Chapter – 2

Work Environment & Culture
INTRODUCTION

Organizational culture and climate continues to engage academic interest and debate. In an organizational life, what we eat, what we do, where we go, our dreams, our hopes, values are the product of organizations surrounded by us and shape our destinations. It may not be an exaggeration to say that ours is a world of organizations. Few decades ago, organizations were, for the most part, simply thought of us rational means by which to co-ordinate and control a group of people. Recently, organizational theorists have begun to analyze the role of culture in the lives of the members of culture in the lives of the members of organization.

Culture has increasingly been linked to a diverse range of individuals and organizational behaviors. There are no significant texts, which have attempted to combine and integrate the more traditional with the more emergent perspective. It will review the current state of the art in terms of the theoretical and methodological issues and problems and it will consider future research directions.

Culture change is increasingly being recognized as an important aspect of total quality development. However, the issue surrounding quality culture has not been comprehensively studied and as such, a structured approach to culture change remains largely unclear.

Every organization has an unwritten culture that defines standards of acceptable and unacceptable behavior for employees. After a few months, most employees understand their organization’s culture. They know things like how to dress for work, whether rules are rigidly enforced, what kinds of questionable behaviors are sure to get them into trouble and which are likely to be overlooked, the importance of honesty integrity and the like.

*Yes, it is possible for you and your employees to be happy on the work environment. The key is in how you handle two factors: motivation and 'hygiene'.*

Employee satisfaction and retention have always been important issues for physicians. After all, high levels of absenteeism and staff turnover can affect your bottom line, as
temps, recruitment and retraining take their toll. But few practices (in fact, few organizations) have made job satisfaction a top priority, perhaps because they have failed to understand the significant opportunity that lies in front of them. Satisfied employees tend to be more productive, creative and committed to their employers, and recent studies have shown a direct correlation between staff satisfaction and patient satisfaction.1 Family physicians who can create work environments that attract, motivate and retain hard-working individuals will be better positioned to succeed in a competitive health care environment that demands quality and cost-efficiency. What's more, physicians may even discover that by creating a positive workplace for their employees, they've increased their own job satisfaction as well.

HERZBERG'S THEORY

In the late 1950s, Frederick Herzberg, considered by many to be a pioneer in motivation theory, interviewed a group of employees to find out what made them satisfied and dissatisfied on the job. He asked the employees essentially two sets of questions:

- Think of a time when you felt especially good about your job. Why did you feel that way?
- Think of a time when you felt especially bad about your job. Why did you feel that way?

From these interviews Herzberg went on to develop his theory that there are two dimensions to job satisfaction: motivation and "hygiene". Hygiene issues, according to Herzberg, cannot motivate employees but can minimize dissatisfaction, if handled properly. In other words, they can only dissatisfy if they are absent or mishandled.

Hygiene topics include company policies, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations and working conditions. They are issues related to the employee's environment. Motivators, on the other hand, create satisfaction by fulfilling individuals' needs for meaning and personal growth. They are issues such as achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility and advancement. Once the hygiene areas are addressed, said Herzberg, the motivators will promote job satisfaction and encourage production.
APPLYING THE THEORY

To apply Herzberg's theory to real-world practice, let's begin with the hygiene issues. Although hygiene issues are not the source of satisfaction, these issues must be dealt with first to create an environment in which employee satisfaction and motivation are even possible.

Company and administrative policies

An organization's policies can be a great source of frustration for employees if the policies are unclear or unnecessary or if not everyone is required to follow them. Although employees will never feel a great sense of motivation or satisfaction due to your policies, you can decrease dissatisfaction in this area by making sure your policies are fair and apply equally to all. Also, make printed copies of your policies-and-procedures manual easily accessible to all members of your staff. If you do not have a written manual, create one, soliciting staff input along the way. If you already have a manual, consider updating it (again, with staff input). You might also compare your policies to those of similar practices and ask yourself whether particular policies are unreasonably strict or whether some penalties are too harsh.
Supervision

To decrease dissatisfaction in this area, you must begin by making wise decisions when you appoint someone to the role of supervisor. Be aware that good employees do not always make good supervisors. The role of supervisor is extremely difficult. It requires leadership skills and the ability to treat all employees fairly. You should teach your supervisors to use positive feedback whenever possible and should establish a set means of employee evaluation and feedback so that no one feels singled out.

Salary

The old adage "you get what you pay for" tends to be true when it comes to staff members. Salary is not a motivator for employees, but they do want to be paid fairly. If individuals believe they are not compensated well, they will be unhappy working for you. Consult salary surveys or even your local help-wanted ads to see whether the salaries and benefits you're offering are comparable to those of other offices in your area. In addition, make sure you have clear policies related to salaries, raises and bonuses.

Interpersonal relations

Remember that part of the satisfaction of being employed is the social contact it brings, so allow employees a reasonable amount of time for socialization (e.g., over lunch, during breaks, between patients). This will help them develop a sense of camaraderie and teamwork. At the same time, you should crack down on rudeness, inappropriate behavior and offensive comments. If an individual continues to be disruptive, take charge of the situation, perhaps by dismissing him or her from the practice.

Working conditions

The environment in which people work has a tremendous effect on their level of pride for themselves and for the work they are doing. Do everything you can to keep your equipment and facilities up to date. Even a nice chair can make a world of difference to an individual's psyche. Also, if possible, avoid overcrowding and allow each employee
his or her own personal space, whether it is a desk, a locker, or even just a drawer. If you've placed your employees in close quarters with little or no personal space, don't be surprised that there is tension among them.

Before you move on to the motivators, remember that you cannot neglect the hygiene factors discussed above. To do so would be asking for trouble in more than one way. First, your employees would be generally unhappy, and this would be apparent to your patients. Second, your hardworking employees, who can find jobs elsewhere, would leave, while your mediocre employees would stay and compromise your practice's success. So deal with hygiene issues first, then move on to the motivators:

**Work itself**

Perhaps most important to employee motivation is helping individuals believe that the work they are doing is important and that their tasks are meaningful. Emphasize that their contributions to the practice result in positive outcomes and good health care for your patients. Share stories of success about how an employee's actions made a real difference in the life of a patient, or in making a process better. Make a big deal out of meaningful tasks that may have become ordinary, such as new-baby visits. Of course employees may not find all their tasks interesting or rewarding, but you should show the employee how those tasks are essential to the overall processes that make the practice succeed. You may find certain tasks that are truly unnecessary and can be eliminated or streamlined, resulting in greater efficiency and satisfaction.

**Achievement**

One premise inherent in Herzberg's theory is that most individuals sincerely want to do a good job. To help them, make sure you've placed them in positions that use their talents and are not set up for failure. Set clear, achievable goals and standards for each position, and make sure employees know what those goals and standards are. Individuals should also receive regular, timely feedback on how they are doing and should feel they are being adequately challenged in their jobs. Be careful, however, not to overload individuals with challenges that are too difficult or impossible, as that can be paralyzing.
Recognition

Individuals at all levels of the organization want to be recognized for their achievements on the job. Their successes don't have to be monumental before they deserve recognition, but your praise should be sincere. If you notice employees doing something well, take the time to acknowledge their good work immediately. Publicly thank them for handling a situation particularly well. Write them a kind note of praise. Or give them a bonus, if appropriate. You may even want to establish a formal recognition program, such as "employee of the month."

Responsibility

Employees will be more motivated to do their jobs well if they have ownership of their work. This requires giving employees enough freedom and power to carry out their tasks so that they feel they "own" the result. As individuals mature in their jobs, provide opportunities for added responsibility. Be careful, however, that you do not simply add more work. Instead, find ways to add challenging and meaningful work, perhaps giving the employee greater freedom and authority as well.

Advancement

Reward loyalty and performance with advancement. If you do not have an open position to which to promote a valuable employee, consider giving him or her a new title that reflects the level of work he or she has achieved. When feasible, support employees by allowing them to pursue further education, which will make them more valuable to your practice and more fulfilled professionally.

GENESIS AND TRANSMISSION OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE

The culture of an organization is derived from the founder’s or pioneer’s philosophy. This, in turn, strongly influences the criteria used in hiring. The actions of top management set the general climate of what is acceptable behavior and what is not. In a landmark study, Hofstede (1980) found that work behavior was more a factor of the local national culture than the parent organization.
As culture is learned and not inherited, gender role patterns are typically demonstrated by one’s parents or other family members and internalized at a very young age. Thus work beliefs are shaped during childhood, and the depth of this early orientation remains relatively constant and more powerful than the temporal effect of organizational affiliation (Hofstede, Neuijen Ohayv, & Sanders, 1990).

Employee behavior (B), is a function of the interaction between personal characteristics (P) and the environment (E) around the person, or \( B = f(P, E) \). As identified by Keith Davis and Newstrom (2000), that inside the organization, there is another powerful force for determining individual and group behavior.

Organizational culture is the set of assumptions, beliefs values and norms that are shared by an organization’s members. This culture may have been consciously created by its key members, or it may have simply evolved across time. It represents a key element of the work environment in which employees perform their jobs – Charles O’Reilly (1989).

This idea of organizational culture is somewhat intangible, for one cannot see it or touch it, but it is present and pervasive. Newstrom and Keith Davis (2000) feel that the culture is like air in a room; it surrounds and affects everything that happens in an organization. He also adds that it is a dynamic systems concept. Culture is also affected by almost everything that occurs within an organization.
How employees are to be socialized will depend on the degree of success achieved in matching new employee’s values to those of the organization in the selection process and top management’s preference for socialization methods, Robbins (2000). But business cultures are influenced by the societies in which they operate.

Robbins (1986) says that the culture of an organization is transmitted to employees in a number of forms – the most potent being through stories, rituals, materials, symbols and language. The material symbols convey to employees who are important, the degree of egalitarianism desired by the top management and the kinds of behaviors (i.e.) risk taking, conservative, authoritarian, individualistic, social, participative etc., which are appropriate.

Jai B.P Sinha (2000) in his research study of public sector enterprises has identified two patterns of work culture. The soft work culture, in which work was less important than non-work activities and interests; and the synergetic work culture, in which organizations concentrated on maintaining systems and procedures to enforce strong work norms.

Most of the organizations and the units or departments within the organization use language as the way to identify members of culture or sub-culture. By learning the language, members attest to that culture is learned. Anthropologists suggest that gender issues are common basic problems worldwide (Inkeles & Levinson, 1969) Hofstede (1980) confirmed this premise by identifying femininity and masculinity as a dimension of societal culture on which national value systems vary. This construct has become common to the international business literature (Adler, 1997). More frequently, employees make inferences about organizational cultures from hearing stories about the way things are done, from reading slogans that portray corporate ideals, or from watching ceremonies in which certain types of employees are honored.

Understanding Organizational Culture provides a useful and comprehensive guide to understanding organizational culture, from a range of angles, contexts and sectors. Does Organizational culture matter to new employees? This question has to answered because companies are moving towards a high task orientation along with high concern for a
team orientation and respect for individuals. Generally for the new employees culture is emphasized through interpersonal relationships and in understanding the work–task values. If the new employees identify themselves with these two factors they survive in the organization.

Culture in simple terms is any environment in which an employees works on a day–to-day basis. It has been described as the DNA of an organization invisible to the naked eye, but critical in shaping the character of the workplace (Tetenbaum T, 1999).

Martin J (2001) feels that Organizational culture is embedded and transmitted through the following mechanisms such as:

Formal statements of organizational philosophy and materials used for recruitment, selection and socialization of new employees.

- Promotion criteria
- Stories, legends, and myths about key people and events.
- What leaders pay attention to measure, and control.

Implicit and possibly unconscious criteria that leaders use to determine who fits key slots in the organization.

There are two implications about culture to keep in mind:

- 1. Cultures vary across organizations
- 2. It helps in assessing the person-job fit by focusing more on values and personality characteristics.
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

Organizational climate considers participation as one of the major tool to develop the organizational life as it is based on democratic value. To develop a sound organizational climate is a long-term proposition. It should represent the goals and philosophies of those who join together to create the organization. Climate is a man made part of the environment in any organization, be it social or industrial. Climate is used as synonymous to work climate.

Schneider (1975) defined a work climate as perceptions of the psychologically, meaningful molar descriptions that people can agree and characterize a system’s practices and procedures.

CREATION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

Organization climate is a multidimensional concept. If it has the major dimension as dominant orientation which emphasis comprises of all those factors that influence behavior in the organization (Reddin, 1990). Therefore for empowering people, organization climate should be supportive and be focused on excellence and achievement of goals. There should be an emphasis on expertise and concern for relevance to others.

Dependency and control should be low. Organizational climate is determined by organizational ethos. Organizational ethos is the distinct identity of an organization, which is got by virtue of its core values, which are accepted through the organization. These core values serve as a guide to the individuals in the organization and also act as the common thread to keep them together. These values have a positive correlation with empowerment. The relationship of psychological climate with job satisfaction is strong (Kumar and Srinivasan, 1996).

While many organizations have subcultures – often created around the work groups – with an additional or modified set of standards, they still have dominant culture that
conveys to all employees those values the organization holds dearest. Members of work
groups have to accept the standards implied in the organization’s dominant culture it
they are to remain in good standing.

Develin and Partners (1989) have cited a culture that involves change acts as a key
factor to obtaining a successful implementation of Total Quality Management (TQM). In
order to seek methodologies for promoting cultural change, it becomes imperative to
understand in considerable detail, the nature of the problems faced by organizations.
Dotun Adebanjo and Dennis Kehoe (1998) have identified seven dimensions of quality
culture to evaluate the cultural problems faced by the organizations. The dimensions are
as follows:

**Effects of organizational culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before empowerment</th>
<th>After empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rigid settings</td>
<td>Flexible environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More levels of hierarchy</td>
<td>Flat organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task oriented</td>
<td>Relationship oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inward-focused</td>
<td>Client-focused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig No–3.0: Effects of organizational culture](attachment:image)

From the above figure-1, it is clear that organizational cultures are important to a firm’s
success for several reasons. It is understood that they give an organizational identity to
employees – a defining vision of what the organization represents. To add they are also
important source of stability and continuity to the organization, which provides a sense
of security to its members.
FUTURE IMPLICATIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND CLIMATE

Over time, an organization’s culture becomes perpetuated by its tendency to attract and retain a person who fits values and beliefs. People may move to a certain region because of geographic characteristics such as temperature, humidity and rainfall, employees also will gravitate toward the organizational culture they prefer as a work environment. This tendency results in a “good fit” of employer and employee.

Several other dimensions of culture are important to note. For one, there is no “best” culture for all firms. Culture clearly depends on the organization’s goals, industry, nature of competition, and other factors in its environment. Measurement and comparison of cultures is difficult at best. Business cultures are influenced by the societies in which they operate.

In fact, societal culture may be where the largest difference in the values and beliefs of cross-cultural organizations resides. Globalisation has brought this issue to the forefront. As more and more companies crossed national boundaries, scholars began to question the relative importance of socio-cultural and organizational frames (Laurent, 1986, Trompenaars, 1993).

It is not surprising that Japanese men and women do not fine comparable career opportunities (Behrman & Zheng, 1995) and that Laurent (1969) found that Swedish managers saw their role as facilitative rather than directive and controlling. This is because different cultures play a different role when it comes to framing a business culture.

It also follows that how a national culture defines its gender orientation and how it would influence the role of men and women in the work place as well as their orientation. This leads to further study of Organizational culture and measurement of the effect of culture on employees and to generalize what type of climate suits the employee to give a better performance.
**TABLE No: II – 1**

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “I am satisfied with my company as a place to work”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisited Response (2008)</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

**Graph No: II – 1**

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “I am satisfied with my company as a place to work”
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: II – 1

During the initial response, 24% of the respondents strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the company as a place to work. 24% of the employees were undecided, while 15.3% had disagreed and 15.9% had strongly disagreed.

The revisited response showed 43.2% of the respondents’ strongly agreeing while 25.4% agreed, i.e. more than 68% were satisfied with work place. 9.2% were undecided with their decision. 12.3% disagreed and 9.9% strongly disagreed that their current place of work was satisfactory.

On Average, more than 55% rated their work place either satisfied or highly satisfied. During the initial response around 24% of the respondents did not rate their satisfaction on current place of work.

Inference:

Organizations require satisfied employees to perform better. During the initial stages of their carrier, and also while the market is performing well, less than half of the respondents had rated their place of work of satisfied.

However the same respondents, over a period of time, while the economy was doing low, and few companies in red, have rated their work place as satisfied or highly satisfied.

The multiple job opportunities available make the employees to take the current work very lightly. While there are few options to look for, employees tend to treat their current place of work highly satisfied.
Does the work environment influence the employee’s perception that the company is good place to work?

**RESPONSES**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>SECURED</th>
<th>CARING</th>
<th>FUTURE OF THE COMPANY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>2091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: The work environment and the employee’s perception that the company is good place to work are independent.

Hypothesis tested at 5% level of significance.

**Expected Values:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>SECURED</th>
<th>CARING</th>
<th>FUTURE OF THE COMPANY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observed Values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL. NO</th>
<th>Observed Values</th>
<th>Expected Values</th>
<th>(Oi-Ei)^2 / Ei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>10.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>80.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
X^2 = \sum (O_i - E_i)^2 / E_i
\]

\[
= 173.22
\]

Tabulated value at 5% level of significance for 2 degrees of freedom, therefore reject the Ho.

We can conclude with 95% confidence that work environment influences the employee to decide that the company is a good place to work.
TABLE No: II – 2

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “I feel my job is secure”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Response (2004)</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisited Response (2008)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>619</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>286</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

Graph No: II – 2

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “I feel my job is secure”
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: II – 2

53.2% of the respondents, i.e. 532 of them have rated their job as highly secure during the initial response. 32.1% i.e., 321 of the respondents have agreed as secure.

There were 39 and 4 respondents, i.e. 3.9% and 0.4% of the respondents who disagreed and strongly disagreed that their work place was secure during the initial response.

In the revisited response, only 8.7% i.e. around 87 respondents have strongly agreed that their job was secure.

28.2% of the respondents have strongly disagreed and 23.1% of the respondents i.e. 270, off they have disagreed that their place of work is secure.

During revisited response, around 23.1% of the respondents were undecided about the rating against 10.4% during initial response.

Inference:

Job security and economic conditions and the organizations performance go hand in hand. When the economy is good, opportunity are more and employees feel more secure in getting a better job than the current one. Economic conditions also help organizations to perform better. This again correlates for stability of the organization and stability of the employee’s job.

Even though the employees job is secured, the volatile economic situation, make the employee feel insecure of the job. This would also lead to lower performance and lower productivity.
TABLE No: II – 3

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “My job requires me to work hard and I feel being part of the work”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Response (2004)</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.9%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisited Response (2008)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.2%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.6%</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

Graph No: II – 3

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “My job requires me to work hard and I feel being part of the work”

**Respondent’s Responses**

- Initial Response: 29.1% Strongly Agree, 32.1% Agree, 18.9% Undecided, 13.0% Disagree, 6.9% Strongly Disagree
- Revisited Response: 7.2% Strongly Agree, 27.1% Agree, 38.1% Undecided, 15.4% Disagree, 12.2% Strongly Disagree
**Interpretation of Table & Graph No: II – 3**

During initial response 29.1% of the respondents have rated as strongly agree for being part of the work. More than 32% i.e. 321 respondents have rated as agreed.

13% and 6.9% of the respondents have rated as disagree and strongly disagree for the question of feeling being part of the current organization.

The revised response had only 7.2% rating as strongly agree and 27.1% responding as agree.

However, 38.1% have failed to give their response or were undecided. 15.4% of the respondents disagreed and 12.2% of the respondents strongly disagreed being part of the work.

**Inference:**

High performing organizations make employee perform at peak. More the employee feel being part of the work and the organization, higher the employee engagement and high results. Organizations try different employee connect forum to make employee feel part of the work.

Employees’ job security plays a vital role in employee feeling part of the work. When organizations are instable, employees too feel being instable and not part of the work they do. From the above it can be inferred that the economic slowdown results in employee being insure and not feeling part of the work they do.

Low level of employee involvement creates a situation of low productivity and high dissatisfaction. It can also be viewed as employee being unable to decide of being involved in the work or not.
TABLE No: II – 4

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “I have enough time to get my job done”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Response (2004)</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisited Response (2008)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Data collected through field survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph No: II – 4

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “I have enough time to get my job done”
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: II – 4

During the initial response, 43.2% of the respondents have rated as strongly agree for having enough time for work. 23.1% have rated as agree. More than half of the respondents feel to have enough time the job they do.

13.0% of the respondents’ i.e.130 of the respondents disagreed and around 11.8% of the respondents, 118 strongly disagree of having enough time to perform their job.

There are 8.9%, 89, of the respondents undecided.

The revisited response had 32.1%, i.e. 321 respondents rated as agree to have enough time for work. 12.3% strongly agreed, while 4.6% or 46 of the respondents were undecided.

268, 26.8% of the respondents rated as strongly disagree for having enough time for job and 24.2% disagreed. This was completely contrary to the initial response.

Inference:

Cost cutting measures make companies to completely redraw their operations. Especially in case of IT industries, the operations and profitability is based on billability and timely deliver. Cost cutting measures make companies to take additional work for the employees targeted to increase productivity and billability.

Comparison of initial response and revisited response gives a very clear contract of two economic scenarios. When the economy is tight and doing low, companies have adopted strategy of overloading employees to deliver more. This, though, would help companies in short term, may create employee discontent in longer run.
TABLE No: II – 5

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “I am optimistic about the future of the company”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Response (2004)</strong></td>
<td>278</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revisited Response (2008)</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>346</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

Graph No: II – 5

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “I am optimistic about the future of the company”

Respondent’s Responses
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: II – 5

One of the very important question, I am optimistic about the future of the company, 27.8%, during the initial response has given a feedback of strongly agree. i.e. 278 of the respondents have rated so.

34.8% of the respondents have said that they feel that are optimistic about the future of the company.

15.4% of the respondents (154) and 7.8% of respondents have rated as disagree and strongly disagree for being optimistic of the company’s future during the initial response.

The revisited response has given a completely opposite view of the optimism. 28.9% and 29.1% of the respondents have rated as disagree and strongly disagree.

20.9% of the respondents have been undecided during revisited response as compared to 14.2% during the initial response towards, being optimistic about the future of the company.

Inference:

A stable organization creates an optimistic environment. An optimistic environment helps employees to be secure and perform better. The above data show that during the slowdown, employees are less optimistic about the future of the organization.

The interesting point to be noted here would be that the same group of employees had rated in contracts during their initial days of their carrier.

When employees are not optimistic, it’s very tricky and risky situation for organizations to make the employees involve in critical work area.
TABLE No: II – 6

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “I feel that the company cares about its people”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Response (2004)</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td><strong>21.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.2%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td><strong>18.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.9%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td><strong>20.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

Graph No: II – 6

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “I feel that the company cares about its people”
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: II – 6

21.8% of the respondents have shown their feeling as strongly agree for company cares for its employees.

329 of the respondents, i.e. 32.9% of the respondents have said they agreed with company caring for the employee during the initial response.

15.2%, or 152 of the respondents were undecided about the rating while, 13.9% and 16.2% of the respondents had given the rating of disagree and strongly disagree respectively.

The revisited response showed 18.9% of the respondents rating as strongly agree and 18.7% as agree for the question ‘company cares for its employees’.

During the revised response 39.8% of the respondents were undecided about their decision. 18.7% and 3.9% of the respondents have disagreed and strongly disagreed.

Inference:

A very emotional question. Organizations do lot of employee engagement initiatives to show that they care for employees. This is a mutual process. When organizations care for employees, employees show a positive approach towards the organization.

An environment which shows company care for employees goes a long way in building a positive relationship.

However a slight change in the organizations approach would pull down employees approach towards the organization. The above interpretations show how the respondents have reacted to the same question in different time period.