

Research Article

A Comparison of the Results only Work Environment and the Rewards and Punishment System Working Conditions

Girdhar Sharma

PhD Scholar, GLA University, Mathura, Uttar Pradesh, India.

I N F O

E-mail Id:

girdhari00@gmail.com

How to cite this article:

Sharma G. A Comparison of the Results only Work Environment and the Rewards and Punishment System Working Conditions. *J Adv Res Servi Mgmt* 2022; 5(1): 1-5.

Date of Submission: 2022-05-01

Date of Acceptance: 2022-05-30

A B S T R A C T

The majority of us work in settings where incentive comes mostly in the form of “sticks and carrots”: If you do well, you will be rewarded, but if you perform poorly, you will be penalized. There have always been discussions over this traditional approach to encouraging individuals, which many believe causes more harm to them than good. We conducted a survey on more than 50 corporate employees and employers with the goal of evaluating the effectiveness or dare we say the ineffectiveness, of the conventional reward and punishment system while also shedding light on a new system that may prove to be revolutionary and change the way that we run our businesses in the future.

Keywords: ROWE, Employment, Environment, Work, Succession

Introduction

The majority of firms follow a system that is built around extrinsic motivators, which involves encouraging people with incentives that are unrelated to their work. In contrast, relatively little attention is paid to the elements that contribute to intrinsic motivation (where people are self-motivated because they are given the freedom to do the work they enjoy).

As a result, in this research, we investigate a model of business that does away with the concept of rewards and punishments as tools of reward and, instead, places the emphasis on the factors that must be present in order for people to have a genuine attachment to the work that they do: The Results Only Work Environment or ROWE.

Background of Present Research

“The best way to use money as a motivator, especially for the purpose of fostering creative and conceptual work, is to take the issue of money off the table so that people can concentrate on the real work” (Daniel Pink, 2009).

Experiments in socioeconomics were conducted at the

beginning of the 1970s by some of the most prominent social scientists in order to demonstrate the degree of efficacy of the traditional incentives system. The findings were unlike anything that had ever been seen before and the first experiment was followed by a succession of other unprecedented experiments that were conducted over the course of a period of forty years. There was one thing that was repeatedly shown by these experiments and that was the fact that traditional incentive systems are not as successful as we believe they are.

Results only Work Environment

Why do many find ROWE to be so beneficial? To begin, this strategy places complete control of the working tasks in the hands of the staff members themselves. They get a larger sense of agency as a result of their capacity to make a positive contribution to society as a whole, which in turn increases their desire and willingness to achieve greatness in their place of employment. Because of the fact that an employee is ultimately responsible for their own performance, they have a greater incentive to complete tasks in a timely and professional manner. In

addition, having the ability to work from any location and when traveling makes for a more streamlined working atmosphere. Because of this, it is possible for employees to successfully work their jobs while working from home without the supervision of their boss. This is a much-appreciated reprieve for introverts from the clamor that often occurs in commercial offices. When companies allow their employees to work from home, it results in a reduction in the quantity of office space that is used, which results in a cost savings across the board.

The ROWE strategy does, of course, come with a few potential drawbacks. Unfortuitously, there will always be those employees who are not going to make the most of the opportunities provided to them by working hard to further their personal growth. In a model based on ROWE, slackers will still exist, which is why employers need to be on the lookout for misuse of the system in such a form. Working away from the office has a number of advantages, but it also has the potential to restrict the amount of contact that takes place. There are others who believe that spending time together in the office is essential for effective teamwork and the achievement of one's objectives.

Objective of the Research

The purpose and objectives of this research is:

- To evaluate the efficiency of the Results Only Work Environment (ROWE) in comparison to the traditional Rewards and Punishment system
- In order to do a work between them and choose which of them is the option that is more suitable for contemporary places

Research Methodology

The contrast between a traditional rewards and punishments system at work and a results-only work environment is going to be the topic of our research. Our goal was to determine which of these is more applicable to workplaces in the 21st century, both in terms of its efficacy and its relevance. This research was conducted using a design known as qualitative research. Because we intended to define and test links between diverse features, as well as investigate the cause and effect that exists between these numerous occurrences, we decided to design our research using a qualitative approach. The following topics were investigated using the qualitative design methodology.

“To obtain patterns between the different aspects that determine an employee's performance and to compare those patterns”

Data Sampling

More than fifty male and female employees, ranging from entry level to senior/executive level, were included in this particular sample. The employees were divided into several

groups according to the characteristics of the type that they did. It is essential to keep in mind that the staff employees were selected with work given to the two distinct sorts of work places that are known to exist in workplaces.

Data Collection

In the first step of the process, a questionnaire with a total of 25 questions was compiled. 15 of these questions were geared specifically for employees, while the other 10 were directed toward employers. These questions covered a wide range of topics, including work culture and environment, happiness on the job, innovative work, employee satisfaction and turnover rates, among other topics. The questionnaires were sent to workers from two distinct kinds of organizations, one of which adheres to the traditional culture of 'reward and punishment,' and the other of which adheres to the culture of 'results alone.' Google forms were used to facilitate the distribution of the questionnaires among the staff employees. We determined that maintaining the confidentiality of the responses was the best course of action given the nature of some of the questions being posed. This ensured that the responders were being completely forthright with their responses. After the data had been retrieved, comparisons were conducted to identify trends in the responses in order to get results.

Data Analysis

It is of the utmost significance to point out that the questionnaires were given out to participants who fell into one of two distinct categories:

- Participants employed in companies that operate according to the traditional reward and punishment system
- Participants employed in organizations whose work cultures emphasize achieving only measurable results

This was done because comparisons between the two systems were required in order to establish which one was more efficient, effective and relevant to the level. The reason this was done is because comparisons between the two systems were required.

As was said previously, the survey participants who were selected to answer questions regarding a variety of topics, including job satisfaction, work-life balance, pay, non-monetary perks, autonomy and creativity, were employees and employers in this particular instance.

The responses that were collected from the participants were carefully analyzed based on all of the numerous criteria and they were then classified based on the many characteristics that were discussed in the previous paragraph.

Following the completion of the data classification process, the responses were further categorized based on the two

distinct kinds of work contexts. This was the most significant category to be assigned. As soon as it was finished, the variations in the patterns of these were able to be seen in stark contrast.

Frequencies

Findings of the Research

There is a science gap between what scientists know and what people in business really do when it comes to working a business. The traditional technique is successful the vast majority of the time due to the fact that it is constructed around extrinsic motivators, which often generate more problems than they solve. The concept of rewarding and punishing employees is an outdated model that does not work nearly as effectively in today's fast-paced work environment, as seen by the abundance of punishment supporting this claim. The results of the research are shown in the following:

- It was discovered that seventy-five percent of the people working under a rewards and punishment system were dissatisfied with the jobs that they had. The numbers were much lower among employees who were subjected to a results-only work environment
- It was also found that 63.5% of the employee participants work in a system in which they are required to work for additional hours and are forced to undergo stress, which eventually results in a reduction in creative job and discontent with their jobs
- It was also discovered that 56.6% of employees who worked in a reward and punishment system were dissatisfied with their remuneration, but the people who worked in ROWE had lower numbers of employees who were unhappy with their jobs
- It was discovered that the majority of employees in a traditional system, which accounts for 64.1% of all workers, do not obtain autonomy to conduct their work. This includes senior workers. The situation is exactly the contrary for employees who are employed in ROWE, since they are granted a great amount of autonomy when working their jobs
- It was also shown that 56.1% of employers grant promotions based on the length of time an employee has worked for the company rather than placing importance on the results generated by the work employees
- It was found that companies that used ROWE had much higher employee retention rates than those that practiced a system of rewards and punishments.
- It was also found that more than sixty percent of business owners do not view their organizations to be environments that encourage open communication and work among employers
- It was also shown that more than 77.7% of people

working in traditional systems had considered quitting their jobs at some system or another. Again, the numbers for ROWE were either very low or they were non-existent

- It was discovered that 67.8% of employers feel that non-monetary rewards are significantly more successful than monetary ones and this information was gleaned from the questions that were posed to the employers

The data make it abundantly evident that a results-only work environment is a more suitable option than the current system in terms of obtaining higher levels of productivity, enhancing work culture, increasing job satisfaction and ensuring employee retention.

Suggestions

The findings and recommendations of the researchers are shown below. These recommendations, which are based on the results of the research, might be helpful in bringing about changes in organisations with regard to their work cultures, levels of creativity and innovation, levels of job satisfaction and rates of culture retention.

Providing Autonomy to the Employees

According to the results, autonomy inspires us to think creatively without requiring us to comply with strict rules and regulations in the work. Organizations have the ability to promote staff autonomy, develop trust and boost innovation and creativity by reconsidering traditional conceptions of control, such as regular office hours, dress code, numerical objectives and so on.

When employees are given autonomy, it will be easier for them to strike a balance between their personal and professional lives.

Try Out 10% Time

Offer the employees the opportunity to spend 10% of their time on the job working on a project that they have chosen for themselves. These initiatives shouldn't be part of their regular work responsibilities, but they should still be beneficial to your business.

Google is notable for its implementation of the 10% time policy, in which workers are given time each week to work on anything other than their normal tasks, such as creating new code or brainstorming ways to enhance an existing procedure.

It is essential to take notice of the fact that applications such as Google Chrome, Gmail and Google News were built during these times, suggesting a high rate of production.

Build Trust

Establishing trust early on is essential to the success of any relationship. One method for doing this is to discuss your uncertainties and questions freely with the people around

you. While you are doing this, reassure everyone that you will be there to support them and be transparent about how you will monitor their performance moving forward.

In addition to this, members of the team need to be able to trust one another. Build trust among the members of your team by encouraging them to mingle outside of work and by inquiring about their personal lives, including their friends, people and interests, whenever you gather everyone together. These more casual exchanges can help you recognize people for who they really are and locate areas of agreement with them.

Clearly Define Job Descriptions

Your team members have a responsibility to fully comprehend the functions for which they have been employed. Therefore, you should begin by writing a detailed job description for each of them. It is possible that as you go through their duties, it will become obvious that a ROWE is not suitable for them and that they would do better in a work setting that is more traditional and organized.

If you decide to go with a ROWE, make sure that when you create the job descriptions for your team members, you just concentrate on the tasks that they are accountable for and steer clear of telling them how they should achieve their objectives. Keep in mind that a ROWE is all about autonomy, so be sure to define what each person's goals are for being there.

Monitor Performance

Because you may not be working very closely with the other participants in a ROWE TM, it is very vital to work track of the progress that each individual is making. Therefore, you should inquire as to the method that they prefer for keeping you up to date. Daily stand-up or scrum meetings give an excellent platform for this and participants may even work virtually if they so want. The likelihood is high that the majority of people will be content to check in daily or weekly.

Ensure that your People work as a Team

When a team is geographically distributed and works at various times, it might be difficult for members to communicate with one another and generate spontaneous ideas. Gather your people together on a regular basis and make it a priority to keep everyone informed. Also, do everything you can to foster original thought and creative expression and make it a priority for each individual to come up with fresh concepts.

Foster the spirit of cooperation by providing your people with the tools they need to maintain open lines of communication with one another. There are a lot of people who work in ROWEs who utilize social media, instant messaging, email, Skype or Zoom virtual meetings.

Take Some Steps to give up Control

Giving up control does not have to imply giving up control all at once; rather, it may be accomplished in stages by doing the following activities, which are listed below:

- Involving individuals in the process of determining their own goals - People are more likely to be invested in their work when they are working toward goals that they have helped to formulate themselves
- Lessening the use of controlling language: Instead of stating "you must" or "you should," try using terms like "think about doing" or "consider doing"
- Maintaining open-door policy, during which people are free to come and chat to you about any time, whether it be business-related or personal, without fear of being judged.

Conclusion

There is a disconnect between what is known in scientific circles and what is done in the business science. The reward motivators of the 20th century, which we believe are a natural element of business, do work, but only in an astonishingly small number of circumstances. This system, which has a "if-then" criteria as its foundation, often stifles creative expression and reduces both job satisfaction and productivity. The hidden, inner motivation to accomplish things for their own purpose rather than for the sake of rewards or punishments is the key to excellent performance, not external punishment.

The way that businesses are managed that is, the rules that they have in place for the administration of talent and people are based on assumptions that have become outmoded. Assumptions that were made during the 20th century. Why haven't we altered the way we do business over the last century, given that we've altered everything else?

The desire to do things because they matter, because we like doing them and because they are a part of something significant should be at the core of each business endeavor. This is the focus of a results-oriented work environment, sometimes known as a ROWE.

ROWE revolves mostly on the following three things: Autonomy. A sense of control and direction. These are the fundamental components of a completely new system and when coupled with the concept of intrinsic motivation, it has the ability to bring about a revolution in the way our system works.

References

1. Amabile TM, Dejong W, Lepper MR. Effects of externally imposed deadlines on subsequent intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1976; 34(1): 92.

2. Kohn A. Punished by rewards: The trouble with gold stars, incentive plans, A's, praise and other bribes. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, Legault, 1999.
 3. Demers LG, Grant I, Chung PJ. On the self-regulation of implicit and explicit prejudice: A self-determination theory perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 2007; 33(5): 732-749.
 4. Lepper MR, Greene D, Nisbett RE. Undermining children's intrinsic interest with extrinsic reward: A test of the "overjustification" hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1973; 28(1): 129-137.
 5. Plant RW, Ryan RM. Intrinsic motivation and the effects of self-consciousness, self-awareness and ego-involvement: An investigation of internally controlling styles. *Journal of Personality* 1985; 53(3): 435-449.
 6. Weinstein N, Deci EL, Ryan RM. Motivational determinants of integrating positive and negative past identities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 2011; 100(3): 527-544.
-