How Can Organizations Recapture the Hearts and Minds of Employees

To Gain the Highest Commitment and Performance

Given the Restructuring Focus of the Past Several Years?

Rick Terrell

Pennsylvania State University

Abstract

The question of recapturing the hearts and minds of employees to gain the highest commitment and performance is a concern most organizations and HR leaders will face as we proceed throughout this period of significant global change. It is my belief that corporate restructuring will become a way of life for most organizations and it is imperative that HR leadership proactively manages this phenomenon. This essay will begin with a discussion of the evolution of the workplace relationship between employers and employees. The paper will then penetrate the values associated with commitment and performance and illustrate how companies will need to challenge traditional paradigms in order to better respond to the needs of the employee and the larger organization as well.

Part 1 - The Evolution of the Employer-Employee Relationship

Comparing Labor, Land, and Capital

The inputs of any organization to provide products and services include labor, land, and capital. Labor is unique to the other two inputs in a number of ways. Both land and capital can be bought and sold as a commodity; labor is rented and involves “free will”. Individuals have the choice to determine if they want to participate as employees in the production of a product or service. However, labor is similar to the other inputs by the fact there is a cost associated with it; employees generally do not provide their labor for free. The relationship between employer and employee has existed since the beginning of civilization. The employee provides a service that is meaningful to the goals of the employer, and the employer compensates the employee monetarily for work provided. Early on in the history of the global workforce it was assumed that this simple transaction assured optimal effort from employees. The success of any organization is extremely dependent on the effort and mindset of its employees.

Corporate downsizing and restructuring over the past decade has greatly influenced the effort and mindset of most employees. Employees have begun to feel that they are essentially a commodity, similar to land and capital. In order to thrive in the global economy where competition is relentless; companies have managed employees as contingent assets; procuring their services on an “as-needed” basis when business needs dictate it, and releasing these employees to improve productivity and meet financial goals. There are a number of flaws with this approach, but I believe the most significant is the loss of productivity, not only productivity for the employer but productivity for the employee.

Employer & Employee Productivity

Morris Altman is a professor of economics at Victoria University (Canada). In his article titled *Economic Theory and the Challenge of Innovative Work Practices*, Altman argues that much of the conventional wisdom stems from the neoclassical economics assumption that individuals inadvertently choose to work as and as well as they can, so to maximize their effort no matter what the extent of competitive pressures of the organizational structure of the firm (Altman, 2002). Altman also indicates that if individuals choose not to conform to the neoclassical ideal, market forces will pressure firm to make effort-maximizing choices such as restructuring or downsizing (Altman, 2002). This dynamic is the basis of the conundrum many companies are facing; one way or another competitive markets will mandate that organizations improve productivity over time or they will cease to exist. This corporate productivity can come in many forms; an improved labor cost structure, increased innovation, loss elimination, development of new markets and categories, etc. Productivity ultimately manifests itself in a way that the value of the goods and services have to increase over time compared to the transactional costs required to create the goods or service. Improving productivity for a company is commonly a key attribute that is widely seen as a corporate objective, but what about productivity of the employee?

Knowledge is Capital

Famed management consultant Peter Drucker states the most important, and indeed the truly unique contribution of management in the 20th century was the fifty-fold increase in the productivity of the manual worker in manufacturing (Drucker, 1999). Drucker believes the most important contribution management needs to make in the 21st century is similarity to increase the productivity of knowledge work and knowledge workers (Drucker, 1999). The most valuable assets of a 20th century company were its production equipment (Drucker, 1999). The most valuable asset of a 21st century institution (whether business or non-business) will be its knowledge workers and their productivity (Drucker 1999). Catherine Kwantes wrote in the *South Asian Journal of Management* that changes in the global marketplace have shifted the themes that makes organizations competitive (Kwantes, 2007). There has been movement away from so-called "hard assets" to the so-called "soft assets", which include organizational knowledge, skills, and intellectual capital (Kwantes, 2007). Kwantes argues that intellectual capital, when combined with a superior process for harnessing organizational knowledge, is perhaps the key ingredient in the continued success of an organization's competitiveness. Intellectual capital consists of the training, knowledge, skills, and abilities that individual employees have (Kwantes, 2007). Economic theory and most business practice see labor as a cost, but employees with high intellectual capital must be considered a capital asset (Drucker, 1999). Costs need to be controlled and reduced; assets need to be made to grow (Drucker, 1999). Employees who have low intellectual capital do not own their means of productivity (Drucker, 1999). They may have a lot of valuable experience, but that experience is valuable only at the place where they work (Drucker, 1999). It is not portable (Drucker, 1999). Workers with high intellectual capital, however, own their means of productivity (Drucker, 1999). That knowledge between their ears is a totally portable and enormous capital asset (Drucker, 1999). Similarly to employer productivity, employee productivity manifests itself in a way that the value of the employee's contribution can increase over time compared to the transactional costs of employing the employee.

The Power of the Reciprocal Relationship

The relationship between employer and employee has evolved from simply bartering an individual contribution for a monetary reward; to a deeper reciprocal relationship wherein both parties (employer and employee) gain significant intrinsic and extrinsic rewards which include experiences and knowledge for the employee, and profit for the employer. Capturing the hearts and minds of employees before and after corporate restructuring is not a "nice to have" phenomenon, it needs to become a "must have". The need for companies to continue to evolve and renew require that employees are totally engaged so that the corporate restructure is implemented in a way which delivers the company mission and objectives and at the same time builds the capability of employees, regardless if they are with the organization long-term. The value of building skills and capability in employees needs to been seen just as significant as ongoing tenure with the organization. The question of how do organizations gain the highest commitment and highest performance from employees while constantly evolving and becoming more competitive is not an easy one to answer, but I believe there are insights to be gained by understanding the values related to commitment and performance.

Part 2 - Gaining Highest Commitment

Defining Employee Commitment

Regardless of the trends associated with the evolution of workforce culture, there are two values that are necessary for commitment between employee to the organization and vice-versa. These two values are loyalty and engagement. Organizations desired employees to be loyal, and organizations want their interests to be seen as important to their employees. Organizations also desire that their employees are engaged; employers want employees who understand the organization's mission and can make the connection between their individual contribution and the organization's objectives. Conversely, employees want loyalty from their organization; as discussed earlier they do not want to be seen as contingent assets. They want employers who will invest in them through wages and other forms of compensation. Employees also desire that organizations are engaged with them at an individual level. Employees want to work for organizations that see that the organization's success is congruent with their individual success; they want to work for organizations who know what is individually important to them. Loyalty and engagement are considered timeless values, meaning these values are considered foundational and will not change over time. However, it will be necessary to challenge prior assumptions on how these values are seen in the work environment. I believe we must introduce new paradigms to establish and maintain these values for the 21st century workforce.

New Paradigms for Commitment – Creating Greater Employee Flexibility

Let's start with the belief that organizations desire loyalty from their employees. Traditionally, loyalty was a function of compliance, conformity and control. Employees visibly demonstrated their loyalty by conforming to the culture the organization was attempting to create. The organizations under this paradigm "manage" employees by developing rigid job descriptions, standard working hours, and standard physical work locations for all employees. These visible benchmarks communicated to the organization that employees were where they needed to be and were working on the organization's goals. This approach also allows the managers of employees to "supervise" their activities and be assured that the employees were working on the areas meaningful to the larger organization. The problem with this approach is loyalty is a value, not an observable behavior, and while employees were physically present; their commitment to the goals of the organization were not necessarily evident. In a 2011 survey by Work+Life Fit Inc., for example, one-third of the 637 full-time employed respondents to a telephone survey said they plan to look for a new job either in or outside their organizations (Quirk, 2012). Two-thirds said they want greater flexibility, including:

- Flexible hours.
- The ability to work remotely.
- The option to work a reduced schedule for less money.

Other studies have shown that an employee's loyalty and intent to stay with an organization increase when flexible work arrangements are available (Quirk, 2012). State Street Corp, a multinational financial services provider conducted an employee engagement survey in 2010 (Quirk, 2012). The findings of the survey determined that employees with some flexibility in their schedules are the most loyal, most committed, and the hardest working (Quirk, 2012). Workplace flexibility can help employees avoid family/work conflicts. In addition, workplace flexibility from home can lead to fewer workplace distractions and less office politics (Quirk, 2012). Without the physical constraint of working in a conventional workplace, employees likely feel greater control over how their work is done (Quirk, 2012). The model below illustrates the old and new paradigms in regards to increasing employee commitment.

Gaining Highest Commitment	
Timeless Values	
Loyalty & Engagement	
Old Paradigms	**New Paradigms**
Compliance, Conformity, and Control	Flexibility
Where I am	What I do
Physically Connecting to the Organization	Virtually Connecting to the Organization

Of course, a one size fits all approach in regards to workplace flexibility is not appropriate in all situations. Workplace flexibility in a manufacturing environment will look different than flexibility in an administrative environment. It is important than organizations understand their business model and determine the right boundaries in regards to workplace flexibility. The key is for HR leaders to truly understand why these boundaries exist and avoid communicating to employees that the boundaries are a result of leaders' preferences or historical norms.

New Paradigms for Commitment – Creating Greater Employer Engagement

Flexibility is only one element to regain employee commitment; another area which needs to be addressed is the employee's desire that the organization is engaged with them at an individual level and that the employee's success is important to the organization. When I entered the workforce 25 years ago, one of the key coaching points I was taught was the value of networking. I was taught that my career was my responsibility and if I wanted to succeed I needed to make the right connections with individuals in the organization that could help me reach my career goals. This type of coaching is pretty consistent in most organizations.

Inherently, there is nothing wrong with communicating the value of employee networking. However, this approach limits the value of the employer-employee relationship and represents a traditional paradigm. The opportunity that is missed with this coaching approach is that it assumes that the relationship between the employer and employee will be a long-term relationship. Unfortunately, for most organizations corporate restructuring and renewal will become a way of life rather than an event that happens once a decade. Insinuating that an organization can guarantee employment as long as an employee chooses to work there represents the type of paternal relationship that employers and employees have had most of the 20th century. One of the most damaging effects of the corporate restructure focus as companies reduced their workforces is that the implied social contract of employment tenure for employees was put at-risk; wherein employees felt companies expected employees to be committed to the larger organization, but these same companies were now viewed as hypocritical because they are perceived as not being committed to the employee. Under the old paradigm, companies primarily demonstrated commitment to its employees through workplace tenure.

In addition to the issue of workplace tenure, the other missed opportunity in the traditional employee networking model is that it assumed that it is the employee's responsibility to understand the organization, but it does not expect the organization to learn about the employee. A growing trend among employers which are considered great places to work is for employers to develop meaningful connections with their employees. Danone UK, a subsidiary of the international food products company, has a program called "Do you dare to dream? (Levering & Erb, 2011)" The program is structured around encouraging and rewarding behavior in three areas: do, dare, and dream (Levering & Erb, 2011). Every year, Danone gives every employee a "dream cloud," a piece of paper on which they can write out their dream (Levering & Erb, 2011). The only stipulation is that the dream be possible for the company to make happen (Levering & Erb, 2011). The paper is then posted on a "dream board," displayed in the office for everyone to see (Levering & Erb, 2011). After four weeks, everyone votes on which dream they would like to see come true (Levering & Erb, 2011). The company fully funds the dream of the person who receives the most votes (Levering & Erb, 2011). Through this program, one person cycled the entire length of Great Britain to raise money for a children's hospice; another undertook a two-month pilgrimage from France to Spain; another returned to Vietnam to find her birth mother; and another went to Cape Town, South Africa to build a house in his native township through Habitat for Humanity (Levering & Erb, 2011). Danone's efforts to help people realize their dreams also reflect the increasingly sophisticated understanding best workplaces have developed about their employees' personal lives and needs (Levering & Erb, 2011). These organizations continue to demonstrate flexibility in tailoring their benefits to individuals' changing needs at different points in their lives (Levering & Erb, 2011). For example, many employees are finding themselves caught in the "sandwich generation" – raising children and caring for aging parents (Levering & Erb, 2011). Recognizing this trend, Noblis, a non-profit research corporation headquartered in the US, recently expanded its EAP program to include geriatric care and assessment services (Levering & Erb, 2011). Care managers meet with families, complete an onsite assessment of the elder's living environment, and if requested, will assess possible housing options (Levering & Erb, 2011). They will also provide a detailed written report with care recommendations and an implementation plan (Levering & Erb, 2011). The plan includes a range of services tailored to create a safe, healthy, enriching lifestyle for the family member (Levering & Erb, 2011). Services may include coordinating and monitoring home health services, household maintenance and repairs, lawn care, snow removal, meal preparation, grocery delivery, and transportation solutions (Levering & Erb, 2011).

These examples from Danone and Noblis represent new and creative ways in which organizations can show loyalty to their employees. These progressive practices demonstrate commitment to employees which is much broader than workplace tenure. While understanding and engaging employees to better meet their needs is a valuable activity, these types of programs are not a substitute for the wages employees need and desire to maintain quality of life. What happens when it becomes necessary to displace employees due to changes in the business climate? An organization that cannot meet its business and financial objectives is in a very weak position to meet the needs of its employees. Keeping the organization viable is mission critical and sometimes maintaining viability involves employee turnover. Clues to dealing with this issue come from the perspective of Peter Drucker discussed earlier. Employees need to be seen as knowledge assets, and that knowledge is portable from firm to firm. Organizations which build skills and capability in its employees not only gain when these employees use their capabilities to meet organizational objectives, but these skills and capabilities should also be seen as a vehicle to increase the marketability of the employee inside or outside the firm. Again, the reciprocal relationship between employer and employee has evolved and matured where the employee provides a contribution to help the organization meet its goals; and the employer compensates the employee by creating value within the employee which helps the employee become a better employee and a more capable individual. This capability is not only defined by contributions within firm, but by knowledge that could further the interests of the individual, inside or outside the firm.

Ultimately, the paradigm shift needed to gain the highest commitment of employees involves redefining the concept of work for the employer and the employees. Work needs to evolve from today's paradigm as the "destination" to improve the quality of life for individuals, to becoming the "vehicle" to improve quality of life. The relationship between the employer and the employee needs to become the enabler to help individuals meet their professional and personal goals. Let's revisit the earlier model to build on the themes to gain employee commitment.

Gaining Highest Commitment	
Timeless Values	
Loyalty & Engagement	
Old Paradigms	**New Paradigms**
Compliance, Conformity, and Control	Flexibility
Where I am	What I do
Physically Connecting to the Organization	Virtually Connecting to the Organization
Employee Networking	Developing Meaningful Connections with Employees

Tenure	Meeting Employees Changing Needs
Education prepares employees for work	Work is an extension of the educational process
Work is the “destination”	Work is the “enabler”
Parental Relationship with Employees	Reciprocal Relationship with Employees

Part 3 – Gaining Highest Performance

Defining Employee Performance

Up to this point we have focused on gaining higher commitment from employees; our discussion will now move into gaining higher performance. Similarly, the narrative for achieving higher performance is rooted in penetrating the values associated with performance. The values behind higher performance are engagement and autonomy. The value of engagement associated with performance differs slightly from the type of engagement discussed to achieve higher commitment. Engagement to achieve higher commitment focused on the relationship between the employee and the larger organization. The engagement we will focus on relative to performance is the relationship between the employee and their direct manager.

New Paradigms for Performance – Creating Greater Leadership Transparency

A 2009 special report from the Business Roundtable Institute of Corporate Ethics and the Arthur W. Page Society focuses on the issue of leadership and trust (Lockwood, 2009). *The Dynamics of Public Trust in Business—Emerging Opportunities for Leaders* emphasizes that trust is a critical factor in business (Lockwood, 2009). Ultimately, trust—“positively impacts business success in a number of critical areas, such as employee performance, customer retention and innovation (Lockwood, 2009).” As organizations seek to be more credible and implement strategies to become more competitive, there likely will be some discomfort, especially for those involved in significant change (Walker & Pagano, 2005). Constant change is becoming the norm in business environments and for most organizations the change is happening faster than the organizations ability to react to it. Of course, change involving the viability of a company, operating facility, department, or work group can be traumatic and contribute to emotional reactions by those impacted. But, less dramatic change such as a change in work priorities, reporting relationships, or work location can be just as impactful to employees. The direct manager generally has the most influence in managing how employees respond to change. When managers practice a level of transparency in their engagement with their direct reports in ways that show respect and concern, both for the individual and for the organization, amazing things can occur (Walker & Pagano, 2005). Organizations benefit from a more efficient process of decision making and execution, operations speed up, and problems are identified more readily along the way (Walker & Pagano, 2005). This dynamic improves the performance of the organization because the focus moves quickly from reacting to the change to delivering the needs of the organization.

Zappos' Inc., the online retailer has woven this level of transparency into its corporate values. The corporate culture at Zappos' sets it apart from nearly every other company (Baird, Gallegos, & Shelton, 2012). Zappos' unorthodox culture is the work of CEO Tony Hsieh, an innovative and successful entrepreneur (Baird, Gallegos, & Shelton, 2012). Hsieh built the culture on the idea that if you can attract talented people and employees enjoy their work, great service and brand power will naturally develop (Baird, Gallegos, & Shelton, 2012). As with its customers, the foundation of Zappos' relationships with its employees is trust and transparency (Baird, Gallegos, & Shelton, 2012). The company wants its employees to actively discuss any issues or concerns that may come up (Baird, Gallegos, & Shelton, 2012). Transparency is also a critical part of the Zappos model (Baird, Gallegos, & Shelton, 2012). Employees receive detailed information about the company's performance and are encouraged to share information about the company (Baird, Gallegos, & Shelton, 2012). Zappos believes that employees should develop open and honest relationships with all stakeholders with the hope that this will assist in maintaining the company's reputation (Baird, Gallegos, & Shelton, 2012). Hsieh uses Facebook and Twitter to share information with employees and customers (he has 2.2 million followers) (Baird, Gallegos, & Shelton, 2012). When Zappos laid off 124 employees in 2008, Hsieh announced the decision via Twitter and later blogged about it (Baird, Gallegos, & Shelton, 2012). Although some companies may hesitate to open themselves to public criticism, Zappos feels it has nothing to hide (Baird, Gallegos, & Shelton, 2012). In fact, most of the public posts on Zappos' social media sites are praise from customers (Baird, Gallegos, & Shelton, 2012).

Managers, who can build the spirit of authenticity while working hard to create meaningful connections with their direct reports and revealing personal information that adds value to the context of work, will be practicing an important part of leadership transparency that builds credibility (Walker & Pagano, 2005). Doing so, however, requires a certain level of maturity and self-awareness and a heightened sense of how people might perceive, dissect, and disseminate the information that is revealed (Walker & Pagano, 2005). And because authenticity or personal transparency ultimately describes the quality of a relationship, managers must create opportunities in which to engage with their employees, allowing their direct reports to know them as well (Walker & Pagano, 2005).

The credibility the manager has with their direct report cannot be understated. Every employee comes to an organization with a finite level of energy. The challenge is to maximize the energy of the employee to the goals of the organization. Organizations that are not equipped with managers who are skilled at managing employees through change will have employees preoccupied with the change. These organizations will have employees wallowing in *"Why is this happening?"* versus moving on to *"OK, now what are we going to do about it?"* In addition, a poor manager-employee relationship takes this same energy and focuses on the defects of the relationship. This phenomena is common is most organizations and will keep HR resources employed indefinitely. Managers who understand these perspectives understand that their relationship with their direct reports is not a boss-subordinate one, but one of partnership and the health of this partnership is essential in meeting the goals of the firm. The paradigm shift of the manager-employee relationship has to move from one rooted in historical norms of hierarchy to one of a partnership of associates with differing levels of responsibility in which one of the partners is a coach to the other partner. Below is the model illustrating the contrast in paradigms in regards to achieving higher performance:

Gaining Highest Performance	
Timeless Values	
Engagement & Autonomy	
Old Paradigms	**New Paradigms**
Transparency has to managed	Transparency is a value
Change is a distraction	Change is an opportunity
Boss-subordinate	Two partners with different responsibilities

<u>New Paradigms for Performance – Creating Greater Employee Autonomy</u>

This essay has developed strong arguments for the need to engage the employee; engagement not only to the employee from the organization, but also employee to their direct manager. One final value we will address relative to improving employee performance is autonomy. I'm sure this may seem inconsistent to the messages that has already been built on, but engagement and autonomy can work hand in hand. Autonomy is different from independence. Without the proper context, autonomy can be assumed to mean that employees can do whatever they want, when they want. Daniel Pink in his book, ***Drive: the Surprising Truth about What Motivates Us*** says, "Autonomy means acting with choice, which means we can both be autonomous...and interdependent with others (Pink, 2009)." In 2004, Fordham University conducted a study of workers at an American investment bank (Pink, 2009). The researchers found job performance increased among employees whose managers offered "autonomous support" (Pink, 2009). These managers listened to the employee's perspectives, gave meaningful feedback, provided ample choice on work priorities and approaches and encouraged employees to make even more meaningful contributions through new projects (Pink, 2009). In another example, researchers at Cornell University studied 320 small businesses, half of these businesses granted workers autonomy; the other half maintained direction based on management control (Pink, 2009). The businesses that offered autonomy grew four-times at the rate of the control-oriented firms (Pink, 2009).

One of the traditional paradigms of managing employees is that management by its nature is charged with creating a set of conditions wherein employees perform tasks in a consistent way, time after time. Again, there is nothing inherently wrong with this approach, but it has the potential to create cultural side effects which limits the performance of employees and thus the performance of the organization. One of these side effects is how organizations view work experience. Work experience is an attribute which is valued inside and outside organizations. For most employment opportunities, work experience is the dominant criteria in determining whether a job applicant will get an opportunity to join an organization. Work experience tells management that the individual has demonstrated they have history in completing the tasks needed by the organization. Work experience also is valued within the organization. Individuals who have achieved significant tenure within the organization are perceived to have developed mastery, even though time spent in an organization does not guarantee that the employee is contributing to a level commensurate with their tenure. Also, significant work tenure manifests itself with the employee in the form of seniority. Seniority, many times is worn as a badge of honor, wherein the employee has an expectation of entitlement from the organization. Under this paradigm, the high tenure employee is very useful to the manager; they know how things get done, they are a resource to other employees, and they can ensure tasks are performed consistently without the managers' visible presence. As successful organizations mature these tenured employees come to assume that the processes and priorities they've used so often are the right way to do the work. Once that happens and these employees begin to execute tasks by assumption rather than by conscious choice, eventually these approaches come to constitute the organization's culture. As long as the organization continues to face the same sorts of problems that its culture has historically addressed, managing the organization is pretty straightforward. However, when the problems facing the organization change fundamentally, the culture is ill-equipped to proactively get in front of change, and the performance of the organization suffers.

Broadening the scope of how we view work experience is one of the keys in developing more capable employees and more capable organizations. Organizations need to view experience as a "value", not a "pre-requisite". Experiences should help employees anticipate, react, and manage situations and not simply confirm their ability to complete tasks. Given the increased breadth of this view, organizations should focus more on life experiences and not only work experiences. Potential employees who are not limited by the historical norms of the firm may provide the necessary innovation and creativity for future business challenges. Of course, this approach has its boundaries. No one would expect an individual without flight experience to be selected as an airline pilot, but organizations should look to increase the diversity of their organizations through individual experiences as well as the opportunities in gender and ethnicity.

The other opportunity in this area is how tenure is viewed within the organization. As stated earlier, experience within the firm should be a value not an entitlement. If managers do not manage this dynamic, the culture will dictate that influence within the organization is a function of time within the organization, and the diverse experiences of those less tenured will not be a consideration in managing change.

Creating this autonomous interdependent environment for employees is the responsibility of the organization’s management. Developing this environment is not an easy task. Frankly, the traditional supervise and control approach is more familiar to most managers globally. So, organizations who desire to improve the performance of their employees have to make a conscious choice to set expectations and equip their management staff to execute this effort. Leaders need to be able to describe how the work of each employee relates to the company’s objectives (shrm.org, 2012). Employees who understand the big picture and deliver work that meets expectations can operate more independently and effectively, freeing managers to focus on employee development and acting as change agents (shrm.org, 2012). Employees who have a clear understanding of the big picture can make more autonomous decisions and can more readily connect with what is happening in the larger environment, rather than needing continual step-by-step guidance from their managers (shrm.org, 2012). Engagement, employee productivity and autonomous work are all facilitated by understanding how one’s work fits into the unit, how the unit contributes to the whole and what organizational issues are influencing the work (shrm.org, 2012). In conclusion, we will update the performance model for a final time summarizing the themes discussed:

Gaining Highest Performance	
Timeless Values	
Engagement & Autonomy	
Old Paradigms	**New Paradigms**
Transparency has to managed	Transparency is a value
Change is a distraction	Change is an opportunity
Boss-subordinate	Two partners with different responsibilities
Hands Off Autonomy	Hands On Autonomy
Experience is a Prerequisite	Experience is a Value
Influence is a function of Time	Influence is a function of Experiences

Final Thoughts

The 21st century has placed a significant spotlight on the motivations of companies, especially large global multi-national firms. Many of these firms have greater financial resources than many of the world's countries. The intent of this paper is not to make an argument in regards to the social responsibilities of these organizations. Those concerns are left best for company leadership and their shareholders. But I believe there is general agreement from all concerned that the ability of an organization to meet its corporate goals is a function of the commitment and performance of its employees. The relationship organizations have with its employees is the dominant factor in managing these attributes. It is in the best interests of all stakeholders that the organization performs a level where it continues to be viable and is able to react proactively, intentionally, and choicefully to changes in the marketplace. This ultimately creates the best situation for both the employer and the employee.

Appendix 1

Contrasting Paradigms to Deliver Highest Commitment

Gaining Highest Commitment	
Timeless Values	
Loyalty & Engagement	
Old Paradigms	**New Paradigms**
Compliance, Conformity, and Control	Flexibility
Where I am	What I do
Physically Connecting to the Organization	Virtually Connecting to the Organization
Employee Networking	Developing Meaningful Connections with Employees
Tenure	Meeting Employees Changing Needs
Education prepares employees for work	Work is an extension of the educational process
Work is the “destination”	Work is the “enabler”
Parental Relationship with Employees	Reciprocal Relationship with Employees

Appendix 2

Contrasting Paradigms to Deliver Highest Performance

Gaining Highest Performance	
Timeless Values	
Engagement & Autonomy	
Old Paradigms	**New Paradigms**
Transparency has to managed	Transparency is a value
Change is a distraction	Change is an opportunity
Boss-subordinate	Two partners with different responsibilities
Hands Off Autonomy	Hands On Autonomy
Experience is a Prerequisite	Experience is a Value
Influence is a function of Time	Influence is a function of Experiences

Works Cited

Altman, M. (2002). Economic Theory and The Challenge of Innovative Work Practices. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* , 271-290.

Baird, H., Gallegos, B., & Shelton, B. (2012). *Zappos: Delivering Happiness to Stakeholders.* University of New Mexico.

Drucker, P. (1999). Knowledge-Worker Productivity: The Biggest Challenge. *California Management Review* , 79-94.

Kwantes, C. (2007). Organizational Commitment, Intellectual Capital and Organizational Competitiveness. *South Asian Journal of Management* , 28-43.

Levering, R., & Erb, M. (2011, January/February). Emerging Trends in People Management. *Swiss Business* , pp. 30-33.

Lockwood, N. (2009). *Business Ethic: The Role of Culture and Values for an Ethical Workplace.* Alexandria: SHRM.

Pink, D. (2009). *Drive: The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us.* New York: Penguin Group.

Quirk, A. (2012, April). The Business Case For Flex. *HR Magazine* .

shrm.org. (2012). *Building a High Performance Culture: A Fresh Look at Performance Mangement.* Alexandria: SHRM.

Walker, K., & Pagano, B. (2005). *Transparency: The Clear Path to Leadership Credibility.* Linkage, Inc.