining employees.’

4.4.4.1: STRATEGIES WHICH ARE IMPORTANT (EMPLOYER VIEW)

Table 4.20: Frequency and percent responses from Employers on statement “Strategies that are important in retaining employees in Manufacturing and IT firms” and results of contingency coefficient analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>17 34.0%</td>
<td>21 42.0%</td>
<td>10 20.0%</td>
<td>2 4.0%</td>
<td>0 .0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>30 60.0%</td>
<td>9 18.0%</td>
<td>5 10.0%</td>
<td>4 8.0%</td>
<td>2 4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47 47.0%</td>
<td>30 30.0%</td>
<td>15 15.0%</td>
<td>6 6.0%</td>
<td>2 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC=.336; p=.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisal system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>18 36.0%</td>
<td>25 50.0%</td>
<td>5 10.0%</td>
<td>2 4.0%</td>
<td>0 .0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>32 64.0%</td>
<td>7 14.0%</td>
<td>10 20.0%</td>
<td>0 .0%</td>
<td>1 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50 50.0%</td>
<td>32 32.0%</td>
<td>15 15.0%</td>
<td>2 2.0%</td>
<td>1 1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC=.397; p=.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>17 34.0%</td>
<td>24 48.0%</td>
<td>8 16.0%</td>
<td>0 .0%</td>
<td>1 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>30 60.0%</td>
<td>13 26.0%</td>
<td>5 10.0%</td>
<td>1 2.0%</td>
<td>1 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47 47.0%</td>
<td>37 37.0%</td>
<td>13 13.0%</td>
<td>1 1.0%</td>
<td>2 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC=.281; p=.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Employee Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>16 32.0%</td>
<td>19 38.0%</td>
<td>14 28.0%</td>
<td>1 2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>25 50.0%</td>
<td>16 32.0%</td>
<td>7 14.0%</td>
<td>2 4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41 41.0%</td>
<td>35 35.0%</td>
<td>21 21.0%</td>
<td>3 3.0%</td>
<td>CC=.216; p=.179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Training and Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>19 38.0%</td>
<td>19 38.0%</td>
<td>9 18.0%</td>
<td>3 6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>28 56.0%</td>
<td>12 24.0%</td>
<td>10 20.0%</td>
<td>0 .0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47 47.0%</td>
<td>31 31.0%</td>
<td>19 19.0%</td>
<td>3 3.0%</td>
<td>CC=.244; p=.095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Employer –employee relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>29 58.0%</td>
<td>10 20.0%</td>
<td>8 16.0%</td>
<td>3 6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>28 56.0%</td>
<td>15 30.0%</td>
<td>7 14.0%</td>
<td>0 .0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57 57.0%</td>
<td>25 25.0%</td>
<td>15 15.0%</td>
<td>3 3.0%</td>
<td>CC=.198; p=.253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>24 48.0%</td>
<td>16 32.0%</td>
<td>10 20.0%</td>
<td>0 .0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>29 58.0%</td>
<td>9 18.0%</td>
<td>10 20.0%</td>
<td>2 4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53 53.0%</td>
<td>25 25.0%</td>
<td>20 20.0%</td>
<td>2 2.0%</td>
<td>CC=.206; p=.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 52.0%</td>
<td>13 26.0%</td>
<td>11 22.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>27 54.0%</td>
<td>11 22.0%</td>
<td>10 20.0%</td>
<td>2 4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53 53.0%</td>
<td>24 24.0%</td>
<td>21 21.0%</td>
<td>2 2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CC = .148; p = .525

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 44.0%</td>
<td>17 34.0%</td>
<td>8 16.0%</td>
<td>3 6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>29 58.0%</td>
<td>16 32.0%</td>
<td>4 8.0%</td>
<td>1 2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51 51.0%</td>
<td>33 33.0%</td>
<td>12 12.0%</td>
<td>4 4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CC = .179; p = .344

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 48.0%</td>
<td>16 32.0%</td>
<td>8 16.0%</td>
<td>2 4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>32 64.0%</td>
<td>12 24.0%</td>
<td>5 10.0%</td>
<td>1 2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56 56.0%</td>
<td>28 28.0%</td>
<td>13 13.0%</td>
<td>3 3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CC = .163; p = .433
Compensation: It was found that 47% of the respondents strongly agreed that this strategy is important in retaining employees and only 6% of the respondents disagreed. Further, the comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a significant association (CC=.336; p=.013), where higher levels of agreement was from the respondents of IT firms (60.0%) as compared to the respondents of Manufacturing firms (34.0%).
Performance appraisal system: A significant association (CC=.336; p=.013), was found between Manufacturing and IT firms for the component performance appraisal system. It was found that 50% of the respondents strongly agreed that this strategy is important and only 2% of the respondents disagreed. Further, the level of agreement was high among respondents of IT firms as compared to the respondents of Manufacturing firms, in which it was found that ‘strongly agree’ responses were 64.0% and 36.0% respectively.

Career development: It was observed that 47% of the respondents strongly agreed that the component career development is an important strategy for retaining employees and only 1% of the respondents disagreed. Further, the comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a Non-significant association (CC=.281; p=.073), indicating similarity in the pattern of responses.

Employee engagement: For the component ‘employee engagement’, 41% of the respondents strongly agreed that this strategy is important and only 3% of the respondents disagreed. Further, the comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.216; p=.179), indicating similar opinions.

Training and development: It was observed that 47% of the respondents strongly agreed that the component training and development is an important strategy and only 3% of the respondents disagreed. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.244; p=.095), where the pattern of responses from the respondents was similar.

Employer-employee relationship: For the component ‘employer-employee relationship’, 57% of the respondents strongly agreed that this strategy is important and only 3% of the respondents disagreed. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.198; p=.253), indicating similarity in the pattern of responses.

Motivation: A Non-significant association (CC=.206; p=.218), was found between Manufacturing and IT firms for the component motivation, where 53% of the respondents strongly agreed that this strategy is important and only 2% of the
respondents disagreed. The pattern of response from the respondents was found to be similar.

**Job satisfaction:** It was observed that 53% of the respondents strongly agreed that the component job satisfaction is an important strategy in retaining employees and only 2% of the respondents disagreed. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.148; p=.525), indicating that the pattern of response is statistically similar irrespective of their firms.

**Morale:** A Non-significant association (CC=.179; p=.344) was observed between Manufacturing and IT firms for the component morale, 51% of the respondents strongly agreed that this strategy is important in retaining employees and only 4% of the respondents disagreed. Further the pattern of response was also found to be similar.

**Team building:** For the component ‘team building’, 56% of the respondents strongly agreed that this strategy is important in retaining and only 3% of the respondents disagreed. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.163; p=.433), indicating similarity in the pattern of responses.

### 4.4.4.2: STRATEGIES WHICH ARE IMPORTANT (EMPLOYEES VIEW)

*Table 4.21: Frequency and percent responses from employees on statement “Strategies which are important in retaining employees in Manufacturing and IT firms” and results of contingency coefficient analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CC=.137; p=.045
### Performance appraisal system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>86 33.6%</td>
<td>91 35.5%</td>
<td>49 19.1%</td>
<td>20 7.8%</td>
<td>10 3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>69 27.2%</td>
<td>81 31.9%</td>
<td>59 23.2%</td>
<td>38 15.0%</td>
<td>7 2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155 30.4%</td>
<td>172 33.7%</td>
<td>108 21.2%</td>
<td>58 11.4%</td>
<td>17 3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CC=.135; p=.050

### Career Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>90 35.2%</td>
<td>97 37.9%</td>
<td>48 18.8%</td>
<td>14 5.5%</td>
<td>7 2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>81 31.9%</td>
<td>64 25.2%</td>
<td>65 25.6%</td>
<td>31 12.2%</td>
<td>13 5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171 33.5%</td>
<td>161 31.6%</td>
<td>113 22.2%</td>
<td>45 8.8%</td>
<td>20 3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CC=.185; p=.001

### Employee engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>75 29.3%</td>
<td>104 40.6%</td>
<td>53 20.7%</td>
<td>18 7.0%</td>
<td>6 2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>75 29.5%</td>
<td>98 38.6%</td>
<td>49 19.3%</td>
<td>25 9.8%</td>
<td>7 2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150 29.4%</td>
<td>202 39.6%</td>
<td>102 20.0%</td>
<td>43 8.4%</td>
<td>13 2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CC=.055; p=.819

### Training and development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>80 31.3%</td>
<td>92 35.9%</td>
<td>60 23.4%</td>
<td>21 8.2%</td>
<td>3 1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>69 27.2%</td>
<td>80 31.5%</td>
<td>70 27.6%</td>
<td>23 9.1%</td>
<td>12 4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149 29.2%</td>
<td>172 33.7%</td>
<td>130 25.5%</td>
<td>44 8.6%</td>
<td>15 2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CC=.124; p=.095
### Employer–employee relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>93 36.3%</td>
<td>84 32.8%</td>
<td>59 23.0%</td>
<td>15 5.9%</td>
<td>5 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>94 37.0%</td>
<td>81 31.9%</td>
<td>60 23.6%</td>
<td>14 5.5%</td>
<td>5 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187 36.7%</td>
<td>165 32.4%</td>
<td>119 23.3%</td>
<td>29 5.7%</td>
<td>10 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC=.014; p=.999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>105 41.0%</td>
<td>80 31.3%</td>
<td>51 19.9%</td>
<td>12 4.7%</td>
<td>8 3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>79 31.1%</td>
<td>70 27.6%</td>
<td>77 30.3%</td>
<td>21 8.3%</td>
<td>7 2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>184 36.1%</td>
<td>150 29.4%</td>
<td>128 25.1%</td>
<td>33 6.5%</td>
<td>15 2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC=.152; p=.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>108 42.2%</td>
<td>72 28.1%</td>
<td>60 23.4%</td>
<td>12 4.7%</td>
<td>4 1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>60 23.6%</td>
<td>82 32.3%</td>
<td>77 30.3%</td>
<td>30 11.8%</td>
<td>5 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168 32.9%</td>
<td>154 30.2%</td>
<td>137 26.9%</td>
<td>42 8.2%</td>
<td>9 1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC=.213; p=.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Morale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>92 35.9%</td>
<td>101 39.5%</td>
<td>49 19.1%</td>
<td>8 3.1%</td>
<td>6 2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>94 37.0%</td>
<td>82 32.3%</td>
<td>45 17.1%</td>
<td>28 11.0%</td>
<td>5 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186 36.5%</td>
<td>183 35.9%</td>
<td>94 18.4%</td>
<td>36 7.1%</td>
<td>11 2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC=.160; p=.010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Team building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CC=.064; p=.716

**Figure 4.22:** Frequency and percent responses by employees of manufacturing and IT firms on “importance of compensation as a retention strategy” for the organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Compensation:** It was observed that 38.4% of the respondents strongly agreed that ‘compensation’ is an important strategy and only 11.4% of the respondents disagreed. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a significant association (CC=.137; p=.045), where higher levels of agreement was found among IT firms compared to Manufacturing firms, in which ‘strongly agree’ responses were 44.1% and 32.8% respectively.
Figure 4.23: Frequency and percent responses by employees of manufacturing and IT firms on the statement “importance of performance appraisal system as a retention strategy for the organization”

Performance appraisal system: A significant association (CC=.135; p=.050), was observed between manufacturing and IT firms on the component ‘performance appraisal system’. Further 30.4% of the respondents strongly agreed that this strategy is important and only 11.4% of the respondents disagreed. Higher levels of agreement was found among the respondents of manufacturing firms as compared to the respondents of IT firms and ‘strongly agree’ responses were 33.6% and 27.2% respectively.
Career development: It was found that 33.5% of the respondents strongly agreed that this component ‘Career Development’ is important for employee retention and only 8.8% of the respondents disagreed. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a significant association (CC=.185; p=.001), where higher levels of agreement was found among the respondents of manufacturing firms as compared to the respondents of IT firms. The respondents who said ‘strongly agree’ were 35.2% and 31.9% respectively.

Employee engagement: For the component ‘employee engagement’ 29.4% of the respondents strongly agreed that this strategy is important and only 8.4% of the respondents disagreed. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.055; p=.819), indicating similarity in their opinions.

Training and development: A non-significant association (CC=.124; p=.095) has been revealed between manufacturing and IT firms for the component ‘training and development’, where 29.2% of the respondents strongly agreed that this strategy is
important and only 8.6% of the respondents disagreed, indicating statistically similar opinion.

**Employer–employee relationship:** For the component ‘employer-employee relationship’, it was that 36.7% of the respondents strongly agreed that this strategy is important and only 5.7% of the respondents disagreed. Further, the comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a Non-significant association (CC=.014; p=.999, indicating similar pattern of responses.

*Figure 4.25: Frequency and percent responses by employees of manufacturing and IT firms on the statement “importance of Motivation as a retention strategy for the organization”*

![Motivation Chart](image)

**Motivation:** It was observed that 36.1% of the respondents strongly agreed that the component ‘Motivation’ is an important strategy for retention and only 6.5% of the respondents disagreed. Further, the comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a significant association (CC=.152; p=.016), where higher levels of agreement was found among the respondents of manufacturing firms as compared to the respondents of IT firms. And the respondents who said ‘strongly agree’ were 41.0% and 31.1% respectively.
Figure 4.26: Frequency and percent responses by employees of manufacturing and IT firms on the statement “importance of Job satisfaction as a retention strategy for the organization”

**Job satisfaction:** A significant association (CC=.213; p=.000) has been observed among Manufacturing and IT firms for the component ‘Job satisfaction’. Where 32.9% of the respondents strongly agreed that this strategy is important and only 8.2% of the respondents disagreed. Further, higher levels of agreement was found among the respondents of manufacturing firms as compared to respondents of IT firms, in which the respondents who said ‘strongly agree’ were 42.2% and 23.6% respectively.
**Figure 4.27: Frequency and percent responses by employees of manufacturing and IT firms on the statement “importance of Morale as a retention strategy for the organization”**

![Bar chart showing frequency and percent responses for Morale strategy by employees of manufacturing and IT firms]

**Morale:** It has been observed that 36.5% of the respondents strongly agreed that the component ‘Morale’ is an important strategy for retention and only 7.1% of the respondents disagreed. Further, the comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a significant association (CC=.160; p=.010), where higher levels of agreement was found among the respondents of IT firms as compared to the respondents of Manufacturing firms, of which the respondents who said ‘strongly agree’ were 37.0% and 35.9% respectively.

**Team building:** For the component ‘team building’, 39.2% of the respondents strongly agreed that this strategy is important and only 6.5% of the respondents disagreed. Further, the comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.064; p=.716), indicating statistically similar responses irrespective of different firms.
4.4.5: H0: Respondents of Manufacturing and IT firms do not differ in their opinion on the ‘availability of Employee Retention Strategies’.

H5: Respondents of Manufacturing and IT firms differ in their opinion on the ‘availability of Employee Retention Strategies’.

4.4.5.1: STRATEGIES WHICH ARE AVAILABLE (EMPLOYERS VIEW)

Table 4.22: Frequency and percent responses from employers on statement “Strategies which are available in Manufacturing and IT firms” and results of contingency coefficient analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies which are available in organization for retaining employees</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisal system</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee engagement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>F</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer-employee relations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Compensation:** 85.0% of the respondents agreed as against 15.0% of the respondents disagreed for the component ‘compensation’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.139; p=.161), indicating a similar opinion from the respondents.

**Performance appraisal system:** A non-significant association (CC=.132; p=.182) has been revealed between the manufacturing and IT firms for the component
‘performance appraisal system’, where 90.0% of respondents agreed as against 10.0% of the respondents who disagreed, indicating a similarity in the pattern of responses.

**Career development:** For the component ‘career development’ it was found that 87.0% of the respondents agreed against 13.0% of the respondents who disagreed. Further, the comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.147; p=.137), indicating similar opinion from the respondents.

**Employee engagement:** A non-significant association (CC=.108; p=.275), was observed for the component ‘employee engagement’, where it was found that 84.0% of the respondents agreed as against 16.0% of the respondents who disagreed. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.108; p=.275), indicating similarity in their pattern of responses.

**Training and development:** 88.0% of the respondents agreed as against 12.0% of the respondents who disagreed for the component ‘training and development’. Further, the comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.061; p=.538), indicating similar opinion from the respondents.

**Employer-employee relationship:** For the component ‘employer – employee relationship’ it was found that 78.0% of the respondents agreed as against 22.0% of the respondents who disagreed. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.000; p=1.000), indicating similarity in their pattern of responses.

**Motivation:** Anon-significant association (CC=.096; p=.334) was observed for the component ‘motivation’, where it was found that 78.0% of the respondents agreed as against 22.0% of the respondents who disagreed. The pattern of responses from the respondents was also found to be similar.

**Job satisfaction:** For the component ‘job satisfaction’ it has been found that 87.0% of the respondents agreed as against 13.0% of the respondents who disagreed. Further,
comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a Non-significant association (CC=.030; p=.766), indicating similarity in their pattern of responses.

**Morale:** 72.0% of the respondents had agreed as against 28.0% of the respondents who disagreed for the component ‘morale’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a Non-significant association (CC=.132; p=.181), where it was found that higher levels of agreement from Manufacturing firms (78.0%) as compared to IT firms (66.0%), indicating similar opinion among the respondents.

**Team building:** A non-significant association (CC=.050; p=.617) was observed for the component ‘team building’, where it was found that 80.0% of the respondents agreed as against 20.0% of the respondents who disagreed. The pattern of responses from the respondents was also found to be similar.

### 4.4.5.2: STRATEGIES WHICH ARE AVAILABLE (EMPLOYEES VIEW)

**Table 4.23: Frequency and percent responses from employees on statement “Strategies which are available in Manufacturing and IT firms “and results of contingency coefficient analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies which are available in organization for retaining employees</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisal system</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee engagement</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer-employee relations</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.28: Frequency and percent responses from employees on statement
“Strategies which are available in Manufacturing and IT firms”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;D</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E E R</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compensation: For the component ‘compensation’, 79.8% of the respondents opined ‘yes’ as against 20.2% of the respondents who opined ‘no’. Further, the comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.065; p=.139), indicating similarity in their pattern of responses.

Performance appraisal system: A non-significant association (CC=.038; p=.396), was observed between Manufacturing and IT firms for the component ‘performance appraisal system’, where 85.7% of the respondents agreed as against 14.3% of the respondents who disagreed. The pattern of the responses from the respondents was also found to be similar.

Career development: 79.0% of the respondents opined ‘yes’ as against 21.0% of the respondents who opined ‘no’ for the component ‘career development’. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a Non-significant association (CC=.036; p=.420), indicating similarity in the pattern of responses.

Employee engagement: A significant association (CC=.106; p=.016) was observed between Manufacturing and IT firms for the component ‘employee engagement’, where 66.5% of the respondents agreed as against 33.5% of the respondents who
disagreed. Further, the agreement was high among the respondents of Manufacturing firms (71.5%) as compared to the respondents of IT firms (61.4%).

**Training and development:** For the component ‘training and development’ 82.9% of the respondents agreed as against 17.1% of the respondents who disagreed. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a significant association (CC=.141; p=.001), where higher levels of agreement was found among respondents of Manufacturing firms (88.3%) as compared to the respondents of IT firms (77.6%).

**Employer-employee relationship:** A significant association (CC=.202; p=.000), was observed between Manufacturing and IT firms for the component ‘employer-employee relationship’, where 63.5% of the respondents agreed as against 36.5% of the respondents who disagreed. Further, the level of agreement was high among the respondents of Manufacturing firms (73.4%) as compared to the respondents of the IT firms (53.5%),

**Motivation:** For the component ‘motivation’, 66.9% of the respondents agreed as against 33.1% of the respondents who disagreed. Further, comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a Non-significant association (CC=.073; p=.097), indicating similarity in the pattern of responses.

**Job satisfaction:** 80.2% of the respondents agreed as against 19.8% of the respondents disagreed for the component ‘job satisfaction’. Further, the comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a significant association (CC=.134; p=.002), where higher levels of agreement was found among the respondents of Manufacturing firms (85.5%) as compared to the respondents of IT firms (74.8%).

**Morale:** A significant association (CC=.175; p=.000), was observed between Manufacturing and IT firms for the component ‘morale’, 58.0% of the respondents agreed as against 42.0% of the respondents who disagreed. Further, the level of agreement was high among the respondents of Manufacturing firms (66.8%) as compared to the respondents of the IT firms (49.2%).
Team building: For the component ‘team building’, 65.3% of the respondents agreed as against 34.7% of the respondents who disagreed. Further, the comparison between Manufacturing and IT firms revealed a non-significant association (CC=.023; p=.596), indicating the pattern of the responses to be similar.

4.4.6: H0₆ Each employee retention strategy (compensation, performance appraisal system, team building, job satisfaction, employee engagement, employer and employee relations, training and development, motivation, career development and morale) does not have its own relative strength in retaining employees

H6 Each employee retention strategy (compensation, performance appraisal system, team building, job satisfaction, employee engagement, employer and employee relations, training and development, motivation, career development and morale) has its own relative strength in retaining employees

4.4.6.1: Employers view

Table 4.24: Mean scores, percentages and ranking of ERS among manufacturing firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Employee retention Strategies</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Performance appraisal system</td>
<td>33.04</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>82.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>80.25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training and Development</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>80.15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>31.52</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>78.08</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>81.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Employee engagement</td>
<td>31.48</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>78.07</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Career development opportunities</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>78.75</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Compensation management</td>
<td>29.86</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>74.65</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>32.08</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>80.02</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Employer –employee relationship</td>
<td>31.72</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>79.03</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.29: Mean scores, percentages and ranking of ERS among manufacturing firms

Manufacturing firms

The perception of Employers of manufacturing firms towards employee retention strategies were ranked in the order of most important to least important. According to it ‘performance appraisal system’ has been ranked first with a percentage of 82.06 and a mean score of 33.04, followed by ‘job satisfaction’ which has been ranked second with a percentage of 81.25 having mean score of 32.50, ‘Motivation’ has been ranked third having a percentage of 80.25 with a mean score of 32.10, the strategy ‘training and development’, has been ranked fourth having a percentage of 80.15 and a mean score of 32.06, ‘Team building’ has been ranked fifth with the percentage of 80.02 and having mean score of 32.08, ‘employer employee relationship’ has been ranked sixth with the percentage of 79.03 and a mean score of 31.72, ‘career development opportunities’ has been given seventh rank with a percentage of 78.75 and a mean score of 31.50, ‘morale’ has been ranked eighth with a percentage of 78.08 and a mean score 31.52, ‘employee engagement’ has been ranked ninth with a percentage of 78.07 and having a mean score of 31.48 and the least was ‘compensation’ which has been ranked tenth with a percentage of 74.65 and showing mean score of 29.86.
Further the perception of employers of IT firms were ranked from most important to least; in which ‘performance appraisal system’ has been ranked first with 81.06% and having a mean score of 32.64, followed by ‘training and development’ which has been ranked second with a percentage of 81.02 and a mean score of 32.48, ‘job satisfaction’ has been ranked third with a percentage of 80.45 and having a mean
score of 32.18, ‘morale’ has been ranked fourth with a percentage of 80 and a mean score 32.00, ‘career development opportunities’ has been ranked fifth with a percentage of 76.85 and having a mean score of 30.74. Further the strategies ‘team building’ and ‘career development’, ‘motivation’ has been ranked sixth with percentage of 78.55 and showing a mean score of 31.24, ‘employee engagement’ has been ranked seventh with a percentage of 78.03 with a mean score of 31.32, ‘employer employee relationship ’ has been ranked eighth with a percentage of 78.01 and having mean score of 31.24, and the least was ‘compensation’ which has been ranked ninth with a percentage of 76.06% and a mean score of 30.64.

4.4.6.2: Employees view

_Table 4.26: Mean scores, percentages and ranking of ERS among manufacturing firms_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Employee Retention Strategies</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Performance appraisal system</td>
<td>29.84</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>74.06</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>29.86</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>74.65</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>75.90</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>30.49</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>76.22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>30.79</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>76.97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Employee engagement</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>75.57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Career development opportunities</td>
<td>28.97</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>72.42</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Compensation management</td>
<td>29.10</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>72.75</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>30.02</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>75.05</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Employer-employee relationship</td>
<td>30.51</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>76.27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The perception of employees of manufacturing firms on employee retention strategies were ranked in the order of most important to least important. According to their perception, ‘job satisfaction’ has been ranked first with percentage of 76.97 and having a mean score of 30.79, followed by ‘employer employee relationship’ which has been ranked second with a percentage of 76.27 and a mean score of 30.51, ‘morale’ has been ranked third having a percentage of 76.22 with a mean score of 30.49, ‘training and development’ has been ranked fourth having a percentage of 75.90 and a mean score of 30.36, ‘employee engagement’ has been ranked fifth with a percentage of 75.57 and having a mean score of 30.23, ‘team building’ has been ranked sixth with a percentage of 75.05 and a mean score of 30.02, further the strategy ‘motivation’ has been ranked seventh having a percentage of 74.65 and showing a mean score of 29.86, ‘performance appraisal system’ has been ranked eighth with a percentage of 74.06 and a mean score of 29.84, ‘compensation’ has been ranked ninth with a percentage of 72.75 and having a mean score of 29.10 and the least was ‘career development opportunities’ with a percentage of 72.42 and showing a mean score of 28.97.
Table 4.27: Mean scores, percentages and ranking of ERS among IT firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Employee Retention Strategies</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Performance appraisal system</td>
<td>30.93</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>77.32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>29.80</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>74.05</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td>30.65</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>76.62</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>30.19</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>75.47</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>30.56</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>76.04</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Employee engagement</td>
<td>30.03</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>75.07</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Career development opportunities</td>
<td>29.79</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>74.47</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Compensation management</td>
<td>30.10</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>75.25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>30.70</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Employer-employee relationship</td>
<td>30.26</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>75.65</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.32: Mean scores, percentages and ranking of ERS among IT firms

In the perception of employees of IT firms the strategies were ranked as follows; ‘performance appraisal system’ has been ranked first with a percentage of 77.32 and having a mean score of 30.93, followed by ‘team building’ which has been ranked second having a percentage of 76.75 and a mean score of 30.70, ‘training and
development’, has been ranked third with a percentage of 76.62 and a mean score of 30.65, ‘job satisfaction’ has been ranked fourth with a percentage of 76.04 and having a mean score of 30.56, ‘employer-employee relation’ has been ranked as fifth with a percentage of 75.65 and a mean score of 30.26. Further the strategy morale has been ranked sixth with a percentage of 75.47 and showing a mean score of 30.19, ‘compensation ’ has been ranked seventh having a percentage 75.25 and a mean score of 30.10, ‘employee engagement  has been ranked eighth with a percentage of 75.07 and having a mean score of 30.03, ‘career development opportunities has been ranked ninth with a percentage of 74.47 and a mean score of 29.79, and the least was ‘motivation’ which has been ranked tenth with a percentage of 74.05% showing a mean score of 29.80.

4.4.7: H0: Secondary variables (gender, experience) do not influence the perception towards employee retention strategies

H7 Secondary variables (gender, experience) influence the perception towards employee retention strategies
4.4.7.1: Influence of Gender on Perception:

*Table 4.28: Mean scores of male and female respondents (Employers and employees) on different components of ERS and results of Two-way ANOVA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Performance appraisal system</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Morale</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32.59</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>31.79</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>32.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33.43</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>31.70</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>31.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32.84</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>31.76</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>32.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.39</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>29.80</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>30.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30.38</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>29.89</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>30.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.38</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>29.83</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>30.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.76</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>30.14</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>30.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30.83</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>30.16</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>30.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.79</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>30.15</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>30.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (Group)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F=18.366; p=.000</td>
<td>F=8.804; p=.003</td>
<td>F=5.229; p=.023</td>
<td>F=5.276; p=.022</td>
<td>F=8.320; p=.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (Gender)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F=.466; p=.495</td>
<td>F=.000; p=.998</td>
<td>F=1.555; p=.213</td>
<td>F=.098; p=.754</td>
<td>F=.141; p=.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (interaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F=.489; p=.485</td>
<td>F=.019; p=.891</td>
<td>F=1.827; p=.177</td>
<td>F=.055; p=.815</td>
<td>F=.003; p=.953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.29: Mean scores of male and female respondents (Employers and employees) on different components of ERS and results of Two-way ANOVA (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Employee engagement</th>
<th>Career development</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
<th>Team building</th>
<th>Employer-employee relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.63</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>30.64</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>29.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30.87</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>32.23</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>30.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.40</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>30.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>29.30</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.68</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>29.53</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>29.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.13</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>29.38</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>29.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.58</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>29.53</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>29.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.85</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>29.93</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>29.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>29.66</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>29.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F (Group) F=3.861; p= .050  
F=8.765; P= .003  
F=1.411; P=.235  
F=3.722; P=.054  
F=3.878; P=.049  
F (Gender) F=1.340; p=.247  
F=1.780; P=.183  
F=.798; P=.372  
F=2.130; P=.145  
F=0.046; P=.830  
F (interaction) F=.004; p= .951  
F=.989; P=.320  
F=.197; P=.657  
F=.381; P=.537  
F=.611; P=.435
Performance appraisal system: Between male and female respondents a non-significant difference was observed (F=.466; p=.495). The interaction between groups and gender was also found to be statistically non-significant (F=.489; p=.485), indicating that the pattern of scoring was similar for both male and female respondents irrespective of the group they belong to.

Motivation: Gender wise comparison indicated no difference among the respondents (F=.000; p=.998) and the interaction between groups and gender was also found to be non-significant (F=.019; p=.891).

Training and development: Between genders no statistical difference was observed (F=1.555; p=.213). The interaction between groups and gender was also found to be statistically non-significant (F=1.827; p=.177), indicating that the pattern of scoring was similar for both male and female respondents irrespective of the group they belong to.

Morale: A non-significant (F value of .098 and p value of .754), difference in mean scores of male and female respondents was observed. Further the interaction between groups and gender was also found to be non-significant (F=.055; p=.815).

Job satisfaction: Between male and female respondents, statistically no significance was observed (F=.141; p=.707) in their mean scores on ‘Job satisfaction’ and the interaction between groups and gender was also found to be non-significant (F=.003; p=.953).

Employee engagement: An non-significant difference was observed (F=1.340; p=.247) among male and female respondents. The interaction between groups and gender was found to be statistically non-significant (F=.004; p=.951), indicating that the pattern of scoring was similar for both male and female respondents irrespective of the group they belong to.

Career development: Between male and female respondents non-significant difference was observed with an F value of 1.780 and p value of .183. The interaction between groups and gender was found to be statistically non-significant (F=.989;
p=.320), indicating that the pattern of scoring was similar for both male and female respondents irrespective of the group they belong to.

**Compensation:** On the component ‘compensation’ non-significant difference was observed (F=.798; p=.372). The interaction between groups and gender was found to be statistically non-significant (F=.197; p=.657), indicating that the pattern of scoring was similar for both male and female respondents irrespective of the group they belong to.

**Team building:** Between male and female respondents a non-significant difference was observed (F=2.130; p=.145). The interaction between groups and gender was found to be statistically non-significant (F=.381; p=.537), indicating that the pattern of scoring was similar for both male and female respondents irrespective of the group they belong to.

**Employer-employee relation:** Gender wise comparison indicated no difference among the respondents (F=.046; p=.830) and the interaction between groups and gender was also found to be non-significant (F=.611; p=.435).
4.4.7.2: Influence of Experience on Perception:

Table 4.30: Mean scores of Respondents with varying work experience (Employer and employee) on different components of ERS and results of Two-way ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Performance appraisal system</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Training and Development</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Morale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>&lt;5 Yrs</td>
<td>31.27</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>31.18</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>31.91</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>32.09</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>33.09</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-10Yrs</td>
<td>32.41</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>32.15</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>31.74</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15Yrs</td>
<td>33.52</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>31.10</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>31.93</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>30.90</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15Yrs</td>
<td>33.52</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>33.24</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>33.52</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>33.38</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32.84</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>31.76</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>32.27</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>31.76</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>32.34</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>&lt;5 Yrs</td>
<td>30.89</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>30.03</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>30.54</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>30.79</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-10Yrs</td>
<td>29.67</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>29.26</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>30.30</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15Yrs</td>
<td>30.15</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>30.02</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>31.06</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15Yrs</td>
<td>30.25</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>30.80</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>30.33</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>31.10</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.38</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>29.83</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>30.51</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>30.67</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>&lt;5 Yrs</td>
<td>30.90</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>30.07</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>30.60</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>30.88</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-10Yrs</td>
<td>30.22</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>29.73</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>30.83</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>30.51</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>30.53</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15Yrs</td>
<td>31.43</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>30.74</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>31.46</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15Yrs</td>
<td>31.21</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>31.49</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>31.26</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>31.76</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.79</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>30.15</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>30.80</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>30.58</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>30.95</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group:
\[ F=14.374; \quad p=.000 \]
\[ F=7.571; \quad P=.006 \]
\[ F=7.619; \quad P=.006 \]
\[ F=7.448; \quad P=.007 \]
\[ F=8.31; \quad P=.003 \]

Experience:
\[ F=.607; \quad P=.611 \]
\[ F=.985; \quad P=.399 \]
\[ F=.411; \quad P=.745 \]
\[ F=1.066; \quad P=.363 \]
\[ F=1.068; \quad P=.362 \]

Interaction (group*experience):
\[ F=.869; \quad P=.457 \]
\[ F=.418; \quad P=.740 \]
\[ F=.087; \quad P=.967 \]
\[ F=.742; \quad P=.527 \]
\[ F=.255; \quad P=.857 \]
Table 4.31: Mean scores of Respondents with varying work experience (Employer and employee) on different components of ERS and results of Two-way NOVA (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (S.D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>&lt;5 Yrs</td>
<td>32.00 (4.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-10Yrs</td>
<td>30.77 (6.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15Yrs</td>
<td>30.66 (4.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15Yrs</td>
<td>33.29 (4.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.40 (5.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>&lt;5 Yrs</td>
<td>30.38 (4.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-10Yrs</td>
<td>29.63 (5.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15Yrs</td>
<td>30.30 (6.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15Yrs</td>
<td>30.25 (5.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.13 (5.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>&lt;5 Yrs</td>
<td>30.45 (4.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-10Yrs</td>
<td>29.86 (5.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15Yrs</td>
<td>30.43 (5.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15Yrs</td>
<td>31.14 (5.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.34 (5.28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group:
F=5.455; p=.020  
F=9.817; p=.002  
F=1.659; p=.198  
F=6.169; p=.013  
F=3.472; p=.063

Experience:
F=1.359; p=.255  
F=1.374; p=.405  
F=1.579; p=.198  
F=3.07; p=.058  
F=1.677

Interaction (group*experience):
F=7.41; p=.528  
F=1.339; p=.261  
F=1.540; p=.655  
F=1.111; p=.344  
F=1.621; p=.602
Performance appraisal system: A non-significant difference (F=.869; p=.457) was observed for the component performance appraisal system, where mean scores were higher for respondents with 11-15 years of experience (31.43) than others, and least mean scores was for those who had 5-10 years of experience (30.22). However, the interaction between groups and experience was also found to be non-significant.

Motivation: For the Motivation strategy, the levels of experience, revealed a non-significant difference (F=.985; p=.399), where respondents having more than 15 years of experience had high mean scores of 31.25 than others, employees with 5-10 years of experience had mean score of 29.73 and the interaction between groups and experience was found to be non-significant (F=.418; p=.740).

Training and development: A non-significant difference was observed (F=.411; p=.745) for levels of experience, where respondents having more than 15 years of experience had high mean scores of 31.49 than others. And the interaction between groups and experience was also found to be non-significant (F=.087; p=.967).

Morale: For different levels of experience, a non-significant difference was observed (F=1.066; p=.363), where respondents having more than 15 years of experience had high mean scores of 31.26 than others. And the interaction between groups and experience was also found to be non-significant (F=.742; p=.527).

Job satisfaction: Between different levels of experience, a non-significant difference (F=1.068; p=.362) was observed, where respondents having more than 15 years of experience had high mean scores of 31.76 followed by 11-15 years (31.46), less than 5 years (mean 30.88) and the least for 5-10 years of experience (30.53). A non-significant (F=.255; p=.857) interaction between groups and experience was observed.

Employee engagement: Non-significant difference was observed for different levels of experience (F=1.359; p=.255), where respondents having more than 15 years of experience had high mean scores of 31.14 followed by less than 5 years (30.45), 11-15 years (mean 30.43) and the least for 5-10 years of experience (29.86). A non-significant (F=.741; p=.528) difference for interaction between groups and experience was also observed.
Career development: Significant difference was not found in their mean scores irrespective of their different levels of experience (F=.974; p=.405). Further the interaction between groups and experience was also found to be non-significant (F=1.339; p=.261).

Compensation: For different levels of experience, a non-significant difference (F=.508; p=.677) was observed, where respondents having more than 15 years of experience had high mean scores of 30.13 than others. And the interaction between groups and experience was found to be non-significant (F=.540; p=.655).

Team Building: Between different levels of experience, a non-significant difference (F=.307; p=.820), where respondents having 11-15 years of experience had high mean scores of 31.05 than others. And the interaction between groups and experience was found to be non-significant (F=1.111; p=.344).

Employer employee relationship: A non-significant difference (F=.597; p=.617) was observed for different levels of experience, where respondents having more than 15 years of experience had high mean scores of 31.00 than others. And the interaction between groups and experience was found to be non-significant (F=.621; p=.602).

4.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter covers introduction, statistical tools used for data analysis, profile of the respondents and inferential statistical analysis. Further for the sake of clearer understanding this chapter has been divided into three sections. Section I covers various statistical tools used for data analysis, Section II highlights the profile of the respondents and Section III deals with inferential statistical analysis.