Chapter – 3

Communication & Reward and Recognition
INTRODUCTION

Since the 1970s, organizational behavior scholars have focused much attention on factors that might affect job performance. Factors studied include, to a great extent, how job performance relates to job satisfaction (Weaver, 1980) and, less so, to communication satisfaction (Clampitt & Downs, 1993).

Much of the lack in job performance-communication satisfaction research may be due to the lack of interest in cross-disciplinary research in organizational communication among human resources management and organizational behavior scholars.

Thus far, organizational communication scholars, often working independently in programs removed from business programs, have done the organizational communication research. Human resources and organizational behavior scholars have focused on other measures related to job satisfaction, such as pay equity and voluntary turnover (Micheli & Lane, 1991; Dalton & Todor, 1993).

In addition, apparently no research has used information technology as respondents, rather than employees and supervisors.

Continuing interest among organizational communication scholars in the organizational communication satisfaction-job performance construct has spanned almost three decades now, though most of the work is anecdotal, quasi-experimental, or a review of existing literature, such as Downs & Hain (1982).

Much more empirical, focused research is needed to investigate the nature of the construct and various dimensions of the factors involved, especially in Information Industry.

Beyond the extensive research done in job performance the past few decades, researchers have done some work on the organization communication-job satisfaction construct (Downs, 1977; Foehrenbach & Rosenberg, 1982; Goldhaber, Porter, Yates & Lesniak, 1978; Muchinsky, 1977; Pincus, 1986; Ruch & Goodman, 1983; Walther, 1988).
The prevailing evidence indicates these factors relate positively. Only three studies, though, have documented correlations specifically between organizational communication and job performance (Clampitt & Downs, 1993; Jain, 1973; Pincus, 1986).

Jain's (1973) early study used a questionnaire interview format to examine the relationship between communication effectiveness of hospital supervisors and their job performance as perceived by their subordinates. Effectiveness criteria were supervisor communication behavior, supervisor-subordinate communication frequency and amount, employee knowledge of policies and procedures, employee communication satisfaction, and nonsupervisory formal communication channels use.

Results showed positive correlations between communication effectiveness and job performance, communication frequency and amount and job performance, and employee communication satisfaction and supervisor job performance.

Surveying 327 hospital nurses, Pincus (1986) measured nine communication factors (Downs & Hazen, 1977) grouped into three dimensions: informational, relational, and informational/relational. The results showed employee perception of organizational communication satisfaction related significantly to both job satisfaction and job performance, though the communication satisfaction-job satisfaction link was stronger than the communication satisfaction-job performance link.

The major contributors to both the organizational communication-job satisfaction relationship and the organizational communication-job performance link were supervisor communication, communication climate, personal feedback, and top management communication. Interestingly, three of the four contributors comprised the informational/relational dimension, which Pincus (1986) described as having "dual focus on both informational and relational aspects of communication."

Top management communication, the fourth contributor, was a relational dimension. Clampitt & Downs (1993) used Downs & Hazen's (1977) communication satisfaction
survey to measure perceptions of eight of the nine factors Pincus (1986) measured (all except top management communication).

The problem of the present study was to examine the effects of employee communication satisfaction on employee job. If higher levels of communication satisfaction result in a healthy and highly productive work environment, both supervisor staff evaluations and firm growth should be high.

There is a direct link between employee satisfaction and between customer satisfactions. The key organizational characteristic for explaining employee satisfaction is organizational communication (a measure of the downward and upward communication in an organization). Interaction between managers and employees with regards to supportiveness and goal setting, as well as job design were also key drivers of employee engagement.

In today’s competitive economy many businesses are looking for that edge to keep them ahead of the game. Having a high rate of employee satisfaction not only creates a positive work environment it also increases productivity.

It makes business sense to invest in employee satisfaction as it has a significant impact on the organizations goals. There are two elements that management needs to consider when trying to engage employees in communication.

First, there needs to be opportunities for the communication to happen. Second, there needs to be a culture of trust. There are many ways to connect with employees. Here are some easy strategies to implement.

**CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR EMPLOYEE COMMUNICATION**

Management needs to create opportunities for employees to voice their concerns and opinions. The best approach is to provide staff with a variety of ways to provide management with feedback.
Not every employee is going to feel comfortable talking directly to a superior. Some examples of communication tools.

**Communication sessions** – bring a group of employees together to discuss concerns. If there are numerous issues picking the top three and focus on what needs to be done to resolve the concerns. At the next communication session address the next group of issues. Records of the discussion need to be kept and passed on to the rest of the employees.

**Opinion Surveys** – have all employees fill out a questionnaire. Many people feel more comfortable providing feedback when it is anonymous. This tool can provide important information to address general problems, but does not help with individual concerns.

**Comment Box, Suggestion Box, E-mail system** - these are all ways that employees can share their frustrations. It is up to the employee if they want to leave a name or not.

**Open Door Policy** – let the staff know that communication is important and that management is available to them should they have a concern.

**Grievance System** – have a system in place to resolve conflicts. Employees will know there are steps they can take.

**Social Outings** – outings are not just for boosting moral, they are also an opportunity for management to connect with the staff in a relatively stress free situation.

The 'grapevine' is the informal communication network found in every organization. The term can be traced back to the United States Civil War in the 1860s. Since battlefronts moved frequently, army telegraph wires were strung loosely from tree to tree across battlefields, somewhat like wires used to support grapevines.

The wires were used to carry telegraph messages created in Morse code (the electronic alphabet, invented in 1844) because the telephone wasn't invented until 1876. Since the lines often were strung hastily during battle, and messages were composed in a hurry, the resulting communication tended to be garbled and confusing. Soon, any rumor was said to have been heard 'on the grapevine'.
There are four types of grapevine rumors:

- **Wish fulfillment** - identifying the wishes and hopes of employees.
- **'Bogey rumors’** - exaggerating employees' fears and concerns.
- **'Wedge-drivers’** - aggressive, unfriendly and damaging. They split groups and dissolve allegiances.
- **'Home-stretchers'** - anticipating final decisions or announcements. They tend to fill the gap during times of ambiguity.

Research shows that grapevine information tends to be about 80% accurate. Since many rumors start from someone's account of an actual event, there are strong elements of truth in many rumors. However, grapevine information often contains big errors as people put their own interpretation onto an event or information they have seen, and then pass it on in a process of partial or selective recall.

Why do people spread rumors? Humans are social animals – we need to talk to others. Chat about others helps to strengthen existing relationships. Besides entertainment value, gossiping can raise people's self esteem – we feel more important by getting information first and by the interest it creates.

It is rare to find people at different levels discussing rumors or gossiping with each other. When two people share a rumor or gossip it has the effect of putting them on a relatively equal footing.

The grapevine can play an important part in the ‘management by walking around’ approach. When managers move around the office without a particular objective, they can pick up relevant rumors. This information would not have become available if the manager had stayed in their office all day.

Managers can sometimes purposely send messages through the grapevine to test the likely reaction to a possible management decision. This can allow feedback to take place and adjustments made before final decisions are made. Thus the grapevine can contribute to a more inclusive workplace.
HOW TO MINIMIZE DESTRUCTIVE RUMORS

Public Relationships practitioners can expect to encounter harmful rumors on the organizational grapevine quite often – about once a week on average, according to research.

Although not always harmful, rumors can reduce employee productivity, tarnish personal reputations and interfere with organizational communication. Rumors obviously abound during restructuring and retrenchment processes – when employees are nervous about their jobs they waste time talking about the rumors and their work rate falls. External rumors are known to have hit sales, damaged corporate reputations and caused share prices to fall.

Most rumors are concerned with common organizational changes such as possible mergers and acquisitions, new aspects of mergers and acquisition processes that are already under way, changes in staffing, retrenchment plans and restructurings.

Research conducted with 74 experienced PR professionals in corporate positions and consultancies, suggested that about a third of rumors related to personnel changes such as a senior executive leaving to join the opposition, about staff changes due to a shake-up in management and about changes caused by a merger or acquisition.

A further third of rumors were about job satisfaction and security. Job satisfaction rumors comprised hearsay about unhappy employees, dissatisfaction with management and transfer of duties. Job security rumors were about lay-offs caused by downsizing, restructuring, plant closing etc. The balance comprised speculation and gossip on a variety of topics.

Plans can be activated to prevent and reduce rumors, although rumors are relatively difficult to grapple with. The important thing is to maintain a good communication flow using several alternative avenues to convey the same message.

Preventative measures should include keeping staff regularly, fully and honestly informed of planned changes through a range of tailored formal and informal
communication avenues such as emails and face-to-face meetings at various levels. Sometimes external stakeholders also need to receive timely messages to prevent a harmful rumor from spreading outside the organization.

An early warning system is a good way to reduce harmful rumors that are already circulating: staff in various locations can be informally appointed to monitor and report on early indications of rumors.

Depending on the nature of the rumors, similar distribution channels to those in the previous paragraph could be established. In addition, a rumor ‘hotline’ – an internal telephone service or email address – could be set up to receive questions from employees about rumors in circulation.

PR staff could prepare messages on the issues for management and supervisors to communicate in response. The messages should be tailored to specific audiences and need to be couched in the everyday language of the workplace, not in ‘management-speak’.

US research showed that a reasonably effective approach to minimizing rumors is to provide structuring to uncertainty. For instance, by explaining the procedures by which planned changes will be decided, the employer gives employees the comfort of knowing the broad guidelines that will be used. Similarly, telling them when an official announcement will be made at least provides them with some structure or stability of intent, even if the content of the announcement is not known to them.

Another technique, requiring your professional judgment, is merely to ignore the rumor and allow it to be overtaken by events.

Experience in the workplace showed that a punitive approach didn’t work, i.e. to search for and/or seek to punish people who started or spread the rumor.
REWARDS & RECOGNITION – INTRODUCTION

Human resources are the most important among all the resources an organization owns. To retain efficient and experienced workforce in an organization is very crucial in overall performance of an organization. Motivated employees can help make an organization competitively more value added and profitable.

Organizations in today’s environment seek to determine the reasonable balance between employee commitment and performance of the organization. The reward and recognition programs serve as the most contingent factor in keeping employees’ self esteem high and passionate. Oosthuizen (2001) stated that it is among the function of managers to motivate the employees successfully and influence their behavior to achieve greater organizational efficiency. La Motta (1995) is of the view that performance at job is the result of ability and motivation.

Ability formulated through education, equipment, training, experience, ease in task and two types of capacities i.e. mental and physical. The performance evaluation and rewards are the factors that proved to be the bonding agents of the performance evaluation programs. According to Wilson (1994), the process of performance management is one among the key elements of total reward system.

Entwistle (1987) is of the view that if an employee performs successfully, it leads to organizational rewards and as a result motivational factor of employees lies in their performance. Majority of the organizations require their employees to work according to the rules and regulations, as well as, job requirements that comply with full standards. The investigations that have been conducted to find the relationship between compensation and individuals were focused to increase the performance of employees (Ciscel, 1974).

The highly motivated employees serve as the competitive advantage for any company because their performance leads an organization to well accomplishment of its goals. Among financial, economical and human resources, human resources are more vital that can provide a company competitive edge as compared to others.
According to Andrew (2004), commitment of all employees is based on rewards and recognition. Lawler (2003) argued that prosperity and survival of the organizations is determined through the human resources how they are treated.

Most of organizations have gained the immense progress by fully complying with their business strategy through a well balanced reward and recognition programs for employee. Deeprose (1994) argued that the motivation of employees and their productivity can be enhanced through providing them effective recognition which ultimately results in improved performance of organizations.

The entire success of an organization is based on how an organization keeps its employees motivated and in what way they evaluate the performance of employees for job compensation. Managing the performance of employees forms an integral part of any organizational strategy and how they deal with their human capital (Drucker as cited in Meyer & Kirsten, 2005).

Today where every organization has to meet its obligations; the performance of employees has a very crucial impact on overall organizational achievement. In a de-motivated environment, low or courage less employees can not practice their skills, abilities, innovation and full commitment to the extent an organization needs.

Freedman (1978) is of the view that when effective rewards and recognition are implemented within an organization, favorable working environment is produced which motivates employees to excel in their performance. Employees take recognition as their feelings of value and appreciation and as a result it boosts up morale of employee which ultimately increases productivity of organizations.

Csikszentmihalyi (1990) posits a view that the state of satisfaction and happiness is achieved by the employees only when they maximally put their abilities in performing the activities and functions at work. In this way motivated employees are retained with the organizations thus reducing extra costs of hiring.
Flynn (1998) argued that rewards and recognition programs keep high spirits among employees, boosts up their morale and create a linkage between performance and motivation of the employees. The basic purpose of recognition and reward program is to define a system to pay and communicate it to the employees so that they can link their reward to their performance which ultimately leads to employee’s job satisfaction. Where job satisfaction, as defined by Lock (cited in Gruneberg, 1979, p. 3), is a pleasurable positive emotional state as a result of work appraisal from one’s job experiences.

The rewards include the financial rewards, pay and benefits, promotions and incentives that satisfy employees to some extent but for committed employees, recognition must be given to keep them motivated, appreciated and committed.

Baron (1983) argued that when we recognize and acknowledge the employees in terms of their identification, their working capacity and performance is very high. Recognition today is highest need according to most of the experts whereas a reward which includes all the monetary and compensative benefits cannot be the sole motivator for employees’ motivation program.

Employees are motivated fully when their needs are met. The level of motivation of employees increases when employees get an unexpected increase in recognition, praise and pay (La Motta, 1995).

In today’s dynamic environment the highly motivated employees serve as a synergy for accomplishment of company’s goals, business plans, high efficiency, growth and performance. Motivation is also required when the organizational workforce has not a good relationship pattern. Employees’ relation with employees and with supervisor is a key ingredient of the inner strength of the organization. The ability of supervisors to provide strong leadership has an effect on job satisfaction of employees (Morris, 2004). This chapter relates how the impact of incentives, rewards and recognition programs drives employee motivation.

Rewards play a vital role in determining the significant performance in job and it is positively associated with the process of motivation. Lawler (2003) argued that there are
two factors which determine how much a reward is attractive, first is the amount of reward which is given and the second is the weight age an individual gives to a certain reward. Deeprose (1994) is of the view that “Good managers recognize people by doing things that acknowledge their accomplishments and they reward people by giving them something tangible.”

Fair chances of promotion according to employee’s ability and skills make employee more loyal to their work and become a source of pertinent workability for the employee. Bull (2005) posits a view that when employees experience success in mentally challenging occupations which allows them to exercise their skills and abilities, they experience greater levels of job satisfaction.

Incentives, rewards and recognition are the key parameters of today’s motivation programs according to most of the organizations as these bind the success factor with the employees’ performance. Robbins (2001) asserts that promotions create the opportunity for personal growth, increased levels of responsibility and an increase on social standing.

Similarly, the recognition which is a central point towards employee motivation adores an employee through appreciation and assigns a status at individual level in addition to being an employee of the organization. Barton (2002) argued that the factor in Fortune best companies which discriminates companies from the others is recognition that is the most important factor of their reward system.

Wilson (1994) stated that the conditional recognition is that type of recognition which one has to earn by his own efforts and which is gained by some sense of achievement of an action or result.

Employees are definitely closer to their organization as their job can become the major satisfaction in their life after having a proper rewards and recognition at their job. Rewards enhance the level of productivity and performance at job whether it’s a first time performance or repeated activity at the job in a progressive way.
Research by Eastman (2009) consistently found that intrinsic motivation is conducive to producing creative work, while extrinsic motivation is unfavorable to producing creative work. Gagne (2009) suggested a new model of knowledge-sharing motivation which provides suggestion for designing five important human resource management (HRM) practices including staffing, job design, performance and compensation systems, managerial styles and training.

Ali and Ahmed (2009) confirmed that there is a statistically significant relationship between reward and recognition respectively, also motivation and satisfaction. The study revealed that if rewards or recognition offered to employees were to be altered, then there would be a corresponding change in work motivation and satisfaction.

**DIFFERENTIATING REWARDS FROM MERIT PAY AND THE PERFORMANCE APPRECIATION**

In designing a reward program, a small business owner needs to separate the salary or merit pay system from the reward system. Financial rewards, especially those given on a regular basis such as bonuses, gain sharing, etc., should be tied to an employee's or a group's accomplishments and should be considered "pay at risk" in order to distance them from salary. By doing so, a manager can avoid a sense of entitlement on the part of the employee and ensure that the reward emphasizes excellence or achievement rather than basic competency.

Finally, in many small businesses teamwork is a crucial element of a successful employee's job.

**Designing a Reward Programme**

The keys to developing a reward program are as follows:

- Identification of company or group goals that the reward program will support
- Identification of the desired employee performance or behaviors that will reinforce the company's goals
• Determination of key measurements of the performance or behavior, based on the individual or group's previous achievements
• Determination of appropriate rewards
• Communication of program to employees

In order to reap benefits such as increased productivity, the entrepreneur designing a reward program must identify company or group goals to be reached and the behaviors or performance that will contribute to this.

While this may seem obvious, companies frequently make the mistake of rewarding behaviors or achievements that either fails to further business goals or actually sabotage them. If teamwork is a business goal, a bonus system rewarding individuals who improve their productivity by themselves or at the expense of another does not make sense. Likewise, if quality is an important issue for an entrepreneur, the reward system that he or she designs should not emphasize rewarding the quantity of work accomplished by a business unit.

Properly measuring performance ensures the program pays off in terms of business goals. Since rewards have a real cost in terms of time or money, small business owners need to confirm that performance has actually improved before rewarding it.

Once again, the measures need to relate to a small business' goals. As Linda Thornburg noted in HR Magazine, "Performance measures in a rewards program have to be linked to an overall business strategy.... Most reward programs use multiple measures which can include such variables as improved financial performance along with improved customer service, improved customer satisfaction, and reduced defects."

Lastly, in order for a rewards program to be successful, the specifics need to be clearly spelled out for every employee. Motivation depends on the individual's ability to understand what is being asked of her. Once this has been done, reinforce the original communication with regular meetings or memos promoting the program. Keep your communications simple but frequent to ensure staffs are kept abreast of changes to the system.
TABLE No: III – 1

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “I clearly understand my job responsibilities”

<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>389</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisited Response (2008)</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

Graph No: III – 1

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “I clearly understand my job responsibilities”
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: III – 1

38.9% of the respondents have strongly responded for the question I clearly understand the job responsibility during the initial response. 53.2% i.e. 532 respondents have rated as agreed.

5.3% are undecided and less than 3% have either disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Overall more than 90% of the respondents felt that they have clear understanding about their job responsibility.

The revisited response showed around 50% of the respondents either agreeing or disagreeing.

23.4% of the respondents have strongly agreed, 22.6% of the respondents had agreed during revisited response.

8.7% of the respondents were undecided on their response.

While 21.3% of the respondents disagreed, 24% of the respondents strongly disagreed for the question I understand my job responsibility in revisited response.

Inference:

The above interpretations clearly explain that during market volatility, organizations fail to provide clarity on job responsibility. The priority of organizations would be to come out of the economic down.

It’s essential to have a proper mechanism to provide clarity on job responsibility to employees all time. This helps in keeping the morale high anytime.
TABLE No: III – 2

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “I have up-to-date and relevant job description to perform my 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>365</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisited Response (2008)</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

Graph No: III – 2

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “I have up-to-date and relevant job description to perform my work”
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: III – 2

As per the initial response 365 of the respondents or 36.5%, have strongly agreed for having up-to-date job description. 54.25 raged as agreed.

Overall 90% of the respondents showed a positive response of having up-to-date job description.

5.8% were undecided. 3.3% and 0.2% have disagreed and strongly disagreed for have up-to-date job description in initial response.

As per the revisited response, 24.3% or 243 respondents strongly agreed, 22.8% of the respondents agree for having up-to-date job description.

9.2% of the responded choose to be undecided. 23.4% of the respondents disagreed that they had up-to-date job description and around 20% of the respondents strongly disagreed.

Inference:

Clear job descriptions are very essential for employees to know what they should do at their work place. Lack of clarity creates confusion and employees tend to perform lower than their potential.

This also leads to a feeling of biased performance appraisals.

The focus from the organization to provide clarity on job description should be always high and clear. The above response shows that the organizations were providing very little clarity for employees about the job description.
TABLE No: III – 3

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “I understand of how my company’s strategy differentiates us from the competition”

<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>231</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.3%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revisited Response (2008)</strong></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.3%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>329</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.3%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

Graph No: III – 3

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “I understand of how my company's strategy differentiates us from the competition”
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: III – 3

231 respondents, i.e. 23.1% of the respondents strongly agreed that they understood how their company’s’ strategies were different from the completion.

62.1% of the respondents rated as agreed, while 5.8% were undecided during initial response.

4.7% and 4.3% of the respondents’ rated disagree and strongly disagree on understanding the company’s strategy.

The revisited response had a mixed bag. 25.6% or 256 of the respondents remained undecided.

23.4% disagreed to have understood about the company’s strategy during revisited response. 22.3% of the respondents rated strongly disagreed on understanding company’s strategy.

Inference:

Employee’s goals should be always aligned to organizational goals. This helps employees to associate themselves with the organization and be part of the growth.

The previous question should a clear result that companies failed to provide job description during a volatile economy. The same can be correlated to this question also.

When employees feel to be left out, or feel not being part of the organization’s goals the productivity decreases. Policies should be built to reward and punish and necessarily linked to organizational goals.
TABLE No: III – 4

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “I am satisfied with my understanding of how my goals are linked to company goals”

<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>287</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisited Response (2008)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph No: III – 4

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “I am satisfied with my understanding of how my goals are linked to company goals”

Respondent’s Responses
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: III – 4

Initial Response: 28.7% of the respondents strongly agreed and 54.3% of the respondents agreed to have understood how their goals are linked to organizations goals.

8.7% or 87 respondents were undecided.

4.8% of the respondents disagreed and 3.5% of the respondents strongly disagreed for the question ‘I am satisfied with my understanding of how my goals are linked to company goals’.

Revisited Response: Maximum number of respondents i.e. 29.8% of them was undecided.

23.4 % of the responded have rated as disagreed, and 20.8% of the respondents have rated as strongly disagree.

6.5% of the respondents, i.e. 65, of them rated as strongly agree and 19.5% of the respondents have rated as agree on understanding their goals linked to company goals.

Inference:

Individual’s goals are necessary to be linked to organizations goals to have a performing organization. When both the goals are aligned, the performance evaluation can be done on quantitative method.

Psychologically, aligning employee’s goals to organizations goals and giving clarity helps in building a close network.
**TABLE No: III – 5**

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “I get a platform to discuss with my manager about my aspiration”

<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>258</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.8%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revisited Response (2008)</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.8%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

**Graph No: III – 5**

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “I get a platform to discuss with my manager about my aspiration”
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: III – 5

25.8% of the respondents have strongly agreed on ability to discuss their aspirations with the managers during initial response.

48.9% have rated as agree and 6.5% were undecided. A majority of 48.9% of the respondents have shown a positive response.

12% or 120 of the respondents have disagreed and 6.8% have strongly disagreed for the statement ‘I get a platform to discuss with my manager about my aspiration’ in the initial response.

In the revisited response, majority of the respondents, 38.7% of them were undecided about the views.

23.4% and 15.8% of the respondents have rated as disagree and strongly disagree respectively for the statement ‘I get a platform to discuss with my manager about my aspiration’

Inference:

Creating a platform between managers and employees to discuss aspiration of the employees is very necessary for a performing organization. This creates employee engagement and employee involvement.

It’s necessary to hear employees. Employees don’t just perform, but would like to create an emotional bonding with the organization or the manager which show consideration for their growth.

The above interpretation shows that during the initial response the employees had given positive feedback and the same set of employees over a period of time, during completely different working conditions, have rated negatively or are undecided.
TABLE No: III – 6

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “I understand company’s vision & mission”

<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>198</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisited Response (2008)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

Graph No: III – 6

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “I understand company’s vision & mission”
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: III – 6

19.8%, 198 respondents have rated as strongly agree, 24.5% as agree for ‘I understand company’s vision & mission’ during the initial response.

23.4% have been undecided. Less than 50% of the respondents were able to understand their company’s vision & mission.

17.8% and 14.5% of the respondents had disagreed and strongly disagreed in the initial response respectively for the statement I understood company’s vision & mission.

In the revisited response, 15% of the respondents have strongly agreed, and 14.9% have agreed for understanding company’s vision & mission.

37.8% of the respondents were undecided. 18.9% have disagreed and 13.4% of the respondents have strongly disagreed to have understanding of company’s vision & mission.

Inference:

Vision defines the desired or intended future state of an organization or enterprise in terms of its fundamental objective and/or strategic direction. Mission, defines the fundamental purpose of an organization or an enterprise, succinctly describing why it exists and what it does to achieve its Vision. It is very essential that employees in the organization are aware of it and work towards achieving it.

From the above interpretation, it is clear that less than 50% of the respondents are aware of the organizations vision and mission. The response has been mostly same at two different periods. This highlights the state the organizations to provide clarity about vision and mission to its employees.
**TABLE No: III – 7**

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “I am part of the decision making process in the organization”

<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>179</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revisited Response (2008)</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

**Graph No: III – 7**

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “I am part of the decision making process in the organization”
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: III – 7

179 respondents, i.e. 17.9% of the respondents have strongly agreed for being part of decision making and 49% of the respondents have rated as agreed for being part of decision making during initial response.

13.8% of respondents disagreed and 6.5% of the respondents have strongly disagreed. However, 12.8% of the respondents were undecided during the initial response.

Revisited response had a complete contradiction in response. A majority of 28.9% of the respondents disagreed and 23.7% of respondents strongly disagreed.

23.9% of the respondents were undecided.

Only 8.7% of the respondents rated as strongly agree and 14.8% of the respondents rated as agree.

Inference:

Making employee part of decision making process creates culture of empowerment in the organization. Empowerment is a psychological situation, which to a larger extent plays a hygiene factor in work environment.

In today organization, employees want to be in the decision making process. They want to heard and considered. The above interpretation shown that, though the respondents have gained experience and knowledge over a period of years, they felt they are not in the decision making process during the economy slow down, which would have had a negative impact on their performance.
TABLE No: III – 8

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “I receive appropriate recognition for my contributions”

<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>27.6%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisited Response (2008)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>325</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

Graph No: III – 8

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “I receive appropriate recognition for my contributions”
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: III – 8

27.6% of the respondents strongly agreed that they receive appreciation for their contribution. 46.5% rated as strongly agree for receiving recognition for their contribution during the initial response. 5.4% of the respondents were undecided.

13.8% of the respondents, i.e. 138 respondents and 6.7% of the respondents have rated as disagree and strongly disagree for getting recognition for their contribution in the initial response.

As per the revisited response, only around 24% of the respondents gave a positive input. While 4.9% rated as strongly agree, 17.6% of the respondents rated as agree.

18.9% of the respondents were undecided on their views for being recognized during the revisited response.

A majority of 32.5% of the respondents rated as disagrees and 26.1% of the respondents strongly disagreed for getting recognition. This was in complete reversal compared to the initial response.

Inference:

Rewarding and recognizing employees should be a part of the culture of the organizations. Rewarding the right employee is key. The above interpretation shows that employees were well recognized during the initial response, but not in the revisited response.

Organizations, during critical period like slow growth, forget to keep their focus on good initiatives. Though the employees have rated positively during the initial response, same group has rated low or negative in revisited response.
TABLE No: III – 9

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “Men and women are provided with equal recognition opportunities in 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>198</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.5%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revisited Response (2008)</strong></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.8%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.2%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

Graph No: III – 9

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “Men and women are provided with equal recognition opportunities in the company”
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: III – 9

19.8% of the respondents strongly agreed that the organizations provided equal recognition. A maximum of 53.2% of the respondents have rated as agree.

More than 70% of the respondents have given positive feedback. 8.7% were undecided.

13.8% or 138 respondents rated as disagree and 4.5% of the respondents have strongly disagreed in the initial response.

During the revisited response, 15.3% of the respondents rated as strongly agree and 49.7% of the respondents have rated as agree.

23.6% of the respondents were undecided during the revisited response. 7.6% of the respondents rated as disagree and 3.8% as strongly disagree for the revisited response for the question of equal recognition.

Inference:

It is very essential for the organization to give equal opportunities and importance to both male and female workers. The above interpretation gives a very clear view that in both the situations, the employees felt the organization was not biased in recognizing both the gender of employees.

The culture of “pay was work, promote for potential” should be created to ensure equality.
TABLE No: III – 10

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “I feel that people get ahead primarily on the merits of their 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>289</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

Graph No: III – 10

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “I feel that people get ahead primarily on the merits of their work”
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: III – 10

28.9% of the respondents have rated as strongly agree and a majority of 43.4% of the respondents have rated as agree during the initial response for the question on getting promotion on merits.

18.1% of the respondents were undecided in the initial response.

While 7.3% of the respondents rated as disagree, 2.3% of the respondents have rated as strongly disagree for the question that people get ahead primary on the merits of their work in the initial response.

The revisited response has given an opposite rating as against initial response. 32.1% of the respondents have rated as disagree and 10.2% of the respondents have rated as strong disagree. 18.7% of the respondents were undecided during the revisited response.

15.3% of the respondents strongly agreed and 23.7% of the respondents agreed that people got ahead primarily on the merits of the work.

Inference:

Organization should have a culture of “pay for performance and promote for potential”. Though the initial response showed a positive sign of more than 79% of respondents rating either agree or strongly agree, in the revisited response, nearly 40% of the respondents gave negative feedback.

The feeler of negative feedback during the revisited response would have come due to companies unable to move the employees to new role or unable to enhance employees job responsibility.
Table showing Standard Deviation of variables under reward and recognition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL. No</th>
<th>Recognition and Rewards</th>
<th>Number of Respondents Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Men and women are provided equal recognition</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Based on Merits of Work</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Visibility for the good work done</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On an Average, 260 employees out of 1000 agreed that they receive appropriate recognitions under different variables with a standard deviation of 36.04.
**TABLE No: III – 11**

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “Employees get visibility for the good work 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><strong>Initial Response (2004)</strong></td>
<td>276</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revisited Response (2008)</strong></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>415</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

**Graph No: III – 11**

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “Employees get visibility for the good work done”
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: III – 11

A majority of 53.2% of the respondents have rated as agree during the initial response for getting visibility for the good work done. 27.6% have rated as strongly agree.

14.3% of the respondents choose to be undecided.

4.7% of the respondents rated as disagree and 0.2% of the respondents has rated as strongly disagree.

In the revisited response, there is a drop in positive feelers, with only 13.9% of the respondents rating as strongly agree and 23.5% rating as agree.

A majority of 32.1% of the respondents have rated as disagree and 12.8% of the respondents have rated as strongly disagree.

17.7% of the respondents were undecided during the revisited response.

Inference:

Providing visibility to employees for their good work is a hygiene motivator. It’s very essential that organizations adapt to the culture of recognition.

Based on the above interpretation it shows that employees during the revisited response have rated low on getting visibility.

The economic down fall had most of the organizations to focus more on business retention and growth rather than employee related initiatives. Organization should have a strong process, which can sustain any type of business situations.
TABLE No: III – 12

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “My organization values rewards and recognition as key for employees’ fulfillment”

<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>285</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisited Response (2008)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

Graph No: III – 12

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “My organization values rewards and recognition as key for employees’ fulfillment”
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: III – 12

28.5% of the respondents have rated as strongly agree and 38.9% of the respondents have rated as agree for question on organizations valuing rewards and recognitions as key for employee fulfillment.

16.2% of the respondents have disagreed and 7.7% of the respondents have strongly disagreed in the initial response. 8.7% of the respondents were undecided.

In the revisited response, a majority of 32.1% of the respondents have rated as disagree and around 15% rated as strongly disagree.

23.1% of the respondents were undecided.

Only 4.6% of the respondents rated as strongly agree and 24.6% of respondents have rated as agree for organizations valuating rewards and recognition as key for employees fulfillment.

Inference:

Organizations should have a good rewards and recognition system which is valued key for employee fulfillment. Rewards and recognitions system should be drafted well to avoid any bias.

Rewards need not be only in the form of cash. Recognizing employees for their good work through certificates, and appreciations mails too goes a long way.
TABLE No: III – 13

Table showing the distribution of response in number and percentage for the question “The performance management in my organization helps in distinguishes the good performer from the rest”

<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>278</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisited Response (2008)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected through field survey

Graph No: III – 13

Graph showing the distribution of response in percentage for the question “The performance management in my organization helps in distinguishes the good performer from the rest”
Interpretation of Table & Graph No: III – 13

27.8% of the respondents have rated as strongly agree for the statement that the organization helps in distinguish good performer from the rest in the initial response.

37.6% of the respondents have rated as agree and 17.6% of the respondents have choose to be undecided.

As per the initial response, 12.8% of the respondents have rated as disagree and 4.2% of the respondents have rated as strongly disagree.

The revisited responses shows that 17.9% of the respondents have rated as strongly agree and a majority of 38.7% of the respondents agree that organizations performance management system helps in distinguish good performers.

However, as compared to initial response 12.8% had rated as disagree, in the revised response it is 24.7% and 4.9% as strongly disagree.

Inference:

Organizations performance management philosophy should be focused on “pay of performance and promote for potential”. The system should be well knitted that, it takes care of all the attributes that helps in recognizing good performers.

Poor performance system would create scope for bias and employee dissatisfaction. Management should ensure that the system is documented and free from any bias and confusion and should have complete clarity.