

RESEARCH ARTICLE

A Comprehensive Study of Fixed Assets Management at Tech Mahindra: Practices, Employee Perceptions, and Organisational Impact

S. Jahnavi (Sarasa Jahnavi)

*Department of Master of Business Administration (Finance)
MLR Institute of Technology, Dundigal, Hyderabad – 500043, India
Affiliated to Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, Hyderabad*

Email Id : saijanu698@gmail.com

Faculty Guide: Mr. Mohammad Sirajuddin, Assistant Professor, MLR Institute of Technology

Received: 10 April 2026 | Revised: 28 May 2026 | Accepted: 17 June 2026

Abstract

Purpose: Fixed assets represent a substantial share of organisational investment and directly shape operational efficiency, cost control, and long-term financial sustainability. This study investigates the fixed asset management practices of Tech Mahindra, a multinational technology services and consulting firm headquartered in Pune, India, with particular attention to how employees perceive the effectiveness of these practices and how that perception relates to productivity, satisfaction, and team dynamics. **Design/Methodology:** A descriptive research design combining primary and secondary data was adopted. Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire (ten items) administered to a random sample of 100 employees in Hyderabad, covering demographic profile, perceived productivity impact, satisfaction, conflict reduction, and the perceived drivers of successful or unsuccessful implementation. Secondary data were drawn from Tech Mahindra's annual reports and related corporate documentation. Responses were analysed using descriptive statistics (frequency and percentage distribution) and a one-way ANOVA testing for a significant difference between tangible and intangible fixed assets. **Findings:** Slightly more than half of respondents (52%) did not perceive current fixed asset management practices as effective in raising productivity, even though 70% attributed observed improvements in employee satisfaction to these practices and 70% of open-ended feedback themes were framed as strengths rather than weaknesses. The most frequently cited drivers of successful implementation were effective communication and collaboration (25%) and leadership support and commitment (20%). The one-way ANOVA returned $F \approx 0$ ($p = 1.00$), indicating no statistically significant difference between the mean scores associated with tangible and intangible fixed assets in the sampled responses. **Practical implications:** The combination of generally positive qualitative sentiment with a narrow majority reporting no productivity benefit suggests that Tech Mahindra's fixed asset management framework is directionally sound but unevenly experienced across departments, pointing to a need for standardised asset lifecycle management, improved tracking technology, and structured

communication. Originality/Value: The study contributes an employee-perception-based, survey-driven perspective to a literature that has historically relied on financial-ratio analysis of fixed asset management, offering a complementary lens for technology-services organisations.

Keywords: *Fixed Asset Management; Asset Utilisation; Employee Productivity; Technology Services Sector; Tech Mahindra; ANOVA*

1. Introduction

Fixed assets — land, buildings, machinery, equipment, vehicles, furniture, and intangible assets such as software and patents — constitute long-term, tangible (and in some cases intangible) resources that organisations hold and use, rather than sell, in the ordinary course of business. Because these assets typically remain in service for more than one year, their acquisition represents a long-term commitment of capital, and the efficiency with which they are managed has a direct bearing on operational performance, cost control, and the organisation's overall financial health.

Tech Mahindra, a multinational corporation headquartered in Pune, India, operates across information technology services, business process outsourcing, and telecommunications, and depends on a broad portfolio of fixed assets — office and data-centre infrastructure, computing and networking equipment, testing and development laboratories, vehicles, furniture and fixtures, and software and intellectual property — to support its operations and deliver value to clients. Effective management of this portfolio, spanning acquisition, depreciation, maintenance, tracking, and eventual disposal, is therefore of direct strategic relevance to the firm.

This study investigates how Tech Mahindra manages its fixed assets and, distinctively, how that management is perceived by the employees who work alongside those assets day to day. Employee perception is treated here not merely as a soft indicator but as a practical proxy for the operational effectiveness of asset management policy: if fixed asset management is functioning well, it should be visible in employees' assessments of their own productivity, satisfaction, and the smoothness of team collaboration.

1.1 Need for the Study

Several considerations motivate this research. Improved understanding of how fixed assets are used can reveal underused assets and opportunities to raise productivity and efficiency. Insight into fixed asset management can support cost control by identifying savings across acquisition, maintenance, and disposal. Documenting current asset management tactics can surface both best practices and improvement opportunities relevant to decision-making and resource allocation. Effective fixed asset management also mitigates risks tied to asset usage, maintenance lapses, and regulatory non-compliance, and supports the accuracy of asset tracking, reporting, and financial disclosure required for compliance purposes. Finally, fixed asset management decisions increasingly intersect with the organisation's long-term sustainability objectives, including the environmental footprint of asset use and disposal.

1.2 Scope of the Study

The study covers Tech Mahindra's fixed asset acquisition methods and criteria, asset tracking and maintenance practices, depreciation and valuation methodology, disposal and retirement processes, the financial impact and performance implications of asset management, risk

management and regulatory compliance, the role of technology and innovation in asset administration, and sustainability and environmental considerations. The empirical component of the study is geographically scoped to respondents based in Hyderabad.

1.3 Research Gap

Prior research on the relationship between fixed asset management and organisational performance is dominated by financial-ratio-based analysis — asset turnover, profitability correlations, and similar measures computed from published financial statements. Comparatively little research captures how the people working within an organisation actually perceive the effectiveness of fixed asset management, despite the fact that employee-level perception plausibly mediates the link between formal asset policy and realised productivity gains. This study addresses that gap by pairing a conventional review of fixed asset management theory with a structured employee survey, situated specifically within the technology services sector in India — a sector under-represented relative to manufacturing, banking, and the cement and pharmaceutical industries that dominate the existing empirical literature on asset and working-capital management.

2. Objectives of the Study

Drawing on the broader set of aims defined in the original project scope, this article concentrates empirical analysis and reporting around three core objectives:

1. To assess Tech Mahindra's current fixed asset management practices — covering acquisition, tracking, maintenance, and disposal — and to evaluate the extent to which these practices are perceived by employees as effective in raising productivity.
2. To examine the relationship between fixed asset management practices and employee-level outcomes, specifically perceived productivity gains, job satisfaction, and the reduction of team conflict, and to identify the principal factors that employees associate with successful versus unsuccessful implementation.
3. To statistically test whether a significant difference exists between tangible and intangible fixed assets in the sampled response data, and to translate the combined survey and statistical findings into actionable recommendations for strengthening Tech Mahindra's fixed asset management framework.

Two further aims, addressed qualitatively, were to identify strengths and improvement opportunities in current practice, and to assess the consistency of asset management's effect across demographic and departmental sub-groups within the sampled workforce.

3. Review of Literature

The literature relevant to this study spans two strands: theoretical frameworks for fixed asset management, and empirical studies linking asset and working-capital management practices to organisational and financial performance.

3.1 Theoretical Framework

Fixed Asset Management Theory frames the central objective of this field as maximising the value, utilisation, and performance of fixed assets across the full asset lifecycle, encompassing valuation, depreciation methodology, maintenance planning, and end-of-life disposal. Capital Budgeting Theory supplies the evaluative tools — Net Present Value, Internal Rate of Return, and Payback Period — used to assess the financial feasibility of asset acquisition and replacement decisions. Asset Turnover Theory directs attention to ratios such as the fixed asset turnover ratio as a measure of how efficiently an organisation converts its asset base into revenue. Risk Management Theory addresses the identification, assessment, and mitigation of risks associated with asset usage, maintenance failure, and regulatory non-compliance. Sustainable Asset Management theory, often operationalised through Triple-Bottom-Line or Environmental-Social-Governance (ESG) criteria, incorporates environmental and social considerations into asset decisions. Finally, Information Systems Theory examines how asset-tracking software, automation, and data analytics enable more effective administration of physical and intangible assets. Together, these frameworks provide the conceptual scaffolding for interpreting the survey-based findings reported in Section 5.

3.2 Empirical Literature

Empirical findings on the link between fixed asset management and profitability are notably mixed. Smith (1980) and Shin and Soenen (1998) examined the relationship between asset management skill and earning power and reached divergent conclusions. In the Indian context, Sur, Chakraborty, and Begum (2008), studying the tea industry, found that fixed asset management, along with stock and debtor management, did not exert a statistically significant effect on profitability among the firms sampled. By contrast, Sur and Chakraborty (2009), examining twenty-five private Indian pharmaceutical companies over an eleven-year period (1993–94 to 2004–05), found that fixed asset and inventory management had a positive and significant effect on profitability for most sampled firms, a result later reinforced by Chakraborty (2017), who found that fixed asset and loan management together meaningfully improved firm profitability.

A separate body of work, including studies by Manjula and Sabarinatham (2015), Geetha and Ramasamy (2014), Gandhimathi and Ramasamy (2014), and others, has examined the financial performance of Indian cement and software companies using ratio-based techniques, generally focused on profitability, liquidity, and financial stability; Selvakumar and Paneerselvam (2014), Usha (n.d.), and Shenbagam Kannappan (2015) applied similar ratio-analysis methods specifically to Indian software companies. Gudimetla (2015, 2018) and Gudimetla and Raghunatha Reddy (2018) extended risk-adjusted performance analysis to Indian thematic and sector-specific mutual funds, concluding in each case that past performance was not a reliable predictor of future results and that manager selectivity mattered more than market timing — a methodological precedent for the risk-adjusted, comparative approach to performance evaluation adopted in the present study's statistical testing.

On the organisational side, several scholars have examined performance management systems (PMS) as the mechanism through which asset and resource management translates into measurable employee outcomes. Otley (1999) and Armstrong and Baron (2004) frame PMS as a means of identifying employee skill gaps and aligning individual performance with organisational goals; Bevan and Thompson (1991) and Kandula (2006) describe PMS as an ongoing dialogue between employees and management that bridges organisational objectives and individual capability; and Lawler (2003) characterises PMS as integrating goal-setting, evaluation, feedback, and reward. These perspectives collectively support the rationale, adopted in this study, for using employee perception as an indicator of how well fixed asset management practices are functioning in practice, rather than relying on financial ratios alone.

3.3 Synthesis

The literature suggests three working propositions for the present study: first, the effect of fixed asset management on profitability is industry- and context-dependent rather than universal, meaning findings from manufacturing or pharmaceutical samples should not be assumed to generalise to technology services; second, employee-facing mechanisms such as performance management systems offer a credible channel through which fixed asset management practices translate (or fail to translate) into measurable productivity and satisfaction outcomes; and third, a combined quantitative–qualitative approach, triangulating survey data with statistical testing, is well suited to capturing this translation process within a single technology-services organisation such as Tech Mahindra.

4. Research Methodology

The study adopts a descriptive research design intended to characterise existing fixed asset management practices at Tech Mahindra and employees' perceptions of those practices, rather than to establish causal relationships.

4.1 Data Sources

Secondary data were drawn from Tech Mahindra's annual reports and related corporate documentation. Primary data were collected through structured interviews with the general manager, deputy general manager, assistant general manager, and other relevant officers, supplemented by a structured employee questionnaire.

4.2 Sample and Instrument

The primary survey was administered to a random sample of 100 employees located in Hyderabad, selected using simple random sampling, over a 45-day study period. Data were collected via a ten-item questionnaire distributed through Google Forms and covering demographic profile (gender, age) alongside substantive items on perceived productivity impact, satisfaction, conflict and

communication, qualitative strengths and weaknesses, and the perceived drivers of successful or unsuccessful implementation of fixed asset management practices.

4.3 Analytical Tools

- Descriptive statistics — frequency counts and percentage distributions for each of the ten survey items, presented as tables with accompanying interpretation.
- One-way ANOVA — used to test for a statistically significant difference between tangible and intangible fixed assets within the response data, evaluated against the F-distribution with (2, 6) degrees of freedom at the conventional significance threshold.
- Visualisation — pie charts, bar charts, and line charts (generated via Google Forms and standard spreadsheet tools) were used to support interpretation of the percentage distributions.

Survey responses were processed using SPSS 19.0.

4.4 Limitations

- Internal Tech Mahindra documentation relevant to fixed asset management may be confidential, constraining the depth of independent verification possible in this study.
- The 45-day study period and available resources limited the scope of data collection relative to what a longer, more resourced study could achieve.
- Findings drawn from a single organisation and a single city (Hyderabad) may not generalise to other firms, industries, or geographies, given that company size and local context can materially affect asset management practice.
- Survey-based data are self-reported and may be subject to respondent bias or differing interpretation of question wording.
- The absence of longitudinal data limits the ability to observe how asset management practices and their perceived effects evolve over time.
- External factors such as industry regulation, macroeconomic conditions, and technological change were not separately modelled, even though they may influence the outcomes observed.

5. Results

This section presents the survey findings against the three objectives stated in Section 2: perceived effectiveness of fixed asset management practices (Objective 1), the relationship to productivity, satisfaction, and team dynamics (Objective 2), and the statistical test of tangible versus intangible asset differences together with summary implications (Objective 3).

5.1 Perceived Effectiveness of Fixed Asset Management Practices (Objective 1)

When asked directly whether Tech Mahindra's fixed asset management scheme helps raise worker productivity, a narrow majority of respondents — 52 of 100 — answered yes, while 48 answered no, indicating a workforce that is divided almost evenly on the practical productivity benefit of current

practices.

Response	Respondents	Percentage
Yes	52	52%
No	48	48%
Total	100	100%

Table 1. Perceived Helpfulness of Fixed Asset Management in Raising Productivity

On a related item assessing the perceived difference in productivity between departments with full versus partial implementation of fixed asset management practices, responses skewed positive overall: 28% rated the difference as "good," 25% as "very good," and 18% as "excellent," against 21% "fair" and 8% "poor."

Rating	Respondents	Percentage
Poor	8	8%
Fair	21	21%
Good	28	28%
Very Good	25	25%
Excellent	18	18%
Total	100	100%

Table 2. Perceived Productivity Difference Between Full and Partial Implementation Departments

5.2 Relationship to Productivity, Satisfaction, and Team Dynamics (Objective 2)

A substantial majority of respondents — 70% — attributed improvements in employee satisfaction specifically to the implementation of fixed asset management practices, with the remaining 30% attributing improvement to other factors.

Factor	Share of Improved Satisfaction
Implementation of fixed asset management practices	70%
Other factors	30%

Table 3. Attribution of Improved Employee Satisfaction

On team dynamics, respondents attributed observed friction primarily to conflict among team members (40%) and misunderstandings in team communication (35%), with 25% reporting an overall decrease in conflicts and misunderstandings following implementation of fixed asset management practices.

Indicator	Percentage
Conflict among team members	40%
Misunderstanding in team communication	35%
Overall decrease in conflicts and misunderstandings	25%

Table 4. Indicators of Team Conflict and Communication

Asked to characterise overall feedback on the strengths and shortcomings of fixed asset management practices, 70% of employee feedback themes were framed as strengths and 30% as weaknesses – broadly consistent with the positive lean observed in Table 2.

Theme	Share of Employee Feedback
Strengths	70%
Weaknesses	30%

Table 5. Thematic Balance of Employee Feedback

When asked about the factors contributing to successful or unsuccessful implementation, respondents most frequently cited effective communication and collaboration (25%) and leadership support and commitment (20%), followed by adequate training and development (15%), employee engagement and involvement (12%), clear goal setting (10%), alignment with organisational culture (8%), and change management practices (7%).

Factor	Contribution
Effective communication and collaboration	25%
Leadership support and commitment	20%
Adequate training and development programs	15%
Employee engagement and involvement	12%
Clear goal setting and performance expectations	10%
Alignment with organisational culture and values	8%
Proper change management strategies	7%
Other factors	3%

Table 6. Perceived Factors Contributing to Implementation Success

Finally, respondents flagged several unexpected patterns warranting further exploration, most notably an unexpected increase in employee turnover (25%) and discrepancies between the perceived and actual impact of fixed asset management practices (18%), alongside variation in satisfaction across departments (15%) and inconsistencies in performance ratings (12%).

Finding / Pattern	Occurrence
Unexpected increase in employee turnover	25%
Discrepancies between perceived and actual impact	18%
Variations in employee satisfaction across departments	15%
Inconsistencies in employee performance ratings	12%
Differences in perception between management and employees	10%
Contradictory feedback on training programme effectiveness	8%
Other unexpected findings	12%

Table 7. Unexpected Findings Warranting Further Exploration

On the question of whether productivity has risen consistently since the implementation of fixed asset practices, the sample again split close to evenly: 48% reported a consistent rise and 52% did not, mirroring the divided response observed in Table 1 and reinforcing the overall picture of a workforce that is not uniformly convinced of measurable productivity gains.

Response	Respondents	Percentage
Yes	48	48%
No	52	52%
Total	100	100%

Table 8. Perceived Consistency of Productivity Improvement Over Time

5.3 Sample Demographic Profile

Of the 100 respondents, 58% were male and 42% were female. By age, 44% were aged 18–30, 23% were aged 31–40, 18% were aged 41–50, and 15% were above 50, indicating a sample skewed toward early- and mid-career employees.

Category	Respondents	Percentage
Male	58	58%
Female	42	42%
Total	100	100%

Table 9. Gender Profile of Respondents

Age Group	Respondents	Percentage
18– 30	44	44%

Age Group	Respondents	Percentage
31– 40	23	23%
41– 50	18	18%
50 and above	15	15%

Table 10. Age Profile of Respondents

5.4 Statistical Test: Tangible versus Intangible Fixed Assets (Objective 3)

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to test the null hypothesis (H0) that there is a significant difference between tangible and intangible fixed assets against the alternative (H1) that no significant difference exists, evaluated using the F-distribution with (2, 6) degrees of freedom at a right-tailed 95% confidence level.

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-statistic	p-value
Between groups	2	0	0	0	1.00
Within groups	6	1118	186.33	—	—
Total	8	1118	139.75	—	—

Table 11. One-Way ANOVA: Tangible vs. Intangible Fixed Assets

The test statistic F equals 0, well within the 95% acceptance region $[-\infty, 5.1433]$, and the resulting p-value of 1.00 is far above any conventional significance threshold (α). Because $p > \alpha$, the null hypothesis (as originally framed) is not rejected on this evidence: the data do not support a statistically significant difference between the group means associated with tangible and intangible fixed assets in this sample. The observed effect size is negligible ($\eta^2 = 0$), meaning the grouping variable explains effectively none of the variance in the outcome measure, and post-hoc comparison (Tukey HSD) confirms no significant difference between any pair of group means.

5.5 Summary of Results Against Objectives

Objective	Key Result
1. Perceived effectiveness of FAM practices	52% see productivity benefit vs. 48% who do not; 71% rate cross-department productivity difference as good-to-excellent
2. Relationship to productivity, satisfaction, conflict	70% attribute satisfaction gains to FAM; 70% of feedback themes are strengths; communication (25%) and leadership support (20%) are top success factors
3. Statistical test (tangible vs. intangible) &	ANOVA: $F \approx 0$, $p = 1.00$ — no significant difference; η

Objective	Key Result
implications	$\eta^2 = 0$ (negligible effect size)

Table 12. Summary of Results Mapped to Study Objectives

6. Discussion

The results present a picture of fixed asset management at Tech Mahindra that is more nuanced than either a clearly positive or clearly negative assessment. Three points merit discussion.

First, the near-even split on direct productivity perception (52% yes / 48% no, and again 48% / 52% on consistency over time) sits alongside a strongly positive qualitative tone (70% strengths-framed feedback, 70% satisfaction attribution). This divergence suggests that fixed asset management practices may be experienced unevenly across departments or asset categories – consistent with the substantial minority (15%) who specifically reported variation in satisfaction across departments – rather than uniformly well or poorly across the organisation as a whole. This pattern echoes the mixed empirical findings of Smith (1980), Shin and Soenen (1998), and the contrasting tea-industry (Sur, Chakraborty & Begum, 2008) versus pharmaceutical-industry (Sur & Chakraborty, 2009) results reviewed in Section 3: the link between fixed asset management and tangible outcomes appears to be context- and implementation-dependent rather than uniform.

Second, the prominence of communication and collaboration (25%) and leadership support (20%) as the leading perceived drivers of successful implementation, taken together with the PMS literature reviewed in Section 3.2 (Otley, 1999; Armstrong & Baron, 2004; Kandula, 2006), points toward a specific mechanism: fixed asset management policy appears to translate into employee-level benefit primarily through the human and managerial processes that surround the assets – how decisions are communicated and how leadership supports adoption – rather than through the technical asset-management procedures alone. This has a direct practical implication, taken up in Section 7: investment in communication and leadership engagement may yield a larger marginal improvement in perceived effectiveness than further investment in the technical asset-tracking infrastructure itself.

Third, the ANOVA result ($F \approx 0$, $p = 1.00$, $\eta^2 = 0$) should be interpreted carefully. The complete absence of explained variance is an unusually clean null result, and given the underlying response data are categorical survey percentages rather than a continuous asset-level financial measure, this result is best read as a sample-specific finding about employee-reported perceptions of tangible versus intangible assets rather than a definitive statement about the firm's actual financial treatment of the two asset classes. The non-significant result is, however, consistent with the proposition that employees do not meaningfully distinguish between tangible and intangible fixed assets when forming judgements about asset management effectiveness – both are evaluated through the same lens of communication, leadership, and visible operational impact identified above.

7. Findings

- Tech Mahindra's fixed asset base spans land, buildings, machinery, equipment, vehicles, and computer hardware, distributed across geographies and business divisions, alongside software and intellectual-property assets.
- Employee perception of the productivity benefit of fixed asset management practices is closely divided, with 52% of respondents perceiving a positive effect and 48% not, and an identical near-even split (48%/52%) on whether productivity has risen consistently over time.
- A majority of respondents (70%) attribute improvements in employee satisfaction directly to the implementation of fixed asset management practices.
- Cross-department comparisons skew positive: 71% of respondents rated the productivity difference between full- and partial-implementation departments as good, very good, or excellent.
- Team-level friction is most often attributed to conflict among team members (40%) and communication misunderstandings (35%), with only 25% reporting a net decrease in conflict following implementation.
- Effective communication and collaboration (25%) and leadership support and commitment (20%) are the two most frequently cited drivers of successful fixed asset management implementation.
- Qualitative feedback leans positive overall, with 70% of thematic feedback framed as strengths versus 30% as weaknesses.
- Notable unexpected patterns include a reported rise in employee turnover (25% of responses) and discrepancies between perceived and actual impact of asset management practices (18%), both meriting further investigation.
- The sample skews male (58% vs. 42% female) and toward early-career employees (44% aged 18–30).
- A one-way ANOVA found no statistically significant difference between tangible and intangible fixed assets in the sampled response data ($F \approx 0$, $p = 1.00$, $\eta^2 = 0$).

8. Suggestions

4. Implement a structured asset lifecycle management plan covering replacement and upgrade cycles, maintenance scheduling, and alignment with evolving technology and business needs.
5. Deploy digital asset-tracking tools, such as dedicated asset management software or RFID technology, to improve visibility, reduce losses, and streamline asset-related decision-making.
6. Use historical data on asset failures, maintenance costs, and downtime to optimise preventive maintenance scheduling and reduce unplanned breakdowns.
7. Strengthen vendor management through clearer communication channels, service-level agreements, and performance-tracking mechanisms with equipment suppliers and service providers.
8. Evaluate emerging technologies — IoT-enabled devices, predictive maintenance analytics, and asset performance management tools — for their potential to reduce maintenance cost and improve decision quality.

9. Standardise and, where feasible, centralise asset management processes across business units and locations to improve consistency, data analysis, and reporting.
10. Expand training and development programmes for personnel involved in equipment operation, repair, and asset tracking, to build both competence and a stronger sense of asset ownership.
11. Establish and monitor key performance indicators (KPIs) for fixed asset management on an ongoing basis, enabling continuous, data-driven improvement.
12. Given the survey finding that communication and leadership support are the leading perceived drivers of success, prioritise structured internal communication and visible leadership engagement when rolling out or revising asset management initiatives.
13. Investigate the reported rise in employee turnover and the gap between perceived and actual impact of asset management practices through targeted, department-level follow-up research.

9. Conclusion

This study set out to examine Tech Mahindra's fixed asset management practices across three objectives: the perceived effectiveness of current practices, the relationship between those practices and employee-level outcomes, and a statistical test of tangible versus intangible asset differences with attendant recommendations. The evidence gathered from a 100-respondent employee survey in Hyderabad, supplemented by secondary corporate data, supports a qualified conclusion: Tech Mahindra's fixed asset management framework produces a generally positive impression among employees — most visibly in attributed satisfaction gains and the predominance of strength-framed feedback — but this positive impression coexists with a workforce that remains closely divided on whether the framework delivers a measurable, consistent productivity benefit.

The statistical test of tangible versus intangible assets returned no significant difference, suggesting that, from the employee vantage point, asset type is less important than the surrounding managerial process — particularly communication and leadership engagement — in shaping perceived effectiveness. This reframes the practical priority for Tech Mahindra: rather than treating fixed asset management primarily as a technical or accounting exercise, the findings suggest that the human and organisational layer of implementation deserves comparable attention. Proper implementation of the lifecycle-management, technology-investment, and communication-focused recommendations in Section 8 would be expected to narrow the productivity-perception gap and convert the currently favourable but inconsistent employee sentiment into a more uniformly recognised organisational strength.

9.1 Directions for Future Research

- Replicate the survey across additional Tech Mahindra locations beyond Hyderabad to test whether the near-even productivity split observed here is geography-specific.

- Pair employee-perception data with department-level financial and operational metrics (e.g., asset turnover, maintenance cost per asset) to test directly whether perceived and actual impact diverge, as 18% of respondents suggested.
- Conduct a longitudinal follow-up to determine whether the reported rise in employee turnover is associated with, or independent of, fixed asset management practices specifically.

References

- Armstrong, M. (2000). *Performance management: Key strategies and practical guidelines*. Kogan Page.
- Armstrong, M., & Baron, A. (2004). *Managing performance: Performance management in action*. CIPD Publishing.
- Bevan, S., & Thompson, M. (1991). Performance management at the crossroads. *Personnel Management*, 23(11), 36–39.
- Black, S. E., & Lynch, L. M. (1998). What's driving the new economy? The benefits of workplace innovation. NBER Working Paper.
- Chakraborty, K. (2017). Working capital and profitability: An empirical analysis of select firms. *Indian Journal of Finance*.
- Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance appraisal and management: The developing research agenda. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74(4), 473–487.
- Gandhimathi, S., & Ramasamy, T. (2014). A study on financial performance of cement companies in India. *International Journal of Management Research*.
- Geetha, E., & Ramasamy, T. (2014). Financial performance analysis of select cement companies in India. *International Journal of Innovative Research*.
- Gudimetla, A. (2015). Timing and selectivity in Indian sector mutual funds performance. (Working paper).
- Gudimetla, A. (2018). Performance and performance persistence of Indian thematic mutual funds. *Sumedha Journal of Management*, 7(Special Issue), 123–133.
- Gudimetla, A., & Raghunatha Reddy, D. (2018). Performance of sector-specific mutual fund schemes: Indian evidence. *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical & Control Systems*, 10(08-Special Issue), 136–141.
- Gungor, P. (2011). The relationship between reward management system and employee performance with the mediating role of motivation. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 24, 1510–1520.
- Kandula, S. R. (2006). *Performance management: Strategies, interventions, drivers*. PHI Learning.
- Lawler, E. E. (2003). Reward practices and performance management system effectiveness. *Organizational Dynamics*, 32(4), 396–404.
- Manjula, P., & Sabarinatham, N. (2015). A study on financial performance of cement industry in India. *International Journal of Applied Research*.
- Otley, D. (1999). Performance management: A framework for management control systems research. *Management Accounting Research*, 10(4), 363–382.
- Selvakumar, M., & Paneerselvam, K. (2014). Financial performance of select IT companies in India: A ratio analysis. *Journal of Commerce and Management Thought*.
- Shin, H. H., & Soenen, L. (1998). Efficiency of working capital management and corporate profitability. *Financial Practice and Education*, 8(2), 37–45.

- Smith, K. (1980). Profitability versus liquidity tradeoffs in working capital management. In Readings on the Management of Working Capital. West Publishing.
- Sur, D., & Chakraborty, K. (2009). Efficiency of working capital management in Indian pharmaceutical companies: A study of select companies. ICFAI Journal of Management Research.
- Sur, D., Chakraborty, K., & Begum, A. (2008). Working capital management and profitability in Indian tea industry. Indian Journal of Accounting.
- Le Brecht, D. J., & Painter, D. F. Fixed asset accounting and management procedures manual. John Wiley & Sons. ISBN 978-0470225493.
- Arif, N., & Tauseef, S. M. Fixed assets: A practitioner's guide to asset accounting in SAP. ISBN 978-1493216443.
- Brown, B. J., & Calabrese, T. D. Fixed assets management: A complete guide to the accounting, reporting, and administration of fixed assets. ISBN 978-0471692124.
- Peterson, R. H., & Gray, G. L. Accounting for fixed assets. John Wiley & Sons. ISBN 978-0470420643.
- Bragg, S. M. Fixed asset accounting: A comprehensive guide. ISBN 978-0470497085.

Appendix: Survey Instrument and Consolidated Response Data

Table A1. Sample Profile

Parameter	Detail
Sample size	100 employees
Location	Hyderabad
Sampling method	Simple random sampling
Study period	45 days
Instrument	10-item structured questionnaire (Google Forms)
Analysis software	SPSS 19.0

Table A2. Consolidated Survey Response Summary (n = 100)

Survey Item	Top Response Category	Share
Productivity benefit of FAM	Yes	52%
Cross-department productivity difference	Good	28%
Gender	Male	58%
Satisfaction attributed to FAM	FAM practices	70%
Age group	18– 30	44%
Team conflict indicator	Conflict among team members	40%
Feedback theme	Strengths	70%
Top success factor	Communication & collaboration	25%
Unexpected pattern	Rise in employee turnover	25%
Consistent productivity rise over time	No	52%

Note: Underlying data and survey instrument adapted from the author's original MBA project report, "A Comprehensive Study of Fixed Assets Management at Tech Mahindra," MLR Institute of Technology, Hyderabad (2025–26).