

Assessing Roles of Services Employee influence in Internal Marketing Quality - A Case Study on a General Insurance Company of India

Dr. N. R. Mohan Prakash*

Abstract

The collective growth of any firm in the services sector is obviously depends on the various roles played by employees of the firm in services process. The service employee role(s) is/are specifically describes the relationship between the job process of the employee and his duty and responsibilities is service encounter. Efficiency of an employee can be improved by technical support and training, however the effectiveness in services delivery is mostly depends on the employee understanding and the level involvement against of various roles he has to play in services delivery process. Effectiveness in services delivery process in turn culminates to improve the services quality. Services differentiation and the consciousness of services quality will helps any services firm for the sustainability, consistent growth and profitability. This paper in an empirical study conducted through a questionnaire on the employees of a leading general insurance company in India. The respondents were asked to rate their performance in the roles. The result of the study reveals that most of the respondents have not given the either extreme rating (1 of 10) on any role. The study is in an indication to mark the significance of each role and the relevance of internal marketing.

1. Introduction

The concept of internal marketing signifies the role of employees in achieving organizational objectives. Employees are a critical resource for any service organization. Internal marketing states that the employees of the organization are the first market and the final consumers are the second. It is a proven fact all over the world that only satisfied employees can deliver quality services to the customers. Employee satisfaction has depends are various factors, however psychological job satisfaction is one the important factors should be consider based on how he/she able to play and influenced by varied roles in service process. If a firm provides an adequate scope to understand and flexible environment to play the relevant role in the services process is one the factors, prominently showing its impression on psychological job satisfaction of employee. Here the question of employee satisfaction rises based on the psychological job satisfaction in addition to other means of satisfaction - such as monetary benefits, career development, training, supporting, motivating, empowerment, rewarding and retention.

Service companies strive to achieve customer satisfaction through employee satisfaction. Gronroos suggested two internal marketing objectives which in turn useful to develop the number

of satisfied employees in a service organization. The objectives of Gronroos are:

1. To ensure that the employees are motivated for customer-oriented and service-minded performance and, thus, successfully fulfill the duties as 'part-time marketers' in their interactive marketing tasks.
2. To attract and retain good employees.

2. Objectives and Methodology of the Study

a) Objectives

The objectives of the study are

- To derive the employee opinion on the various roles played in services process and examines the relevance of role played and internal marketing.
- To suggest suitable measures wherever necessary.

b) Methodology

To pursue the above mentioned objectives, data from both primary and secondary sources are necessary. The secondary data were collected from the records of Company and from the reports of General Insurance Corporation and Insurance Regulatory and Development Agency (IRDA). Literature was collected from the libraries of various Universities, research institutions and insurance institutions located at various parts of the country and by searching websites of various organizations.

Primary data sources include employees of the company at Grade I, II and III level. A sample of 300 was divided equally between the two regions and among the three Grades of the employees. For the selection of sample unit, simple random sampling technique was adopted.

A comprehensive questionnaire was designed to elicit self appraisal information from the employees on various issues related to service employee roles and its relevance to internal marketing.

3. Service Employee Roles

Through this study the Gronroos objectives of employee satisfaction was made an attempt by assessing internal marketing quality of employees of a leading general insurance company of India in consideration of the following roles, which have to be required to perform by every services employee who are involved in the service production.

1. **Product designer:** Service employees should ascertain each customer's specific services requirements and design a distinctive service product by taking into consideration the resources and competencies of the service organization.
2. **Performer:** A service employee has to interact with uncontrollable elements (consumers) and extract quality performance, by influencing the customers to get involved in the process.
3. **Technician:** The services employee should possess the skills to operate the necessary equipment and tools according to the requirement of service process.
4. **Associate:** An employee in services process is to associate with consumer and produce quality service.
5. **Friend:** It is one of the important role to every services employee, has to play. He has to play the role of a friend with

consumers as well as co-employees in a team. This role helps a services employee to meet the various requirements of co-employees and customers effectively.

6. **Empathiser:** It is the very essential role of a services employee. Service consumers feel comfortable and perceive better quality when contract employees are empathetic.
7. **Assurer:** As services are intangible, variable and perishable, customers seek assurance in every production process; hence through the words and actions a service employee required to build up assurance to customers.
8. **Salesman:** Every employee in a services organization has to play this role. A service employee will have an opportunity to interact closely and intimately with customers. Therefore, their role in influencing and persuading the customers is vital. Service companies can use their contact employees as sales personnel.
9. **Marketing intelligence:** A service organization can relay on their employees to generate information on marketing intelligence. This can be used to assess response of the customers on company policies and quality specifications and it is very valuable to the organization.
10. **Researcher:** This is one the important roles of service employee. A service employee has improved the thinking process to bring out the better way of services delivery. Employee, with his/her continuous involvement in work and interactive experience with varied customers, with a distinctive knowledge base, are capable of bringing innovation or research in work.

4. Literature Review

Krishna Kumar Sree (2007) in his study suggested an OCTAPACE CULTURE, Self Development of individuals, Counseling, Career Planning, to make the human resources well equipped and grow along with the organization. He opined that the components of Human Resources Development should include: Inter-departmental co-ordination, Inter-personal relations, team building, role clarity, key performance areas and objectives facilitating factors, inhibiting factors, employee motivation Vs self development and productivity. Jonathon R.B, Halbesleben and M. Ronald Buckley (2004) in their study on 'Managing Customers as Employees of the Firm: New Challenges for Human Resources Management', discussed the role customers play as human resources in service-based organizations. Lance A. Bettencourt and Kevin Gwinner (1996) emphasized that customizing the delivery of service on the frontline is a key to customer satisfaction. The findings from an exploratory qualitative study provide an insight on the role of frontline employees in providing qualitative service experiences to the customers. The study emphasizes the need for training of frontline employees. Christine Sanes (1996) in their work on 'Employee impact on service delivery' stated, that the customers expect suppliers to deliver a high standard of service before and after purchase, and in a competitive market this can mean the difference between success and failure. The study examines the role of employees in providing customer satisfaction, and ways in which management can support and motivate them. Paolo Guenzi and Ottavia Pelloni (2004) in their study on 'the impact of interpersonal relationships on customer satisfaction and loyalty to the service provider explored the impact of interpersonal relationships on customer satisfaction and loyalty towards the firm. The findings show that customer-to- employee and

customer-to-customer relationships contribute differently to the development of customer loyalty. Michael D. Hartline and O.C. Ferrell (1996) have developed and tested a model of service employee management that examines constructs simultaneously across three interfaces of the service delivery process: manager-employee, employee-role, and employee-customer. The researchers examined the attitudinal and behavioural responses of customer-contact employees that can influence customers' perceptions of service quality, the relationships among these responses, and three formal managerial control mechanisms. The findings indicate that managers who are committed to service quality are more likely to empower their employees and use behavior-based evaluation. However, the use of empowerment has both positive and negative consequences in the management of contract employees. Some of the negative consequences are mitigated by the positive effects of behavior-based employee evaluation. They opined that to increase customers' perceptions of service quality, managers must increase employees' self-efficiency and job satisfaction, and reduce employees' role conflict and ambiguity. Yahya Melhem and Irbid, Jordan (2004) in their research study, found that trust, communication, knowledge and skills of customer-contact employees may have a direct and strong impact on the empowerment of service employees. Empowerment antecedents (trust, incentives, communication, and knowledge) of customer-contact employees accounted for significant variation in the levels of empowerment among customer-contact employees in the banking industry. Ian N. Lings (2000) the study presented a model of service quality which is based on both internal and external customer and supplier groups in supply chain partners. The model examined two possible types of internal customers who are proposed in intra-firm inter-departmental relationships and two types of interaction are proposed in inter-firm inter-departmental relationships. The study reveals that maximizing internal service quality will have the effect of increasing employee motivation to perform their tasks. Further the research disclosed that the improved support delivered from other departments in the organization will make it easier for individuals to fulfill their roles in the value chain of organization and provide higher levels of service quality to the external customers. Roderick D. Iverson, Colin S. McLeod and Peter J. Erwin(1996) examined the impact of employee commitment and trust on both service quality and acceptance of organizational changes. They examined the factors that significantly contribute to the development of trust and the creation of organization commitment. The study reveals that organizational commitment and trust are significant determinants of organizational performance.

5. Results of The Study

The respondents were asked to rate their performance in the role of product designer. Service is an intangible product and every contact employee will have an opportunity to play a creative role in designing final product in accordance with the basic policy guidelines.

The data presented in Table 1 reveals that the average self assessment rating of the employees in the role of the product designer was 54.90 per cent. Out of the 10 marks, the mark awarded by the respondents varied between one and 10. More

than 50 per cent of the respondents awarded marks between 4 and 6. There are 17 respondents who awarded themselves with 10 marks each while there are 9 respondents who awarded themselves with only one mark. The average rating of the respondents from Grade-I category for this role was 55 per cent. The rating of the respondents from Grade-III category was equal to Grade-I in the role of product designer. Grade-II category respondents' average rating for this role was 54.70.

Table 1: Employees rating on the role as a Product Designer

Mark	Grade-I	Grade-II	Grade-III	Total
1	4 (1.33)	2 (0.67)	3 (1.00)	9 (3.00)
2	3 (1.00)	12 (4.00)	4 (1.33)	19 (6.33)
3	9 (3.00)	3 (1.00)	11 (3.67)	23 (7.66)
4	13 (4.33)	17 (5.66)	21 (7.00)	51 (17.00)
5	24 (8.00)	11 (3.66)	16 (5.33)	51 (17.00)
6	15 (5.00)	23 (7.66)	12 (4.00)	50 (16.66)
7	13 (4.99)	16 (5.33)	15 (5.00)	44 (14.66)
8	14 (4.67)	10 (3.33)	6 (2.00)	30 (10.00)
9	2 (0.67)	1 (0.33)	3 (1.00)	6 (2.00)
10	3 (1.00)	5 (1.67)	9 (3.00)	17 (5.66)
Total	100 (33.33)	100 (33.33)	100 (33.33)	300 (100.00)
Percentage of Marks Scored	55.00	54.70	55.00	54.90

Figures in brackets indicate percentage to the grand total

The self evaluation of the performance in the role of service performer in terms of 1-10 marks is shown in Table 2. As many as 74 respondents representing 24.66 per cent awarded themselves 7 marks each. Out of the total, 15 per cent of the respondents awarded 6 marks each and 14.33 per cent of the respondents awarded 8 marks each. There are 34 respondents representing 11.33 per cent who awarded themselves one mark each for their performance. However, there are 10 respondents who awarded themselves with 10 marks each. The average marks of the total respondents for their role as performer was 55.20 per cent. The respondents from Grade-I category got 57.80 per cent of marks on the average. In the case of Grade-II and Grade-III category of respondents the average marks are 54.60 and 53.20 per cent respectively.

Table 2: Employees rating on the role as a Performer

Mark	Grade-I	Grade-II	Grade-III	Total
1	9 (3.00)	12 (4.00)	13 (4.33)	34 (11.33)
2	5 (1.67)	8 (2.67)	6 (2.00)	19 (6.33)
3	7 (2.33)	4 (1.33)	11 (3.67)	22 (7.33)
4	5 (1.67)	6 (2.00)	8 (2.67)	19 (6.33)
5	12 (4.00)	6 (2.00)	6 (2.00)	24 (8.00)
6	12 (4.00)	24 (8.00)	9 (3.00)	45 (15.00)
7	23 (7.66)	26 (8.66)	25 (8.33)	74 (24.66)
8	21 (7.00)	5 (1.67)	17 (5.66)	43 (14.33)
9	3 (1.00)	4 (1.33)	3 (1.00)	10 (3.33)
10	3 (1.00)	5 (1.67)	2 (0.67)	10 (3.33)
Total	100 (33.33)	100 (33.33)	100 (33.33)	300 (100.00)
Percentage of Marks Scored	57.80	54.60	53.20	55.20

Figures in brackets indicate percentage to the grand total

Table 3 presents the data relating to self assessment rating of the respondents on their role as a technician. It can be seen from the table that the marks awarded by the respondents varied between one and 10. Out of the total, 67 respondents representing 22.33 per cent awarded 7 out of 10 for their performance in the role as a technician. A little over 18 per cent awarded 6 marks each for their role performance. About 11 per cent of the respondents awarded only one mark to themselves, while three per cent of respondents awarded full marks for their performance in the role as a technician. The average mark of the respondents was 54.40 per cent for the role as a technician. The average mark of respondents from Grade-II category was the highest (58.30 per cent) followed by Grade-I category respondents (52.80 per cent) and Grade-III category respondents (52.10 per cent).

Table 3: Employees rating on the role as a Technician

Mark	Grade-I	Grade-II	Grade-III	Total
1	11 (3.67)	7 (2.33)	14 (4.67)	32 (10.66)
2	7 (2.33)	6 (2.00)	9 (3.00)	22 (7.33)
3	5 (1.67)	12 (4.00)	7 (2.33)	24 (8.00)
4	5 (1.67)	3 (1.00)	10 (3.33)	18 (6.00)
5	16 (5.33)	6 (2.00)	3 (1.00)	25 (8.33)

6	28 (9.33)	15 (5.00)	12 (4.00)	55 (18.33)
7	13 (4.33)	28 (9.33)	26 (8.66)	67 (22.33)
8	9 (3.00)	13 (4.33)	14 (4.66)	36 (12.00)
9	3 (1.00)	4 (1.33)	3 (1.00)	10 (3.33)
10	3 (1.00)	6 (2.00)	2 (0.67)	11 (3.67)
Total	100 (33.3)	100 (33.3)	100 (33.3)	300 (100.00)
Percentage of Marks Scored	52.80	58.30	52.10	54.40

Figures in brackets indicate percentage to the grand total

The respondents were asked to rate their performance in the role of associate. An associate role in service operations will help an employee to bridge the gap between the customer and himself/herself, which in turn useful for the service organization to develop an understanding with customers as well as with co-employees. The data presented in Table 4 reveals that the average self assessment rating of the employees in the role of associate was 50.20 per cent. The mark awarded by the respondents varied between one and 10. As many as 163 respondents representing 54.32 per cent of the total awarded marks between 4 and 6. There are 11 respondents who awarded themselves with 10 marks each, while 18 respondents who awarded only one mark each. The average rating of the respondents from Grade-II category for this role was the highest (55 per cent) followed by the respondents from Grade-I (49.30 per cent) and Grade-II categories (46.30 per cent).

Table 4: Employees rating on the role as an Associate

Mark	Grade –I	Grade –II	Grade -III	Total
1	9 (3.00)	7 (2.33)	2 (0.67)	18 (6.00)
2	5 (1.67)	6 (2.00)	12 (4.00)	23 (7.66)
3	7 (2.33)	4 (1.33)	16 (5.33)	27 (9.00)
4	15 (5.00)	11 (3.66)	26 (8.66)	52 (17.33)
5	29 (9.66)	16 (5.33)	13 (4.33)	58 (19.33)
6	14 (4.67)	26 (8.66)	13 (4.33)	53 (17.66)
7	13 (4.33)	17 (5.66)	9 (3.00)	39 (13.00)
8	2 (0.67)	3 (1.00)	4 (1.33)	9 (3.00)
9	3 (1.00)	4 (1.33)	3 (1.00)	10 (3.33)
10	3 (1.00)	6 (2.00)	2 (0.67)	11 (3.66)
Total	100.00 (33.33)	100.00 (33.33)	100.00 (33.33)	300 (100.00)
Percentage of Marks Scored	49.30	55.00	46.30	50.20

Figures in brackets indicate percentage to the grand total

The data relating to self evaluation of the performance in the role of friend is shown in Table 5. Out of the total, 71 respondents representing 23.66 per cent awarded themselves 7 marks each. A little over 20 per cent of the respondents awarded 6 marks each and 9.66 per cent of the respondents awarded 8 marks each. There are 18 respondents representing 6.00 per cent who awarded themselves one mark each for their performance. However, there are 11 respondents who awarded themselves with 10 marks each. The average marks of the total respondents for their role as friend was 56.56 per cent. The respondents from Grade-III category got 59.40 per cent of marks on the average. In the case of Grade-II and Grade-I category of respondents the average marks are 58.70 per cent and 51.60 per cent respectively.

Table 5: Employees rating on the role as a Friend

Mark	Grade –I	Grade –II	Grade -III	Total
1	9 (3.00)	7 (2.33)	2 (0.67)	18 (6.00)
2	5 (1.67)	10 (3.33)	6 (2.00)	21 (7.00)
3	11 (3.67)	4 (1.33)	6 (2.00)	21 (7.00)
4	5 (1.67)	5 (1.67)	13 (4.33)	23 (7.66)
5	17 (5.66)	6 (2.00)	9 (3.00)	32 (10.66)

6	29 (9.66)	17 (5.66)	15 (5.00)	61 (20.33)
7	16 (5.33)	28 (9.33)	27 (9.00)	71 (23.66)
8	2 (0.67)	13 (4.33)	14 (4.66)	29 (9.66)
9	3 (1.00)	4 (1.33)	6 (2.00)	13 (4.33)
10	3 (1.00)	6 (2.00)	2 (0.67)	11 (3.66)
Total	100 (33.33)	100 (33.33)	100 (33.33)	300 (100.00)
Percentage of Marks Scored	51.60	58.70	59.40	56.56

Figures in brackets indicate percentage to the grand total

Table 6 presents the data relating to self assessment rating of the respondents on their role as an empathizer. Out of the total, 69 respondents representing 23.00 per cent awarded 5 marks out of 10 for their performance in the role as an empathizer. A little over 18.33 per cent awarded 4 marks each for their role performance. The respondents awarded only one mark themselves, constitute 6 per cent of the total. While four per cent of the respondents awarded full marks for their performance in the role as an empathizer. The average mark of the respondents was 51.46 per cent for the role as an empathizer. The average marks of respondents from Grade-III category was the highest (55.80 per cent) followed by Grade-II category respondents (49.70 per cent) and Grade-I category respondents (48.90 per cent).

Table 6: Employees rating on the role as an empathizer

Marks	Grade- I	Grade – II	Grade - III	Total
1	9 (3.00)	7 (2.33)	2 (0.67)	18 (6.00)
2	5 (1.67)	9 (3.00)	6 (2.00)	20 (6.66)
3	8 (2.67)	4 (1.33)	7 (2.33)	19 (6.33)
4	15 (5.00)	29 (9.66)	11 (3.67)	55 (18.33)
5	27 (9.00)	16 (5.33)	26 (8.66)	69 (23.00)
6	18 (6.00)	15 (5.00)	15 (5.00)	48 (16.00)
7	10 (3.33)	5 (1.67)	13 (4.33)	28 (9.33)
8	2 (0.67)	3 (1.00)	14 (4.66)	19 (6.33)
9	3 (1.00)	5 (1.67)	4 (1.33)	12 (4.00)
10	3 (1.00)	7 (2.33)	2 (0.67)	12 (4.00)
Total	100.00 (33.33)	100.00 (33.33)	100.00 (33.33)	300 (100.00)
Percentage of Marks Scored	48.90	49.70	55.80	51.46

Figures in brackets indicate percentage to the grand total

The respondents were asked to rate their performance in the role of assurer. The data presented in Table 7 reveals that the average self assessment rating of the employees in the role of assurer was 52.73 per cent. More than 70 per cent of the respondents awarded marks between 4 and 7. There are 17 respondents who awarded themselves with only one mark, while there are 12 respondents who awarded themselves with 10 marks each. The average rating of the respondents from Grade-III category for this role was the highest (56.80 per cent) followed by the rating of the respondents from Grade-II category (52.70 per cent) and Grade-I category (48.70 per cent).

Table 7: Employees rating on the role as an Assurer

Marks	Grade I	Grade II	Grade III	Total
1	3 (1.00)	11 (3.67)	3 (1.00)	17 (5.66)
2	7 (2.33)	9 (3.00)	6 (2.00)	22 (7.33)
3	8 (2.67)	4 (1.33)	5 (1.67)	17 (5.66)
4	28 (9.33)	9 (3.00)	11 (3.67)	48 (16.00)
5	21 (7.00)	16 (5.33)	12 (4.00)	49 (16.33)
6	19 (6.33)	21 (7.00)	25 (8.33)	65 (21.66)
7	6 (2.00)	15 (5.00)	28 (9.33)	49 (16.33)
8	2 (0.67)	3 (1.00)	4 (1.33)	9 (3.00)
9	3 (1.00)	5 (1.67)	4 (1.33)	12 (4.00)
10	3 (1.00)	7 (2.33)	2 (0.67)	12 (4.00)
Total	100 (33.33)	100 (33.33)	100 (33.33)	300 (100.00)
Percentage of Marks Scored	48.70	52.70	56.80	52.73

Figures in brackets indicate percentage to the grand total

The self evaluation of the performance in the role of salesman was shown in Table 8. Out of the total, 60 respondents representing 20 per cent awarded themselves 6 marks each. A little over 13 per cent of the respondents awarded 7 marks each and 12.00 per cent of the respondents awarded 8 marks each. There are 15 respondents representing 5.00 per cent who awarded themselves one mark each for their performance. However, there are 13 respondents (4.33 per cent) who awarded themselves with 10 marks each. The average marks of the total respondents for their role as salesman was 54.16 per cent. The respondents from Grade-III category got 55.20 per cent of marks on the average. In the case of Grade-II and Grade-I category of respondents the average marks are 54.30 and 53.00 per cent respectively.

Table 8: Employees rating on the role as a salesman

Marks	Grade-I	Grade-II	Grade-III	Total
1	9 (3.00)	3 (1.00)	3 (1.00)	15 (5.00)
2	5 (1.67)	15 (5.00)	6 (2.00)	26 (8.66)
3	11 (3.67)	4 (1.33)	18 (6.00)	33 (11.00)
4	3 (1.00)	9 (3.00)	20 (6.67)	32 (10.66)
5	15 (5.00)	16 (5.33)	2 (0.67)	33 (11.00)
6	32 (10.66)	24 (8.00)	4 (1.33)	60 (19.99)
7	12 (4.00)	13 (4.33)	15 (5.00)	40 (13.33)
8	6 (2.00)	4 (1.33)	26 (8.66)	36 (12.00)
9	3 (1.00)	5 (1.67)	4 (1.33)	12 (4.00)
10	4 (1.33)	7 (2.33)	2 (0.67)	13 (4.33)
Total	100.00 (33.33)	100.00 (33.33)	100.00 (33.33)	300 (100.00)
Percentage of Marks Scored	53.00	54.30	55.20	54.16

Figures in brackets indicate percentage to the grand total

Table 9 presents the data relating to self assessment rating of the respondents on their role as marketing intelligence. Out of the total, 64 respondents representing 21.33 per cent awarded 7 out of 10 marks for their performance in the role of marketing intelligence. The marks awarded by 16.00 per cent of the respondents for their role performance was six each. A little over 6 per cent of the respondents awarded only one mark each, while four per cent of respondents awarded full marks for their performance in the role as marketing intelligence. The average mark of the respondents was 55.30 per cent. The average marks of respondents from Grade-I category was the highest (57.30 per cent) followed by Grade-II category respondents (55.30 per cent) and Grade-III category respondents (53.30 per cent).

Table 9: Employees rating on the role in Marketing Intelligence

Marks	Grade-I	Grade-II	Grade-III	Total
1	5 (1.67)	6 (2.00)	8 (2.67)	19 (6.33)
2	9 (3.00)	15 (5.00)	9 (3.00)	33 (11.00)
3	8 (2.67)	4 (1.33)	13 (4.33)	25 (8.33)
4	8 (2.67)	9 (3.00)	6 (2.00)	23 (7.66)
5	3 (1.00)	11 (3.67)	9 (3.00)	23 (7.66)
6	19 (6.33)	15 (5.00)	14 (4.66)	48 (16.00)
7	28 (9.33)	15 (5.00)	21 (7.00)	64 (21.33)
8	14 (4.33)	13 (4.33)	14 (4.66)	41 (13.66)
9	3 (1.00)	5 (1.67)	4 (1.33)	12 (4.00)
10	3 (1.00)	7 (2.33)	2 (0.67)	12 (4.00)
Total	100 (33.33)	100 (33.33)	100 (33.33)	300 (100.00)
Percentage of Marks Scored	57.30	55.30	53.30	55.30

Figures in brackets indicate percentage to the grand total

The respondents were asked to rate their performance in the role as a researcher. The data presented in Table 10 reveals that the average self assessment rating of the employees in the role of the 'Researcher' was 56.96 per cent. More than 50 per cent of the respondents awarded marks between 5 and 7. Out of the total, 15.00 per cent respondents awarded 8 marks each for their role as a researcher. There are 17 respondents who awarded themselves with only one mark, while there are 12 respondents who awarded themselves with 10 marks each. The average rating of the respondents from Grade-I category for this role was the highest (65.10 per cent) and followed by the respondents of Grade-III and Grade-II categories (53.60 per cent and 52.20 per cent respectively).

Table 10: Employees rating on the role as Researcher

Marks	Grade- I	Grade-II	Grade-III	Total
1	3 (1.00)	11 (3.67)	3 (1.00)	17 (5.66)
2	7 (2.33)	9 (3.00)	6 (2.00)	22 (7.33)
3	8 (2.67)	4 (1.33)	5 (1.67)	17 (5.66)
4	2 (0.67)	9 (3.00)	11 (3.67)	22 (7.33)
5	1 (0.33)	21 (7.00)	28 (9.33)	50 (16.66)

6	9 (3.00)	16 (5.33)	25 (8.33)	50 (16.66)
7	26 (8.66)	15 (5.00)	12 (4.00)	53 (17.66)
8	38 (12.66)	3 (1.00)	4 (1.33)	45 (15.00)
9	3 (1.00)	5 (1.67)	4 (1.33)	12 (4.00)
10	3 (1.00)	7 (2.33)	2 (0.67)	12 (4.00)
Total	100 (33.33)	100 (33.33)	100 (33.33)	300 (100.00)
Percentage of Marks Scored	65.10	52.20	53.60	56.96

Figures in brackets indicate percentage to the grand total

It can be inferred from the data shown in Tables 1 to 10 that the employees of the Company are not fully satisfied with the performance in the respective roles as service provider. The self assessment rating on an average varied between 50.20 per cent and 56.96 per cent (see Table 11). The lowest rating was for their performance as 'Associate' and the highest rating was their performance as 'Researcher'. The respondents from Grade-I category are more satisfied for their role as 'Researcher', 'Marketing Intelligence' and 'Performer' compare to Grade-II and Grade-III category respondents. The respondents from Grade-II category are more satisfied for their role as 'Technician' and 'Associate' compare to Grade-I and Grade-III categories. The respondents from Grade-III category were relatively more satisfied compare to Grade-I and Grade-II categories for their performance in roles such as 'Friend', 'Empathizer', 'Assurer' and 'Salesman'.

Table 11: Consolidated rating of Employees on varied roles

Mark	Product Designer	Performer	Technician	Associate	Friend	Empathiser	Assurer	Salesman	Marketing Intelligence	Researcher
1	9 (3.00)	34 (11.33)	32 (10.66)	18 (6.00)	18 (6.00)	18 (6.00)	17 (5.66)	15 (5.00)	19 (6.33)	17 (5.66)
2	19 (6.33)	19 (6.33)	22 (7.33)	23 (7.66)	21 (7.00)	20 (6.66)	22 (7.33)	26 (8.66)	33 (11.00)	22 (7.33)
3	23 (7.66)	22 (7.33)	24 (8.00)	27 (9.00)	21 (7.00)	19 (6.33)	17 (5.66)	33 (11.00)	25 (8.33)	17 (5.66)
4	51 (17.00)	19 (6.33)	18 (6.00)	52 (17.33)	23 (7.66)	55 (18.33)	48 (16.00)	32 (10.66)	23 (7.66)	22 (7.33)
5	51 (17.00)	24 (8.00)	25 (8.33)	58 (19.33)	32 (10.66)	69 (23.00)	49 (16.33)	33 (11.00)	23 (7.66)	50 (16.66)
6	50 (16.66)	45 (15.00)	55 (18.33)	53 (17.66)	61 (20.33)	48 (16.00)	65 (21.66)	60 (19.99)	48 (16.00)	50 (16.66)
7	44 (14.66)	74 (24.66)	67 (22.33)	39 (13.00)	71 (23.66)	28 (9.33)	49 (16.33)	40 (13.33)	64 (21.33)	53 (17.66)
8	30 (10.00)	43 (14.33)	36 (12.00)	9 (3.00)	29 (9.66)	19 (6.33)	9 (3.00)	36 (12.00)	41 (13.66)	45 (15.00)
9	6 (2.00)	10 (3.33)	10 (3.33)	10 (3.33)	13 (4.33)	12 (4.00)	12 (4.00)	12 (4.00)	12 (4.00)	12 (4.00)
10	17 (5.66)	10 (3.33)	11 (3.67)	11 (3.66)	11 (3.66)	12 (4.00)	12 (4.00)	13 (4.33)	12 (4.00)	12 (4.00)
Total	300 (100.00)	300 (100.00)	300 (100.00)	300 (100.00)	300 (100.00)	300 (100.00)	300 (100.00)	300 (100.00)	300 (100.00)	300 (100.00)
Percentage of Marks Scored	54.90	55.20	54.40	50.20	56.56	51.46	52.73	54.16	55.30	56.96

6. Conclusion

The findings from the study on the self assessment of the performance on the role played by the respondents' drives to the conclusion that the respondents are not convinced thoroughly with their performance. Only a few respondents could exhibit high level of satisfaction in terms of assigning higher marks for their roles as services provider.

In a service encounter wherein employees and customers synchronize for the service production and consumption process, the organization has an opportunity to ensure 100 per cent quality from the employees' side. Customers are not controllable and therefore the company can only persuade and facilitate their participation. The quality of the service depends upon the way employees perform their roles as service provider and the way customers could participate in the service production and consumption process. The findings clearly indicate that the employees of the company could perform only to the level of about 60 per cent of their potential. This is a critical dimension, the organization should focus upon. It is necessary to conduct a detailed study on these issues to identify the problems and to take measures to improve the performance of the employees in different roles that they are expected to play. It is recommended therefore to constitute an expert committee to study this matter and to device a measurable self appraisal system in consultation with employees of different categories and to review periodically to identify performance levels of employee and to initiate appropriate measures to support employee for improvement their performance.

7. References

1. Christine Sanes, 'Employee impact on service delivery', *Management Development Review*, Vol.9, No.2, 1996, pp.15-20.
2. Ian N. Lings, 'Internal marketing and supply chain management', *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 14 No 1 2000, pp. 27-43, MCB University Press, 0887-6045.
3. Jonathon R.B. Halbesleben, M. Ronald Buckley, 'Managing Customers as Employees of the Firm: New Challenges for Human Resources Management', *Personnel Review*, Vol.33, No.3, 2004.
4. Krishna Kumar, *Management for Operational Heads* The Journal of Insurance Institute of India, Vol. No. XXXIII, July-December 2007, pp 7-20.
5. Lance A. Bettencourt, and Kevin Gwinner, 'Customization of the Service Experience: The Role of the Frontline Employee', *International Journal of Service Industry Management*; Vol.7, No.2, 1996.
6. Michael D. Hartline and O.C. Ferrell, 'The Management of Customer-Contact Service Employees: An Empirical Investigation', *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.60, 1996, pp.52-70.
7. Paolo Guenzi and Ottavia Pelloni, 'The impact of interpersonal relationships on customer satisfaction and loyalty to the service provider', *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol.15, No.4, 2004, pp.365-384.
8. Roderick D. Iverson, Colin S. McLeod and Peter J. Erwin, 'The role of employee commitment and trust in service relationships, *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*', MCB University Press, [ISSN 0263-4503], Vol. 14/3, 1996, pp. 36-44.
9. Rama Mohana Rao, K. "Services Marketing", Pearson Education (Singapore) Pvt. Ltd., Indian Branch, 482 F.I.E. Patparganj, Delhi, 2005.
10. Yahya Melhem and Irbid, Jordan, 'The antecedents of customer-contact employees' empowerment' *Employee Relations*, Vol.26, No.1, 2004, pp.72-93.