

SHIV SHAKTI

International Journal in Multidisciplinary and Academic Research (SSIJMAR)

Vol. 6, No. 5, October 2017 (ISSN 2278 – 5973)

A STUDY ON EMPLOYEE EXPECTATIONS WITH REFERENCE TO XYZ LIMITED

Dr.S.Poongavanam, Asst. Professor, AMET Business School, AMET University, Chennai

E.Mail:s.poongavanam@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The main objective of the research is to examine employee expectation from the company with regard to monetary and non monetary package offered. Research and Development (R&D) in industry focus on the research work to find the level of satisfaction and ways to improve it. Work related factors such getting pay for overtime, giving employees more authority, the possibility of getting promotion in the workplace, employees' participation in decision-making processes and sensitivity of management towards problems at work. The data gained from employees of the firm are analyzed by using ANOVA and percentage

Key Words : Monetary benefits, Commitment, team work & Communication system.

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW

It is important for the employees to understand their performance and believe on the work and feel they are worth able employee to be competent and worthwhile, and then they are likely to be more effective and perceive their job to be more rewarding. Managers reinforce this concept when they encourage and are responsive to their employees, provide them more challenging assignments, and offer additional assistance and support whenever needed.

Managers have the ability to alter overall performance through expanding their employees' self-confidence and by building their self-esteem. These actions impact performance by expanding individual personal perceptions of what one can accomplish.

The employees' expectation on salary, bonus, and leave will increase when their performance increases. If it is satisfied than they will move to some different organization. Employees are facing with daily stress and if they cannot aboe to cope with the stress it will leads to failures. So all the employees expects some king psychological treated from the company. Managers can positively support their employees by keeping all in his mind. They can build

expectations that employees will readily overcome any setbacks and continue to work toward success.

Rosnowski & Hulin [19] submitted that the most informative information to have about an employee in an organization was a valid measure of their overall level of job satisfaction. The urgency of a valid measure of job satisfaction, as proposed by Rosnowski & Hulin [19], was possibly the motivation behind the numerous research efforts pertaining to job satisfaction.

Judge, Hanisch, & Drankoski [18] supported the submission of Cranny et al[17], by advising that it was imperative for human resource managers “to be aware of those aspects within an organization that might impact most employees’ job satisfaction, and to enhance these aspects because, in the long run, the results will be fruitful for both the organization and the employee”

Objective of the study

1. To study the employee expectation from the company.
2. To measure Employees satisfaction with the facilities offered by the company.
3. To give best possible suggestions in order to make services more effective.

Research Methodology

The present study is based on primary data and secondary data and it is descriptive in nature. Primary data is collected from the employees through questionnaires. A structured questionnaire was prepared after careful consideration with the HR and experts. Questionnaire is administered among a sample size of 120 respondents in an organization. Simple percentage analysis and ANOVA test has been used as the tool of analysis.

Need of the study

It is necessary to understand the significance of Human Resource Management's functions and its services in small to large scale companies. The information collected from the employees will explain satisfactory levels of the services offered in the company. This study will help to identify the lacuna that exist in the organization and also helps to find the expectations of employee working in the organization. It gives suitable ways to enhance the effectiveness of services offered and to improve them by getting suitable suggestions from employees.

Limitations of Study:

The sample was confined to 120 respondents. So this study cannot be generalized to all the organization.

Some of the respondents were feared to fill the questionnaire. So the result may not reflect the actual satisfactions.

DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

TABLE- 1

EMPLOYEES PROUD TO WORK FOR XYZ

Description	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
To a no extent	1	.8	.8
To a small extent	4	3.3	4.2
To a moderate extent	6	5.0	9.2
To a large extent	47	39.2	48.3
To a very large extent	62	51.7	100.0
Total	120	100.0	

It is clear that, 62 (51.7%) of the respondents commented to a very large extent, that employees proud to work for XYZ, 47 (39.2%) to a large extent, 6 (5%) to a moderate extent, 4 (3.3%) To a small extent and only 1 (0.8%) To a no extent. Thus, most of the respondents are feeling proud to work for XYZ-Ranipet.

TABLE-2

DESCRIPTIVES STATISTICS

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Minimum	Maximum

Description					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
To a no extent	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
To a small extent	4	2.50	.577	.288	1.58	3.41	2.00	3.00
To a moderate extent	6	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
To a large extent	47	2.23	.427	.062	2.10	2.35	2.00	3.00
To a very large extent	62	2.41	.497	.063	2.29	2.54	2.00	3.00
Total	120	2.32	.470	.042	2.24	2.41	2.00	3.00

TABLE-3

ANOVA

H_0 – There is no significant difference between these mean values of employee’s perception of being proud to work for XYZ.

H_1 - There is significant difference between these mean values of employee’s perception of being proud to work for XYZ.

Description	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.803	4	.451	2.113	.084
Within Groups	24.522	115	.213		
Total	26.325	119			

Interpretation:

$P = .084$

$P > .05$

Since P value (.084) is greater than the .05 at 5% level of significance. Null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore there is no significant difference between these mean values of employee's perception of being proud to work for XYZ.

TABLE- 4
TEAM WORK AT XYZ

Description	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Highly ineffective	1	.8	.8
Ineffective	5	4.2	5.0
Partially effective	14	11.7	16.7
Effective	47	39.2	55.8
Highly effective	53	44.2	100.0
Total	120	100.0	

The above table shows that, 53 (44.2%) of respondents rated highly effective, 47 (39.2%) of respondents rated Effective and 14 (11.7%) of respondents rated partially effective, 5 (4.2%) of respondents rated Ineffective and only 1 (0.8%) of respondent rated highly ineffective of team work at XYZ. Thus, it clearly shows team work at XYZ-Ranipet is highly effective.

TABLE-5
DESCRIPTIVES STATISTICS

Description	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Highly ineffective	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Ineffective	5	2.40	.547	.244	1.71	3.08	2.00	3.00
Partially effective	14	2.50	.518	.138	2.20	2.79	2.00	3.00
Effective	47	2.38	.491	.071	2.23	2.52	2.00	3.00
Highly effective	53	2.22	.422	.058	2.11	2.34	2.00	3.00
Total	120	2.32	.470	.042	2.24	2.41	2.00	3.00

TABLE-6**ANOVA**

H_0 – There is no significant difference between these mean values of team work at XYZ.

H_1 - There is significant difference between these mean values of team work at XYZ.

Description	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.236	4	.309	1.416	.233
Within Groups	25.089	115	.218		
Total	26.325	119			

Interpretation:

$$P = .233$$

$$P > .05$$

Since P value (.233) is greater than the .05 at 5% level of significance. Null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore there is no significant difference between these mean values of team work at XYZ.

TABLE- 7**XYZ ADHERES TO COMMITMENT BY ITS EMPLOYEES**

Description	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Rarely	10	8.3	8.3
Occasionally	35	29.2	37.5
Often	51	42.5	80.0
Very Often	24	20.0	100.0
Total	120	100.0	

It is clear that, 51 (42.5%) of the respondents marked often, that XYZ adheres to commitment by its employees, 35 (29.2%) occasionally, 24 (20%) Very Often and only 10 (8.3%) rarely. Thus, the XYZ adheres to commitment by its employees Oftenly.

TABLE-8

DESCRIPTIVES STATISTICS

Level

Description	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Rarely	10	2.30	.483	.152	1.95	2.64	2.00	3.00
Occasionally	35	2.34	.481	.081	2.17	2.50	2.00	3.00
Often	51	2.37	.488	.068	2.23	2.50	2.00	3.00
Very Often	24	2.20	.414	.084	2.03	2.38	2.00	3.00
Total	120	2.32	.470	.042	2.24	2.410	2.00	3.00

TABLE-9

ANOVA

H_0 – There is no significant difference between these mean values of XYZ adheres to commitment by its employees.

H_1 - There is significant difference between these mean values of XYZ adheres to commitment by its employees.

Description	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.459	3	.153	.687	.562
Within Groups	25.866	116	.223		
Total	26.325	119			

Interpretation:

$$P = .562$$

$$P > .05$$

Since P value (.562) is greater than the .05 at 5% level of significance. Null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore there is no significant difference between these mean values of XYZ adheres to commitment by its employees.

TABLE- 10

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM AT XYZ

Description	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Highly ineffective	4	3.3	3.3
Ineffective	4	3.3	6.7
Partially effective	10	8.3	15.0
Effective	65	54.2	69.2
Highly effective	37	30.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	

The above table shows that, 65 (54.2%) of respondents rated effective, 37 (30.8%) of respondents rated Highly Effective and 10 (8.3%) of respondents rated partially effective, 4 (3.3%) of respondents rated Ineffective and only 4 (3.3%) of respondent rated highly ineffective of performance evaluation system at XYZ. Thus, it clearly shows performance evaluation system at XYZ.-Ranipet is effective.

TABLE-11

DESCRIPTIVES STATISTICS

Level

Description	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Highly ineffective	4	2.75	.500	.250	1.95	3.54	2.00	3.00
Ineffective	4	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Partially effective	10	2.10	.316	.100	1.87	2.32	2.00	3.00
Effective	65	2.27	.450	.055	2.16	2.38	2.00	3.00
Highly effective	37	2.45	.505	.083	2.29	2.62	2.00	3.00
Total	120	2.32	.470	.042	2.24	2.41	2.00	3.00

TABLE-12

ANOVA

H_0 – There is no significant difference between these mean values of performance evaluation system at XYZ-Ranipet.

H_1 - There is significant difference between these mean values of performance evaluation system at XYZ-Ranipet.

Description	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.470	4	.618	2.977	.022
Within Groups	23.855	115	.207		
Total	26.325	119			

Interpretation:

$$P = .022$$

$$P > .05$$

Since P value (.022) is greater than the .05 at 5% level of significance. Null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore there is significant difference between these mean values of performance evaluation system at XYZ-Ranipet.

TABLE- 13

PROMOTION BASED ON PERFORMANCE

Description	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Highly dissatisfied	4	3.3	3.3
Dissatisfied	3	2.5	5.8
Partially satisfied	10	8.3	14.2
Satisfied	63	52.5	66.7
Highly satisfied	40	33.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	

It is found that, 63 (52.5%) of the respondents are satisfied that, promotion based on performance, 40 (33.3%) of the respondents are highly satisfied and 10 (8.3%) of the respondents are partially satisfied, 4 (3.3%) of the respondents are highly dissatisfied and only 3 (2.5%) of the respondents are dissatisfied with this statement. Thus, it is clear that, the promotion based on performance is satisfied at XYZ-Ranipet.

TABLE-14

DESCRIPTIVES STATISTICS

Level

Description	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Highly dissatisfied	4	3.00	.000	.000	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Dissatisfied	3	2.33	.577	.333	.89	3.76	2.00	3.00
Partially satisfied	10	2.30	.483	.152	1.95	2.64	2.00	3.00
Satisfied	63	2.31	.469	.059	2.19	2.43	2.00	3.00
Highly satisfied	40	2.27	.452	.071	2.13	2.41	2.00	3.00
Total	120	2.32	.470	.042	2.24	2.41	2.00	3.00

TABLE-15

ANOVA

H_0 – There is no significant difference between these mean values of promotion based on performance.

H_1 - There is significant difference between these mean values of promotion based on performance.

Description	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.933	4	.483	2.278	.065
Within Groups	24.392	115	.212		
Total	26.325	119			

Interpretation:

$$P = .065$$

$$P > .05$$

Since P value (.065) is greater than the .05 at 5% level of significance. Null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore there is no significant difference between these mean values of promotion based on performance.

TABLE- 16

INCREASE IN PAY SCALE

Description	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very unhappy	7	5.8	5.8
Unhappy	8	6.7	12.5
Partially happy	18	15.0	27.5
Happy	49	40.8	68.3
Very happy	38	31.7	100.0
Total	120	100.0	

It is found that, 49 (40.8%) of the respondents are Happy that, pay scale increases without giving of promotion, 38 (31.7%) of the respondents are Very happy and 18 (15%) of the respondents are partially happy, 8 (6.7%) of the respondents are Unhappy and only 7 (5.8%) of the respondents are Very unhappy with this statement. Thus, it is clear that, the respondents are feeling happy, when their increases pay scale without promotion.

TABLE-17

DESCRIPTIVES STATISTICS

Level

Description	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Very unhappy	7	2.71	.487	.184	2.26	3.16	2.00	3.00
Unhappy	8	2.25	.462	.163	1.86	2.63	2.00	3.00
Partially happy	18	2.22	.427	.100	2.00	2.43	2.00	3.00
Happy	49	2.32	.473	.067	2.19	2.46	2.00	3.00
Very happy	38	2.31	.471	.076	2.16	2.47	2.00	3.00
Total	120	2.32	.470	.042	2.24	2.41	2.00	3.00

TABLE-18
ANOVA

H_0 – There is no significant difference between these mean values of increases pay scale without promotion.

H_1 - There is significant difference between these mean values of increases pay scale without promotion.

Description	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.299	4	.325	1.493	.209
Within Groups	25.026	115	.218		
Total	26.325	119			

Interpretation:

$$P = .209$$

$$P > .05$$

Since P value (.209) is greater than the .05 at 5% level of significance. Null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore there is no significant difference between these mean values of pay scale increases without promotion.

TABLE- 19
ENVIRONMENT AT XYZ

Description	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Highly dissatisfied	2	1.7	1.7
Dissatisfied	4	3.3	5.0
Partially satisfied	10	8.3	13.3
Satisfied	52	43.3	56.7
Highly satisfied	52	43.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	

It is found that, 52 (43.3%) of the respondents are highly satisfied that environment at XYZ, 52 (43.3%) of the respondents are satisfied and 10 (8.3%) of the respondents are partially satisfied, 4 (3.3%) of the respondents are dissatisfied and only 2 (1.7%) of the respondents are highly dissatisfied with this statement. Thus, it is clear that, the environment at XYZ is highly satisfied.

TABLE-20
DESCRIPTIVES STATISTICS

Description	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Highly dissatisfied	2	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Dissatisfied	4	2.50	.577	.288	1.58	3.41	2.00	3.00
Partially satisfied	10	2.20	.421	.133	1.89	2.50	2.00	3.00
Satisfied	52	2.34	.480	.066	2.21	2.47	2.00	3.00
Highly satisfied	52	2.32	.473	.065	2.19	2.45	2.00	3.00
Total	120	2.32	.470	.042	2.24	2.41	2.00	3.00

TABLE-21
ANOVA

H_0 – There is no significant difference between these mean values of the environment at XYZ.

H_1 - There is significant difference between these mean values of the environment at XYZ.

Description	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.513	4	.128	.572	.684
Within Groups	25.812	115	.224		
Total	26.325	119			

Interpretation:

$$P = .684$$

$$P > .05$$

Since P value (.684) is greater than the .05 at 5% level of significance. Null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore there is no significant difference between these mean values of the environment at XYZ.

TABLE- 22
COMMUNICATION SYSTEM AT XYZ

Description	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not bad	7	5.8	5.8
Good	24	20.0	25.8
Very good	40	33.3	59.2
Excellent	49	40.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	

The above table shows that, 49 (40.8%) of respondents projected Excellent, 40 (33.3%) of respondent's projected Very good and 24 (20%) of respondents projected good, only 7 (5.8%) of respondent's projected not bad, of communication system at XYZ. It is clearly shows that the communication system at XYZ is Excellent.

TABLE-23
DESCRIPTIVES STATISTICS

Level

Description	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Not bad	7	2.42	.534	.202	1.93	2.92	2.00	3.00
Good	24	2.33	.481	.098	2.13	2.53	2.00	3.00
Very good	40	2.25	.438	.069	2.10	2.39	2.00	3.00
excellent	49	2.36	.487	.069	2.22	2.50	2.00	3.00
Total	120	2.32	.470	.042	2.24	2.41	2.00	3.00

TABLE-24
ANOVA

H_0 – There is no significant difference between these mean values of the communication system at XYZ.

H_1 - There is significant difference between these mean values of the communication system at XYZ.

Description	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.390	3	.130	.581	.629
Within Groups	25.935	116	.224		
Total	26.325	119			

Interpretation:

$$P = .629$$

$$P > .05$$

Since P value (.629) is greater than the .05 at 5% level of significance. Null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore there is no significant difference between these mean values of the communication system at XYZ.

TABLE- 25

WORKERS RELATIONSHIPS AMONG PEERS

Description	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very poor	3	2.5	2.5
Not bad	5	4.2	6.7
Good	17	14.2	20.8
Very good	58	48.3	69.2
excellent	37	30.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	

The above table shows that, 58 (48.3%) of respondents rated Very good, 37 (30.8%) of respondents rated excellent and 17 (14.2%) of respondents rated good, 5 (4.2%) of respondents rated Not bad and only 3 (2.5%) of respondents rated Very poor of relationships among peers. It is clearly shows that relationships among peers are very good.

TABLE-26

DESCRIPTIVES STATISTICS

Description	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Very poor	3	3.00	.000	.000	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Not bad	5	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Good	17	2.35	.492	.119	2.09	2.60	2.00	3.00
Very good	58	2.24	.431	.056	2.12	2.35	2.00	3.00
excellent	37	2.43	.502	.082	2.26	2.59	2.00	3.00
Total	120	2.32	.470	.042	2.24	2.41	2.00	3.00

TABLE-27

ANOVA

H_0 – There is no significant difference between these mean values of relationships among peers.

H_1 - There is significant difference between these mean values of relationships among peers.

Description	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.741	4	.685	3.341	.013
Within Groups	23.584	115	.205		
Total	26.325	119			

Interpretation:

$$P = .013$$

$$P > .05$$

Since P value (.013) is greater than the .05 at 5% level of significance. Null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore there is no significant difference between these mean values of relationships among peers.

TABLE- 28

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SENIOR & SUBORDINATES

Description	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very poor	1	.8	.8
Not bad	5	4.2	5.0
Good	17	14.2	19.2
Very good	58	48.3	67.5
excellent	39	32.5	100.0
Total	120	100.0	

The above table shows that, 58 (48.3%) of respondents marked Very good, 39 (32.5%) of respondents marked excellent and 17 (14.2%) of respondents marked good, 5 (4.2%) of respondents marked Not bad, only 1 (0.8%) of respondents are says Very poor of relationship between senior & subordinates. It is clearly shows that relationship between senior & subordinates are very good.

TABLE-29

DESCRIPTIVES STATISTICS

Level

Description	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Very poor	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Not bad	5	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Good	17	2.41	.507	.123	2.15	2.67	2.00	3.00
Very good	58	2.32	.473	.062	2.20	2.45	2.00	3.00
excellent	39	2.33	.477	.076	2.17	2.48	2.00	3.00
Total	120	2.32	.470	.042	2.24	2.41	2.00	3.00

TABLE-30

ANOVA

H_0 – There is no significant difference between these mean values of relationship between senior & subordinates.

H_1 - There is significant difference between these mean values of relationship between senior & subordinates.

Description	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.765	4	.191	.860	.490
Within Groups	25.560	115	.222		
Total	26.325	119			

Interpretation:

$$P = .490$$

$$P > .05$$

Since P value (.490) is greater than the .05 at 5% level of significance. Null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore there is no significant difference between these mean values of relationship between senior & subordinates.

CONCLUSION

Employee expectation from the services offered by the company play major and important role in an organization. Company main aim is to maximize the productivity of an organization by best utilization & improving the efficiency of its employees. Work life of employees is very important company must on word satisfying and improving the work life balance of all the employees. Employees as valuable resources for all the organization. In this study HR managers cannot able to satisfy to the fullest extent and creates future plans for implementation of new services.

REFERENCES

Aswathappa. K , human resource management Text & cases: mc Graw Hill Education Pvt.Ltd.(2003) .

RaoSubba. P, human resource management & industrial relations (text, cases and games): Himalaya publishing house (2000)

Rogers, E.W. & Wright, P. 1998. Measuring organizational performance in strategic human resource management research: Problems, prospects, and performance information markets. Human Resource Management Review, 8, 311–331. [4]

Wright, P.M. & Boswell, W.R. 2002. Desegregating HRM: A review and synthesis of micro and macro human resource management research. Journal of Management, 28, 247–276.

- Seibert, S. Silver, S. & Randolph, W.A. 2004. Taking empowerment to the next level: A multiple-level model of empowerment, performance, and satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 332–349.
- Bloom, M. 1999. The performance effects of pay dispersion on individuals and organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 25–40.
- Huselid, M. A. 1995. The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 635-672.
- Koch, M. J. & McGrath, R. G. 1996. Improving labor productivity: Human resource management policies do matter. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 335-354.
- MacDuffie, J. P. 1995. Human resource bundles and manufacturing performance: Organizational logic and flexible production systems in the world auto industry. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 48, 197-221.
- Arthur, J. B. 1994. Effects of human resource systems on manufacturing performance and turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 7, 670-687.
- Batt, R. 2002. Managing customer services: Human resource practices, quit rates, and sales growth. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 587-597.
- Guthrie, J. P. 2001. High involvement work practices and, turnover and productivity: Evidence from New Zealand. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 180-190.