INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE AND MANAGEMENT

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT   ii

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

www.ijrcm.org.in

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT   iii

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

www.ijrcm.org.in

CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

We invite unpublished novel, original, empirical and high quality research work pertaining to recent developments & practices in the area of Computer, Business, Finance, Marketing, Human Resource Management, General Management, Banking, Insurance, Corporate Governance and emerging paradigms in allied subjects. The above mentioned tracks are only indicative, and not exhaustive.

Anybody can submit the soft copy of his/her manuscript **anytime** in M.S. Word format after preparing the same as per our submission guidelines duly available on our website under the heading guidelines for submission, at the email addresses, **info@ijrcm.org.in** or **infoijrcm@gmail.com**.

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT

1. **COVERING LETTER FOR SUBMISSION**:

   Dated: _____

   The Editor

   IJRCM

   Subject: **Submission of Manuscript in the Area of _____ (Computer/Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Management/other, please specify)**.

   Dear Sir/Madam,

   Please find my submission of manuscript titled '_____' for possible publication in your journal.

   I hereby affirm that the contents of this manuscript are original. Furthermore It has neither been published elsewhere in any language fully or partly, nor is it under review for publication anywhere.

   I affirm that all author (s) have seen and agreed to the submitted version of the manuscript and their inclusion of name(s) as co-author(s).

   Also, if our/my manuscript is accepted, I/We agree to comply with the formalities as given on the website of journal & you are free to publish our contribution to any of your journals.

   Name of Corresponding Author:

   Designation:

   Affiliation:

   Mailing address:

   Mobile & Landline Number (s):

   E-mail Address (s):

2. **INTRODUCTION**: Manuscript must be in English prepared on a standard A4 size paper setting. It must be prepared on a single space and single column with 1" margin set for top, bottom, left and right. It should be typed in 12 point Calibri Font with page numbers at the bottom and centre of the every page.

3. **MANUSCRIPT TITLE:** The title of the paper should be in a 12 point Calibri Font. It should be bold typed, centered and fully capitalised.

4. **AUTHOR NAME(S) & AFFILIATIONS:** The author (s) full name, designation, affiliation (s), address, mobile/landline numbers, and email/alternate email address should be in 12-point Calibri Font. It must be centered underneath the title.

5. **ABSTRACT**: Abstract should be in fully italicized text, not exceeding 250 words. The abstract must be informative and explain background, aims, methods, results and conclusion.

6. **KEYWORDS:** Abstract must be followed by list of keywords, subject to the maximum of five. These should be arranged in alphabetic order separated by commas and full stops at the end.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT　iv

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

www.ijrcm.org.in

7.   **HEADINGS**: All the headings should be in a 10 point Calibri Font. These must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised. Leave a blank line before each heading.

8.   **SUB-HEADINGS**: All the sub-headings should be in a 8 point Calibri Font. These must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised.

9.   **MAIN TEXT**: The main text should be in a 8 point Calibri Font, single spaced and justified.

10.   **FIGURES &TABLES**: These should be simple, centered, separately numbered & self explained, and titles must be above the tables/figures. Sources of data should be mentioned below the table/figure. It should be ensured that the tables/figures are referred to from the main text.

11.   **EQUATIONS**: These should be consecutively numbered in parentheses, horizontally centered with equation number placed at the right.

12.   **REFERENCES**: The list of all references should be alphabetically arranged. It must be single spaced, and at the end of the manuscript. The author (s) should mention only the actually utilised references in the preparation of manuscript and they are supposed to follow **Harvard Style of Referencing**. The author (s) are supposed to follow the references as per following:

- All works cited in the text (including sources for tables and figures) should be listed alphabetically.
- Use (**ed.**) for one editor, and (**ed.s**) for multiple editors.
- When listing two or more works by one author, use --- (20xx), such as after Kohl (1997), use --- (2001), etc, in chronologically ascending order.
- Indicate (opening and closing) page numbers for articles in journals and for chapters in books.
- The title of books and journals should be in italics. Double quotation marks are used for titles of journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, reports, working papers, unpublished material, etc.
- For titles in a language other than English, provide an English translation in parentheses.
- Use endnotes rather than footnotes.
- The location of endnotes within the text should be indicated by superscript numbers.

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING FOR STYLE AND PUNCTUATION IN REFERENCES:

Books
- Bowersox, Donald J., Closs, David J., (1996), "Logistical Management." Tata McGraw, Hill, New Delhi.
- Hunker, H.L. and A.J. Wright (1963), "Factors of Industrial Location in Ohio," Ohio State University.

Contributions to books
- Sharma T., Kwatra, G. (2008) Effectiveness of Social Advertising: A Study of Selected Campaigns, Corporate Social Responsibility, Edited by David Crowther & Nicholas Capaldi, Ashgate Research Companion to Corporate Social Responsibility, Chapter 15, pp 287-303.

Journal and other articles
- Schemenner, R.W., Huber, J.C. and Cook, R.L. (1987), "Geographic Differences and the Location of New Manufacturing Facilities," Journal of Urban Economics, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 83-104.

Conference papers
- Chandel K.S. (2009): "Ethics in Commerce Education." Paper presented at the Annual International Conference for the All India Management Association, New Delhi, India, 19–22 June.

Unpublished dissertations and theses
- Kumar S. (2006): "Customer Value: A Comparative Study of Rural and Urban Customers," Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

Online resources
- Always indicate the date that the source was accessed, as online resources are frequently updated or removed.

Website
- Kelkar V. (2009): Towards a New Natural Gas Policy, Economic and Political Weekly, Viewed on February 17, 2011 http://epw.in/epw/user/viewabstract.jsp

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT
A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories
www.ijrcm.org.in

v

IDENTIFYING THE DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE & THEIR PERCEIVED RELATIVE IMPORTANCE IN THE MIND OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ORGANIZATIONS – A CASE OF FOUR INDIAN ORGANIZATIONS

DR. SITANATH MAJUMDAR

PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

DEAN, FACULTY OF COMMERCE, MANAGEMENT & SOCIAL WELFARE

UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA

KOLKATA – 700 027

KAUSHIK KUNDU

ASST. PROFESSOR

DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT & SOCIAL SCIENCE

HALDIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

HATIBERIA – 721 657

ABSTRACT

The study of organizational culture always evokes some special interest against the multicultural background of Indian society. However, in order to explore the cultural characteristics of any organization some dimensions are required to be identified. These dimensions of organizational culture must originate from the basic anthropological concept of the culture in the society. While searching for the dimensions it has been identified that the mainstream study of organizational culture has taken two distinct paths, unique in their own way. One path has been enriched by the academicians and researchers and more oriented towards the conceptual frameworks and their interpretations. The other path has been contributed by the professional practitioners who are more interested in the practical application of the concept. The dimensions that have been identified is required to be verified whether these are linked with the cultural orientations of the society. An empirical effort has been made to identify the links. It is also important to identify how the members of the organization perceive the cultural factors or dimensions according to their relevance. The study has also tried to identify the perception. The study has been undertaken on four Indian organizations extended in two different locations. However, the study may be generalized considering the diverse nature of the sample.

KEYWORDS

Organizational Culture, Orientations, Power, Context, Collectivity, Sex Difference

INTRODUCTION

Indian population is multilingual, multiracial, and multicultural in nature. The study of culture always evokes some special interest in such a kaleidoscopic background of this country. Again, the economic dynamics of the country has resulted in emergence of many different types of business organizations. So it has become important and relevant to study their organizational culture in the background of the cultural mosaic of the country. Astonishingly, except for a handful of conceptual discussions, there exist a few empirical studies on organizational culture in Indian context. Some eminent scholars like **Zahid H. Gangee, (1991)** have provided very useful conceptual frameworks of organizational culture. **Gouranga P. Chattopadhayay, (1991)** has made some enlightening contribution to organizational culture in the same book edited by him. However, none of these contributions is based on any empirical analysis. However, **U. Pareek (2002)** has provided an elaborate framework of organizational culture based on the empirical survey. This paper has made an effort to identify the relevant dimensions of organizational culture appropriate for empirical study and how the phenomenon of organizational culture may be influenced by the variables such as type of the society, region where the organization is situated, age of the organization, and the nature of the organization.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

The formal writing on the concept of organizational culture starts with the publication of an article by **Pettigrew in 1979**. He introduces the anthropological concept of culture to show how the related concepts may be used in organizational analysis. **Pettigrew** regards culture as the source of family of concepts. The family includes the concept of symbol, language, ideology, belief, ritual and myth. In his later observation, **Pettigrew** has also mentioned differing levels of culture, arguing that at the deepest level, culture consists of a complex set of values, assumptions, and beliefs that define the ways in which a firm conducts its business (**Pettigrew, 1990**).

Beres and Porterwood (1979) taking a somewhat different track present the concept of organizational culture as "a cognitive frame of reference and a pattern of behaviour transmitted to members of a group from the previous generations of the group."

Louis (1980) defines organizational culture as "a set of common understandings for organizing actions and language and other symbolic vehicles for expressing common understandings."

However, **Pfeffer (1981)** observes that organizations may have a number of different and competing cultures. He argues that the individual organizational subunits are likely to develop distinctive ideologies and structure of meaning.

Contemporary to these early developments, there is an emerging interest in understanding the cultural factors responsible for the astonishing performance of some Asian organizations. The Art of Japanese Management (**Pascale and Athos, 1981**), Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Organizational Life (**Deal and Kennedy, 1982**), and In Search of Excellence (**Peters and Waterman, 1982**), have emphasized that the organizations with deeply embedded shared values always enjoy competitive advantages over the others. **Deal and Kennedy** define organizational culture as "the way we do things around here."

Organizational culture as a topic of organizational research has evoked such an interest among organizational scientists that in **1983**, Administrative Science Quarterly has devoted a special issue to the particular concept. This issue, edited by **Jelinek, Smircich, and Hirsch**, has explored and attempted to define culture construct. In the same year, Organizational Dynamics has also come out with another special issue on the same area focusing on the implication of culture for practicing managers. These remarkable events may be considered as the beginning of the scholarly exploration and study of organizational culture.

Smircich (1983), in his article, summarizes five different programs of research that flow out of linking the terms culture and organization and examines their underlying assumptions and metaphors. In the first two programs culture has been conceptualized as either an independent or dependent, external or internal, organizational variable. In the final three, (cognitive perspective, symbolic perspective, structural and psychodynamic perspective) culture has not been perceived as a variable but has been conceived as a root metaphor for conceptualizing organization.

Edgar Schein has undertaken extensive study of organizational culture, its definition and concept, properties, (**1985**) and research approaches (**1990**). **He** (**1985**) emphasizes on the shared properties of culture in general and identifies a number of overt phenomena expressing culture of an organization as a whole.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT   60

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

www.ijrcm.org.in

Several other authors have noted that the primary interest on organizational culture of early eighties have evolved simultaneously from two different sources (**Knights and Willmott, 1987; Barley et al., 1988; Sackmann, 1991**). The first source is the group of management writers who have provided very practical practitioner's accounts of organizational success stories, emphasizing the importance of shared values and belief systems in influencing the behaviour of the organizational members. The second one is the group of academic researchers who put their effort to conceptualize organizations in terms of meaning. **Sackmann (1991)** observes that the concern of the academic group is primarily in understanding culture in organizations while the practitioners' main focus is prediction and control of culture of the organization.

Hofstede (1980) presented his 'Onion Model' of culture originally to explain and analyse national culture of the countries or nations. He defines culture as "the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group from another."

The so-called 'organizational culture school of thought' has been shaped through the early works of **Hofstede, Pettigrew, Peters, Deal and Kennedy, Schein** and others. **Louis (1983)** integrates all the assumptions related with it. She argues that the concept of organizational culture has emerged in part out of the dissatisfaction with the fundamental inadequacies in traditional methods of exploring the dynamics of organizations (**Van Maanen, 1979; Evered and Louis, 1981**). **Louis** reasons that the common thread underlying such concepts as symbols, myths, and metaphors, is that they are all artifacts of culture. Identifying that traditional organizational theories are limited by their failure to grasp behavioural nuances in organization at the collective level, she points out that with few exceptions, researchers in the organizational sciences " have proceeded as if study of the universal stratum alone were sufficient to produce understandings of organizational behaviour" (**Louis, 1983**). **Louis** also proposes that it is only when these and other are considered as a whole that the character and nature of the organization's social system become meaningful.

Modern explorations on organizational culture has also developed a comparative typology like homogeneous versus heterogeneous cultures, enriched versus managed cultures, developing versus stationary cultures, and balanced versus dissonant culture (**Fletcher and Jones, 1992**).

DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Hofstede (1990) proposes the following dimensions of culture, which he uses for a pioneering survey involving employees of IBM across fifty countries.

Power Distance: It is the extent to which the less powerful members of organizations and institutions accept and expect that power is distributed unequally.

Uncertainty Avoidance: It is the extent to which a culture programs its members to feel either comfortable or uncomfortable in unstructured situations.

Individualism on the One Side versus Its Opposite Collectivism: It is the degree to which individuals are supposed to look after themselves or remain integrated into groups, usually around a family.

Masculinity versus Opposite Feminity: It refers to the distribution of emotional roles between the genders, which is another fundamental problem for any society to which a range of solutions are found: it opposes 'tough' masculine to 'tender' feminine societies.

Long term versus short-term orientation: It is related to the choice of force for people's efforts, the future or the present.

In their epic study of culture and leadership involving 62 societies (as the title of the project suggests), **House et al. (2004)** selected nine dimensions of culture: 1) Power Distance 2) Uncertainty Avoidance 3) Human Orientation 4) Institutional Collectivism 5) In-Group Collectivism 6) Assertiveness 7) Gender Egalitarianism 8) Future Orientation 9) Performance Orientation.

The above-mentioned studies use their own rationale to select the sets of dimensions. A study of culture in Indian context must be judged on the basis of Indian psyche and the socio-historical evolution of Indian society.

While discussing work culture in Indian context **Sinha (1990)** has adapted **Gunnar Myrdal's (1968)** concept to distinguish between soft and synergic work cultures on the basis of a study of six organizations. Sinha has noted following characteristics of organizational culture in India: a) Hierarchical social structures and relations, b) Social networking through "own-other" dichotomy, c) Affection-deference relationships within in-groups, d) Preference for personalized relationships over contractual one, and e) Power play.

In his later study, **Sinha (1995)** identifies four styles of leadership, which may be treated as culture components: autocratic, bureaucratic, participative, and task-nurturant.

Amarchand and Jayraj (1992) perform a study of manufacturing organizations and identify four types of organizational cultures: growth- centered, person-centered, mixed, and weak. From the study, they infer that quality and organizational effectiveness vary with the type of culture in descending order – the highest levels are thus found in the growth-centered cultures and the lowest levels are found in the weak cultures.

SELECTION OF DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

The conceptual framework of values provided by **Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961)** has often been used in explaining different types of culture. They propose five main orientations a) relationship with nature, b) orientation to the context, c) time orientation, d) orientation to collectivities, and e) orientation to sex differences

The orientations may be explained as follows:

a. Relationship with nature: In this orientation between man and nature, one may be perceived as dominating the other. The individual (man) against the nature may be viewed as a helpless subject, resulting in fatalistic orientation. The opposite is based on the assumption that man can manipulate and control nature. This orientation may be called scienticism.

b. Orientation to the context: This relates to the importance, or lack of importance, given to context while trying to understand the meaning of phenomena. In context sensitive cultures, events can be understood only in their contexts.

Time orientation: This is the orientation in relation to past, present, and future. Here time may either be seen as a collection of discrete units or packets, or as continuous flowing phenomena.

c. Orientation to collectivities: The relationship between individuals and the groups (collectivities) may be of two types: primacy and identity. Following patterns may arise from the relationships:

d. Individualism to Collectivism: The individual is seen as more important than the collectivities or the otherwise. Collectivities may be defined by their identities or by the persons belonging to them.

Norms may be determined by the collectivities and the individual may be obliged to follow them. On the other hand individual may evolve his own norms and judge his action against those norms.

e. Orientation to sex differences: If the differences between men and women are emphasized and the social roles are divided according to gender the orientation polarizes towards masculinity. If the gender biasness is not emphasized while distributing social roles the orientation goes towards Feminity.

Along with the five orientations provide by **Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck**, another important orientation in determining culture is the 'orientation to power'. **McClelland (1975)** has proposed a relevant framework of power that can be used in conceptualizing typologies of culture in the societies. This orientation determines the concept of the distribution of power in a society.

This study, has taken four orientations to identify six dimensions of culture.

Six dimensions have been selected for the present study based on the orientations of culture as manifested in the society and the organization as discussed above. The dimensions and the corresponding orientation are provided below:

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT 61

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

www.ijrcm.org.in

FIGURE 1.1: RELATIONSHIP OF ORIENTATION OF CULTURE WITH DIMENSION (DESIGNED BY AUTHORS)

Orientation	Dimension
Orientation to the context	1. Ambiguity Tolerance
	2. Context Relatedness of Behaviour/ Contextual Association
Orientation to collectivities	3. Individualism vs. Institutional Collectivism
	4. Primary Group Identity
Orientation to sex differences	5. Masculinity Vs. Feminity
Orientation to power	6. Power Distance

ORIENTATION TO THE CONTEXT (ENVIRONMENT)
1. Ambiguity Tolerance: **Kluckhohn and Strodbeck (1961)** explain that the context or the environment may be viewed as structured and unchanging in the one hand or uncertain, ambiguous, and fluid on the other. Members of the society or the organization may feel comfortable or uncomfortable in the ambiguous environment. **Adorno et al. (1950)** describe this phenomenon as ambiguity tolerance. In the context they explore the 'authoritative personality syndrome, and the related attitude like intolerance towards ambiguity, rigidity, dogmatism etc. **Hofstede (1990)** terms the same concept as uncertainty avoidance "which is related to the level of stress in a society in the face of an unknown future.

2. Context Relatedness of Behaviour: Another dimension is related to the context of environment proposed by **Kluckhohn and Strodbeck**. Importance may be attached to the meaning of some phenomena in a particular context, or ignore the context in search of universal meaning. **Hall (1977)** proposes this tendency as high context and low context cultures. In the first types, events are interpreted only in their momentary context. **Orientation to Collectivities:**
The relationship between individuals and the collectivities to which they belong may be seen in dimensions primacy and identity. The first one describes the relationship of the individual with the collectivity in the society or the organization, and the second one explores the identity of the individual based on his/ her origin from a particular collectivity. Two dimensions of culture have been derived from them:

3. Individualism vs. Institutional Collectivism: **Blumberg and Winch (1972)** propose a 'curvilinear hypothesis' for the relationship between family complexity and the complexity of societies as they develop from traditional to modern. Very traditional hunting tribes used to live in nuclear families. In further advanced agrarian societies people develop more complex relationships and move towards extended collective relationships with the other individuals of the society. As the agrarian societies develop towards modern industrial societies extended relationships tend to disintegrate again into nuclear units. Conversely, collectivism stands for a preference where the individuals care for the extended social collectivities other than themselves and their nuclear families. The central issue of this dimension is the degree of interdependence between the individual members and the society.

4. Primary Group Identity: In any collectivity the identities of the groups are formed on some basis: kinship, ethnicity, religion, caste, etc. If any one such group assumes stronger identity they become the primary group for the individuals belong to that group. In a paradigm of culture we may have two extremes; in one end are the collectivities, which emphasize on the importance or the significance of the primary group. At the other end are the collectivities where importance is assigned on the quality of the individual himself overlooking his/her primary group identity.

Orientation to sex differences:
In some society the gender difference among the members is over-emphasized and the social roles are distributed according to the difference. In other societies the difference is not so prominent and accordingly the role distribution is not so biased. This results in the cultural orientation of sex differences. The dimension masculinity vs. Feminity has been derived from this concept.

5. Masculinity Vs. Feminity: Different characteristics have been attributed to the properties of masculinity and feminity. Men are attributed toughness, competition, aggression, perseverance, achievement, and assertiveness. Feminity manifests itself in compassion, empathy, harmony, collaboration, nurturance, sense of aesthetics, and creativity. If a society emphasizes the differences between two gender roles and allocates social roles according to such differences, men would be expected to work in areas of masculine attributes and women to work in areas require feminine attributes. In such a case the society is extreme masculine society (**Mead, 1962**). Avoiding the extreme cases masculinity-feminity property can be considered as a continuum that consist the masculine as well as the feminine traits in varying proportions depending on the orientation of the culture of the particular society. In order to find out the orientation of the particular society an acceptable differentiation of the traits is necessary.
Psychologist **Sandra Bem (1974)** has constructed a list of 20 masculine traits (self-reliant, assertive, etc.), 20 feminine traits (affectionate, gentle, etc.), and 20 neutral traits (truthful, friendly). She believes that our complex society requires flexibility with respect to sex role.

Orientation to power:
In a collectivity, distribution of power is not equal. Members of some collectivities may be uneasy or uncomfortable about this unequal distribution. There may be attempts to redistribute it. Other collectivities may be tolerant to the unequal distribution. **McClelland (1975)** proposes the framework of power, with individual orientations being defined by the source of power (external or internal), and the target of power (others and self). This framework may be used in conceptualizing typologies of culture. The related dimension to this framework is power distance.

6. Power Distance: **Hofstede (2001)** defines this dimension as: "the extent to which the members of a society accept that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally." The term 'power distance' has been borrowed from the work of **Mulder (1977)**. He defines power as: "the potential to determine or direct the behaviour of another person or other persons more so than the other way round." **Mulder (1977)** also defines power distance as: "the degrees of inequality in power between a less powerful individual (I) and a more powerful individual (O), in which I and O belong to the same (loosely or tightly knit) social system." The fundamental issue addressed by this dimension is how a society as well as an organization handles inequalities and their visible manifestations among the members as they occur.

The dimensions of organizational culture as discussed above have been derived from the anthropological concept. These dimensions may be used to distinguish one collectivity from the other, the collectivity precisely being the organization. The dimensions together may be used to form a profile. The profiles of the various collectivities form a continuum of organizational culture. One can make inter-comparison among the organizations based on these dimensions. Moreover, due to the anthropological origin of the dimensions, they may be used to explore the relationship between the society and the organization.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

- The scope of the examination of phenomenon of organizational culture in Indian context is vast and inclusive. However, this study has been made to achieve following objectives in its limited scope:
- To identify a set of dimensions of organizational culture that may be examined and verified in the context of the societal culture.
- To develop a questionnaire that may be reliable and valid in examining the culture of different organizations in Indian context.
- To examine the dimensions and their relationship with the different cultural orientation of the society.
- To examine the influence of the factors such as nature of the organization, type of the society, age of the organization, and the location of the organization on the organizational culture.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT   62
A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories
www.ijrcm.org.in

This study is exploratory descriptive in nature. It is exploratory in nature because its purpose is "to discover significant variables in the field situation, to discover relationship among variables and to lay groundwork for later, more systematic and vigorous testing" (**Kerlinger, 1973**). This descriptive study is designed to contribute to a clear understanding of the constructs developed and used for the research and also to identify the relationships between the constructs. As mentioned by **Kerlinger (1973)**, descriptive studies are "aimed at discovering the relations and interactions among sociological, psychological, and educational variables in real life situations." He opined that "any scientific studies, large or small, that systematically pursue relations and test hypotheses…. And are done in real life situations like communities, schools, factories, organizations, and institutions will be considered field studies."

The study has been done using a combination of past literature survey and primary empirical data. The constructs for this study have been developed from the past literatures. The core concept of culture has been explored and a model of organizational culture has been developed based on the anthropological concept of culture. This model is found to be appropriate to study culture in any organization. Effort has been made to explain the construct organizational by this model. To explore the construct of organizational culture empirically a set of dimensions has to be identified. The dimensions must be culturally significant and appropriate in Indian context. At the same time, the dimensions must have universal acceptance across the cultural boundaries. Six such dimensions namely, Ambiguity Tolerance, Context Relatedness to Behaviour, Individualism to Institutional Collectivism, Primary Group Identity, Feminity to Masculinity, and Power Distance have been identified using conceptual frameworks of different cultural components.

The set of six culture dimensions has been used to prepare the questionnaire to examine organizational culture.

The number of items for the questionnaire of organizational culture is 27 +1, the last being the question of ranking.

SAMPLING

Due to the purpose of the present study a stratified random sampling has been done. Firstly four organizations were selected considering their chronological ages, natures, and geographical locations. The organizations with their locations and in the age order are as follows:

TISCO (Jamsedpur) > IOC (Haldia) > HPL (Haldia) > RDB Rasayan (Haldia)

The organizations have been divided into two groups according to their chronological age of operation: 1. Old organization group comprising TISCO & IOC (operating for more than 25 years) 2. New or young organization group comprising HPL and RDB Rasayan (Operating for less than 25 years). Based on location the organizations are classified under two groups 1. Haldia based organizations (IOC, HPL, & RDB Rasayan) 2. Jamsedpur based organization (TISCO). All the organizations are manufacturing in nature with well defined production process.

Secondly, the respondent members of those organizations have been classified into three groups according to their place of socialization, the groups are 1. Rural & Semi-urban 2. Industrial Township and 3. Urban and city.

A Total two hundred sixty sets comprising of three questionnaires were distributed and the respondents were interviewed on the basis of the questionnaires. 50 respondents have not been considered for analysis either due to incomplete process or due to inconsistencies in their responses. 210 completed questionnaires were finally considered for analysis. The respondents have been classified as shown in Table 3.1:

Total sample size: N= 210

Place of Socialization / Organization	Rural & semi urban	Industrial Township	Urban and city.	Total
TISCO (Jamsedpur, old)	16	20	20	56
IOC (Haldia, old)	23	21	20	64
HPL (Haldia, young)	8	12	25	45
RDB Rasayan (Haldia, young)	25	10	10	45
Total	72	63	75	210

Figure 1.2: Classification of respondents (Authors)

RESULTS & ANALYSIS

The assessment of construct validity, as the measurement of theoretical constructs in the research of social science is very important to test a construct. The failure to present explicitly the construct validity seriously undermines the test of the theory (**Brahma, S., 2009**). Validity is a very board term in research. But the major concern should be for the three types of construct validity: face/ content validity, reliability, and convergent validity. The last two items together may be grouped as trait validity.

FACE/CONTENT VALIDITY

The three questionnaires have been developed following the logic of deductive method. For each of the questionnaires a pool of items has been selected to define each of the dimensions. Six such cultural dimensions have been taken to define the constructs of societal culture and organizational culture. Seven such dimensions have been selected to define the construct of organizational climate. The pool of items for each of the dimensions defining each construct has been scrutinized carefully and the final selection of items has been made with the help of the experts from academics and practicing managers. As observed by **Bohrnstedt, 1983**, there is no rigorous method to assess content validity. But, at the same time **Govindarajan and Kopalle (2006)** used this method of content validation to develop a five item scale on a construct of 'disruptive innovation.'

RELIABILITY

Reliability of a scale can be described as the degree to which a measure is free from error and, therefore, yields consistent results (**Peter, 1979**). The reliability of the questionnaires has been measured using the most popular method of Cronbach alpha coefficient. Essentially Cronbach alpha can be considered as an average correlation of every combination of one item to the other items in the same scale. If a scale has several dimensions or sub scales, reliability should be computed for each subscale (**Brahma, S., 2009**). As a rule of thumb, alpha = 0.70 is considered as minimum accepted value; however a value in the range of 0.60 is also acceptable for some scales (**Nunally, 1978**).

TABLE 1: RELIABILITY FOR ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Study Type	Organization	Questionnaire	Dimension	Number of items under the dimension	Reliability: Cronbach Alpha Coefficient
		For Organizational Culture	Ambiguity Tolerance	5	.833
			Context Relatedness of the Behaviour	4	.774
			Individualism to Institutional Collectivism	4	.810
			Primary Group Identity	4	.873
			Masculinity to Feminity	5	.624
			Power Distance	5	.88
		For the Organization questionnaire (=27 items)		27	.81

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT
A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories
www.ijrcm.org.in

63

As shown in the **Table 1** the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients for six dimensions range between .624 (lowest) and .88 (highest). As discussed, the range of the values of alpha coefficients for each of the dimensions of the organizational culture may be considered high enough for the designed questionnaire to be reliable for the present study.

CONVERGENT VALIDITY

Correlations between items and their respective scale (or sub scale) scores are examined for statistical significance to determine convergent validity of a scale by correlational method. When all items correlate significantly with their own subscale, convergent validity is established (**Brahma, S., 2009**). **Karim and Noor (2006)** exhibited the convergent validity of organizational commitment scale by this method.

In the present study, the scores for the dimensions or subscales for the construct of organizational culture have been determined by the 'Discriminant scores' from the discriminant analysis of the data.

Item- to-total correlation coefficients between each item score and the total discriminant score for each of the six dimensions of organizational culture:

TABLE 2: ITEM-TO-TOTAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN EACH ITEM SCORE AND CORRESPONDING OVERALL SCORE FOR THE RELEVANT DIMENSION FOR ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Item wise scores of	Item No.	Overall Scores of Dimensions or sub-scales					
		OAT	OCRB	OIIC	OPGI	OFM	OPD
OAT	1	.83					
	7	.79					
	13	.88					
	19	.68					
	25	.76					
OCRB	2		.92				
	8		.78				
	14		.88				
	20		.83				
OIIC	3			.78			
	9			.69			
	15			.68			
	21			.81			
OPGI	4				.77		
	10				.71		
	16				.77		
	22				.74		
OFM	5					.76	
	11					.69	
	17					.81	
	23					.83	
	26					.77	
OPD	6						.82
	12						.85
	18						.74
	24						.68
	27						.72

OAT= Organizational Ambiguity Tolerance, OCRB= Organizational Context Relatedness of Behaviour, OIIC= Organizational Individualism to Institutional Collectivism, OPGI= Organizational Primary Group Identity, OFM= Organizational Masculinity to Feminity, OPD= Organizational Power Distance

Table 2 presents the item-to-total correlations for every one of the twenty-seven items of the organizational culture questionnaire. The scores of all the items under a particular dimension have been correlated separately with the overall score of the particular dimension under which the items belong. It has been found that all the twenty-seven inter item correlations are positive and statistically significant. It can be inferred that there is adequate agreement among responses to each set of items designed to give the measure of the given dimension of organizational culture. Hence, it may be concluded that the designed questionnaire is valid for studying organizational culture in Indian context.

7.4 IDENTIFICATION OF THE DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Dimensions	Component					
	Factor – 1	Factor – 2	Factor – 3	Factor – 4	Factor – 5	Factor – 6
Scores of Ambiguity Tolerance	.155	**.727**	-.421	.152	.121	.152
Scores of Context Relatedness of Behaviour	-.295	**.806**	.395	-.405	.101	.135
Scores of Individualism vs. Institutional Collectivism	**.701**	-.101	-.281	.348	.410	.188
Scores of Primary Group Identity	**.839**	-3.222E-02	.199	.279	-.265	.465
Scores of Feminity vs. Masculinity	-.385	.371	.314	**.813**	-.216	-.148
Scores of Power Distance	.391	.272	**.736**	.322	.221	-.435

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT 64
A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories
www.ijrcm.org.in

TABLE 3: COMPONENT MATRIX

EXTRACTION METHOD: PRINCIPAL COMPONENT ANALYSIS. (SIX COMPONENTS EXTRACTED.)

Table 3 reports the factor loadings for each variable on the un-rotated components or factors. Each number represents the correlation between the item and the un-rotated factor. These correlations help to formulate an interpretation of the factors or components. This is done by looking for a common thread among the variables that have large loadings for a particular factor or component.

	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative (%)	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	1.839	30.646	30.646	1.839	30.646	30.646
2	1.055	17.577	48.223	1.055	17.577	48.223
3	.982	16.366	64.590	.982	16.366	64.590
4	.839	13.976	78.566	.839	13.976	78.566
5	.783	13.043	91.608	.783	13.043	91.608
6	.504	8.392	100.000	.504	8.392	100.000

Table 4: Total Variance Explained

EXTRACTION METHOD: PRINCIPAL COMPONENT ANALYSIS.

Table 4 gives eigenvalues, variance explained, and cumulative variance explained for the factor solution. The first panel gives values based on initial eigenvalues. For the initial solution, there are as many components or factors as there are variables.

The "Total" column gives the amount of variance in the observed variables accounted for by each component or factor. The "% of Variance" column gives the percent of variance accounted for by each specific factor or component, relative to the total variance in all the variables. The "Cumulative %" column gives the percent of variance accounted for by all factors or components up to and including the current one. For instance, the Cumulative % for the second factor is the sum of the % of Variance for the first and second factors.

Interpretation:

As shown in **Table 3**, six factors have been extracted through principle component analysis. Two dimensions, namely Individualism vs. Institutional Collectivism (IIC) and Primary Group Identity (PGI) have been extracted with significant high loading (**.701 & .839**) as factor 1. The factor may be identified as **Orientation to Collectivities**. In factor 2, two other dimensions have been extracted with high factor loading (**.727 & .806**), namely Ambiguity Tolerance and Context Relatedness of Behaviour. The second factor may be termed as **Orientation to the Context.** The dimension of Power Distance has been loaded as factor three (**.736**) and may be termed as **Orientation to Power**. The remaining dimension, Feminity vs. Masculinity has been loaded as factor 4 (**.813**) and may be identified as **Orientation to Sex (Gender) Differences**.

IDENTIFYING THE INFLUENCES OF NATURE OF ORGANIZATIONS, TYPES OF SOCIETIES, AGE OF ORGANIZATIONS,, AND LOCATION OF ORGANIZATIONS ON ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

TABLE 5 ORGANIZATION WISE THURSTON CASE V ANALYSIS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Dimension / Organization	Dimension-1 Ambiguity Tolerance	Dimension-2 Context Relatedness of Behaviour	Dimension-3 Individualism to Institutional Collectivism	Dimension-4 Primary Group Identity	Dimension-5 Masculinity to Feminity	Dimension-6 Power Distance
IOC 🔴	0.62 (5)	0.89 (3)	1.49 (1)	0.77 (4)	0 (6)	1.38 (2)
TISCO 🟣	0.43 (5)	0.89 (3)	0.84 (4)	1.22 (2)	0 (6)	1.31 (1)
HPL 🟢	0 (6)	0.91 (4)	1.26 (3)	1.78 (1)	0.8 (5)	1.33 (2)
RDB Rasayan 🟠	0.94 (2)	0.55 (3)	0.98 (1)	0 (6)	0.26 (5)	0.43 (4)
Total 🔵	0.88 (5)	1.12 (4)	1.32 (3)	1.65 (2)	0 (6)	1.98 (1)

The numbers inside the bracket indicate the ranks of the dimensions and the numbers outside the bracket express the relative values of the dimensions derived from Thurston Case V analysis.

TABLE 6 SOCIETY WISE THURSTON CASE V ANALYSIS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Dimension / Society Types	Dimension-1 Ambiguity Tolerance	Dimension-2 Context Relatedness of Behaviour	Dimension-3 Individualism to Institutional Collectivism	Dimension-4 Primary Group Identity	Dimension-5 Masculinity to Feminity	Dimension-6 Power Distance
Rural & semi Urban 🔴	1.21 (1)	1.14 (2)	1.07 (3)	0.53 (5)	0 (6)	0.81 (4)
Industrial township 🟢	1.17 (3)	0.71 (5)	0.94 (4)	1.35 (2)	0 (6)	1.52 (1)
Urban & City 🟣	0 (6)	0.72 (4)	1.03 (3)	1.24 (2)	0.44 (5)	1.47 (1)
Total 🔵	0.88 (5)	1.12 (4)	1.32 (3)	1.65 (2)	0 (6)	1.98 (1)

The numbers inside the bracket indicate the ranks of the dimensions and the numbers outside the bracket express the relative values derived from Thurston Case V analysis.

TABLE 7 ORGANIZATION AGE WISE THURSTON CASE V ANALYSIS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Dimension / Organization Age	Dimension-1 Ambiguity Tolerance	Dimension-2 Context Relatedness of Behaviour	Dimension-3 Individualism to Institutional Collectivism	Dimension-4 Primary Group Identity	Dimension-5 Masculinity to Feminity	Dimension-6 Power Distance
Old Organizations	0.51 (4)	1.36 (3)	1.88 (1)	0.46 (5)	0 (6)	1.68 (2)
New/ Young Organizations 🔴🟢	0.88 (2)	0.37 (5)	0.69 (3)	0.42 (4)	0 (6)	0.93 (1)
Total 🔵	0.88 (5)	1.12 (4)	1.32 (3)	1.65 (2)	0 (6)	1.98 (1)

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT   65

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

www.ijrcm.org.in

The numbers inside the bracket indicate the ranks of the dimensions and the numbers outside the bracket express the relative values derived from Thurston Case V analysis.

TABLE 8 LOCATION WISE THURSTON CASE V ANALYSIS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Dimension Locations	Dimension-1 Ambiguity Tolerance	Dimension-2 Context Relatedness of Behaviour	Dimension-3 Individualism to Institutional Collectivism	Dimension-4 Primary Group Identity	Dimension-5 Masculinity to Feminity	Dimension-6 Power Distance
Location Haldia	0.67 (4)	0.91 (3)	1.48 (1)	0.43 (5)	0 (6)	1.32 (2)
Location Jamsedpur	0.43 (5)	0.89 (3)	0.84 (4)	1.22 (2)	0 (6)	1.31 (1)
Total	0.88 (5)	1.12 (4)	1.32 (3)	1.65 (2)	0 (6)	1.98 (1)

The numbers inside the bracket indicate the ranks of the dimensions and the numbers outside the bracket express the relative values derived from Thurston Case V analysis.

Results: Thurston Case V analysis for organizational culture (Table 5 to table 8):

In organization wise analysis (**table 5**), it is found that each of the organizations comes with a unique pattern which has some similarities as well as dissimilarities with respect to the other organizations and the overall result. However, the pattern of organizational culture of TISCO bears maximum resemblance with the overall organizational culture pattern while the pattern of organizational culture of RDB Rasayan appears to be very different with respect to the overall as well as other organizations.

In society wise analysis of organizational culture (**table 6**), all the three societies show different patterns of organizational culture from one another with organizational culture of industrial society having closest resemblance with the overall organizational culture. The dimension Power Distance has been given maximum importance except of rural and semi-urban society. Again, the dimension Masculinity to Feminity has been given lowest preference across all the society types.

In organizational age wise analysis of organizational culture (**table 7**), it is found that the old organization group and the new/young organization group show almost different pattern from each other. However, irrespective of all the groups the dimension Masculinity to Feminity has been given the lowest preference. Both the old and the new/young organization groups emphasize on the dimension of Power Distance. It has been observed that with the maturity of the organizations some of the priorities tend to change. For example, for young organizations power distance has been emphasized as the most important factor, whereas for old organizations highest priority has been given to group orientation (individualism to institutional collectivism) or the teamwork factor of organizational culture. Mature organizations also appear to offer better defined, unambiguous environment and hence importance of the factor ambiguity tolerance has been diminished with maturity.

In location wise analysis of organizational culture (**table 8**) it is observed that organizational cultures of the two locations are more different than similar. However, the preference of dimension Power Distance as one of the most important and the preference of dimension Masculinity to Feminity as of lowest significance remain the same.

INTERPRETATION: It has also been found that across all the organizations (nature) and all the society types, power distance has been preferred as the most important factor for organizational culture except for the organization RDB Rasayan. Power distance has also not been identified as top priority factor for the societies such as rural and semi-urban. The main reason may be that the rural & semi-urban people are not socially conscious of hierarchical power structure and that has already been reflected in the of society wise societal culture analysis through Thurston Case V method. Each of the society type identifies a separate set of priority factors of organizational culture. This indicates that societal culture has a direct influence on identifying the factors of the organizational culture.

As identified earlier, the rural & semi-urban members show their high tolerance to uncertainty in organizational environment marking it as the highest priority factor. Members from urban & city and industrial township societies assign highest priority to the hierarchical difference in organizations.

Maturity of organization influences the process of prioritization of cultural factors. At the formative stage of the organization, there exists a lot of uncertainty and ambiguity. As expected the very factor has been given high importance by the members of the young organizations. Similarly, to establish definite norms in the organization, the hierarchy of power is given highest importance. As the organizations mature, the importance of team building and group activity takes the place of hierarchy of power. With the emergence definite set of established norms and ideas, the priority to Ambiguity Tolerance also diminish.

CONCLUSION

Traditionally, both scholars and practitioners have assumed the universality of management concepts. The multinational or transnational business organizations show a tendency to adopt management concepts and techniques effective at home-ground and try to implement them into other regions, societies, and hence cultures. But it is now becoming clear, from both management practice and cross-cultural management research, that this universality of assumptions regarding management concepts, at least across cultures, may not be valid in all the cases.

In the present context, it has become very important to understand how organizational culture is manifested in the organizations and how its dimensions are related to the anthropological context of culture. The present study has identified six dimensions of organizational culture in the Indian context which may be classified under the four cultural orientations such as orientation to context, orientation to uncertainty, orientation to power, and orientation to sex (gender) differences. All these dimensions have shown significant importance (**Table 3**) in the context of the organizations under study.

The final step is to identify the set of factors that becomes relevant and important in case organizational culture. It has been observed that the importance of the factors change with the types of the societies, nature of the organization, and maturity of the organizations, and the location of the organizations. The relevance of the factors of organizational culture is by and large influenced by the type of the society, nature of organizations, maturity of organizations, and locations of organizations. It is observed that across the organizations, members consider the hierarchical power structure (power distance) in the organization to be the most important factor (**Table 5**). The only exceptions are the members of the rural & semi-urban society, who perceive that tolerance to uncertainty (ambiguity tolerance) is the most important attribute in organizational culture (**Table 6**). The family identity of the individuals (primary group identity) is considered a very important factor. As observed in the case of organizational culture, the gender based attributes of the individuals (feminity vs. masculinity) across all the societies are considered as the least relevant among all the factors. It may be inferred that the culture in Indian organizations do not give much importance to the gender orientation.

Across any classifications of organizations, two factors have emerged to be very important, one is the Power Distance and the other one is Primary Group Identity. Although these factors are perceived as the most important at the initial phase of the organizational life, their importance appear to diminish with the maturity of the organization (**Table 7**). For mature organizations, group or team oriented cultural factor individualism vs. institutional collectivism) emerges as the most important one. It has also been noted that the members of organizations situated at different locations assign slightly different preferences of cultural factors. That means the location of the organization evidently has some influence on the organizational culture.

In any exploratory study, concerning culture variety is an important factor. This study is limited to only two regions of the country. For practical constraint, the different parts of the country with different sub-cultural patterns cannot be studied. The inclusion of those subcultures may contribute some new findings to the study.

The study is also limited within the Indian organizations. The inclusion of international, transnational, and foreign-based collaboration organizations may identify some new factors of organizational culture and the shaping of organization under the influence of the cultural phenomena.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT 66
A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories
www.ijrcm.org.in

This study has tried to explore the nature of organizational culture, the factors associated with it. It has also tried to identify the relative importance of the sub-factors for the phenomenon. However, the detail influence of each of the sub-factors and their proportionate weightage to form the constructs has not been done. Future study may try to explore this avenue for further clarification.

REFERENCES

Adorno, T. W., Frenlel-Burnswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper & Row.

Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 42: 155-162.

Deal, T .E. Kennedy, A. A. (1982). Corporate Cultures. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Evered, R. L., & Louis, M. R. (1981), "Alternative perspectives in the organizational sciences: inquiries from the inside and inquiries from the outside", Academy of Management Review. Vol. 6:.385-389.

Fletcher, B, Jones, F (1992), "Measuring organizational culture: the cultural audit", Managerial Auditing Journal. 7: pp.30-36.

Frost, P. J., Moore, L., Louis, M. R., Lundberg, C. C., & Martin, J. (Eds.) (1985). Organizational Culture. Sage: Newbury Park, CA.

Frost, P.J., Moore, L.F., Louis, M.R., Lundberg, C.C., & Martin, J. (Eds.). (1991). Reframing organizational culture. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gangjee, Z. H. (1991), "Understanding Organizational Culture: Symbols, Scripts, Events and Myths", chapter 10. In G. P. Chattopadhyay (Ed.) Organizational Culture (Cultural Roots of Modern Management). New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House.

Govindarajan, V. & Kopalle, P. (2006). Disruptiveness of Innovations: Measurement and an Assessment of Reliability and Validity. Strategic Management Journal, 27: 189-199.

Hall, E. (1977). Beyond Culture. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.

Hofstede, G (1980), Culture's Consequences. London: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1996). Gender stereotypes and partner preferences of Asian women in masculine and feminine cultures. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology. 27: 533-546.

Hofstede, G., (2001). Culture's Consequences (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Hofstede, G., Neuijen, B., Ohayv, D. D., & Sandars, G. (1990). Measuring organizational cultures: A qualitative and quantitative study across twenty cases. Administrative Science quarterly, 35: 286-316

House, R., Hauges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. & Gupta, V., (2004). Culture, Leadership, and Organizations - The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies. London:Sage.

Jelinek, M., Smircich, L., & Hirsch, P. (1983). Introduction: A code of many colors. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28: 331-338.

Keeley, M. (1983). "Values in organizational theory and management education", Academy of Management Review. Vol. 8: 376-386.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). Foundations of behavioural research (2nd Ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kluckhohn, F. R. & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). Variations in value orientations. Westport, CT: Green wood.

Knights, D., Willmott, H (1987), "Organisational culture as a management strategy", International Studies of Management and Organisation, Vol. 17: No.3.

Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. Administrative Science Quarterly, 2: 225-251.

Louis, M.R (1983), "Organizations as culture-bearing milieux", in Pondy, L.R, Frost, P.J., Morgan, G, Dandridge, T.C (Eds),Organisational Symbolism, JAI Press,, Greenwich, CT, pp.39-54.

McClelland, D. C. (1975). Power: The inner experience. New York: Irvington.

Mead, M. (1962). Male and female: A study of the sexes in a changing world. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.

Peters, T. J. (1978), "Symbols, patterns and settings", Organizational Dynamics, 9: 3-23.

Pettigrew, A.M. (1979), "On studying organizational cultures", Administrative Science Quarterly, 24: 570-581.

Pettigrew, A.M. (1990), "Is corporate culture manageable?", in Wilson, D, Rosenfeld, R (Eds.), Managing Organisations, 267-72.

Pfeffer, J. (1981), "Management as symbolic action", in Cummings, L.L, Staw, B.M (Eds.), Research in Organizational Behaviour. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Sackmann, S (1991), Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, Vol. 27: pp.295-317.

Schein, E. H. (1985), Organizational Culture and Leadership: A Dynamic View. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E. H. (1990), "Organizational culture", American Psychologist, Vol. 45:

Schein, E. H. (1991). What is culture? In Frost, P. J., Moore, L. F., Louis, M. R., Lundberg, C. C., Martin, J., (1991) (Eds.), Reframing Organizational Culture, California: Newbury Park, Sage Publication.

Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly. 28: 339-358.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX – 1: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE SURVEY

General information about the respondents:

1. Gender:

Male	Female

2. Age Group:

25-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	More than 45

3. Place of early socialization:

Rural area / Semi urban	Industrial Township	Urban / Metro

4. Place of late socialization:

Rural area / Semi urban	Industrial Township	Urban / Metro

5. Level of education:

Matriculation/ ITI	H. S. Pass	Graduate/ Diploma Eng.	Post Graduate/ Degree Eng.	Professional (MBA, CA, Dr. etc.)

6. Name of the organization:

IOC	HPL	RDB Rasayan	TISCO

7. Designation:

8. Monthly income: (optional)

Bellow 10000	10000-15000	15001-20000	20001-25000	More than 25000

Questionnaire of Organizational Culture

Please read the following questions and answer accordingly:

1. i. Most of our supervisors feel very uncomfortable in the unknown and uncertain job situations.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

ii. The fact that our peers do not show the same degree of intimacy with one another outside our workplace appears quite normal to us.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

iii. Most of my peers believe that if the organizational targets are achieved, individual performance becomes irrelevant.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

iv. In our organization family background/pedigree of the employees are not given much importance.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT 67

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

www.ijrcm.org.in

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

v. Most of our employees believe that qualities like creativity, compassion, and aesthetics are less important than aggression, competitiveness, or toughness in our workplace.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

vi. Apart from the pay package and related benefits there are always other visible symbols to differentiate various positions in our organization.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

vii. Uncertain situations help the professional development of the employees in any organization.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

viii. Our employees strongly react to our supervisors' use of 'slang' issuing instructions to them.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

ix. Even during most critical times our superiors insist on giving more importance on personal satisfaction than giving priority to the organization's need satisfaction.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

x. Employees from reputed and respectable families are treated especially even though they work at the lower levels.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

xi. Our employees believe that the superiors should not show caring and protective attitude towards their subordinates.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

xii. Office space, furniture, room decorations and other similar arrangements are provided appropriate to the designation of the employees.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

xiii. Your Colleagues are comfortable in the job environment, which is (✓ at the appropriate box)

Extremely Unchallenging	Not Unchallenging	Somewhat Challenging	Challenging	Extremely Challenging

xiv. Bosses always maintain a uniform conduct with the subordinates irrespective of any situation both within and outside the workplace.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

xv. Indicate the most appropriate situation according to your peers

Organizational → / Individual ↓	High Performance	Medium Performance	Low Performance
High Performance			
Medium Performance			
Low Performance			

xvi. Most of my colleagues believe that qualified employees even from the lower strata of the society can reach the top positions in this company.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

xvii. My peers do not believe that imagination and harmony are of much importance in the context of our organization.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

xviii. My peers believe that power and prestige associated with the higher posts are more important than the pay package.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

xix. Indicate the comfort level of your peers in the jobs, which are

Extremely rigid and with very precise instructions	Rigid and with precise instructions	Somewhat rigid and with somewhat precise instructions	Flexible and with no precise instructions	Extremely flexible and without any instructions

xx. While executing any critical function our employees

Frequently use strong words at each other	Sometimes use strong words at each other	Occasionally use strong words at each other	Tries to remain polite as much as possible	Remain very polite even in extreme situations

xxi. Please rank the following factors as you think your peers prioritize:
a) society b) organization c) peer d) self e) concerned department f) family and kin g) locality h) others (please mention)

xxii. Rank the following factors according to the importance given by your organization to evaluate an individual (put score in 100):
a) Status of the family in the society b) Educational qualification c) Nature of the profession d) Age e) Political connection

xxiii. Rank the following characteristics according to the degree of importance given in the organization:

a) Competitiveness	e) Compassion
b) Aggression	f) Creativity
c) Assertiveness	g) Care and Protection
d) Toughness	h) Aesthetic Sense

xiv. Bosses maintain respectable distance with his subordinates in any situation.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

xxv. Indicate the best type of job in your opinion (in the box)

Imagination → / Challenge ↓	High	Medium	Low
High			
Medium			
Low			

xxvi. Our superiors prefer subordinates with womanish behaviour pattern.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

xxvii. Rank the following items in descending order of priority to distinguish hierarchical positions in the organization
a) Pay package and related benefits b) Room decoration, parking space etc. c) Personal assistants d) Behaviour e) Others (specify)

2. Given bellow are some selected attributes of culture that influence an organization. Please rank them as you think their importances are on Organizational Culture:

	Rank
Tolerance of individuals to uncertain situations	
Behaviour of the individuals to be judged on fixed scale or on changing situations	
People's tendency towards individual satisfaction or towards collective satisfaction	
Individuals identity to be judged by family background or individual accomplishment	
Masculine vs. Feminine behaviour of people in organization	
Acceptance of power and authority of so called powerful people	

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT   68
A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories
www.ijrcm.org.in

REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

Esteemed & Most Respected Reader,

At the very outset, International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management (IJRCM) appreciates your efforts in showing interest in our present issue under your kind perusal.

I would like to take this opportunity to request to your good self to supply your critical comments & suggestions about the material published in this issue as well as on the journal as a whole, on our E-mails i.e. **info@ijrcm.org.in** or **infoijrcm@gmail.com** for further improvements in the interest of research.

If your good-self have any queries please feel free to contact us on our E-mail **infoijrcm@gmail.com**.

Hoping an appropriate consideration.

With sincere regards

Thanking you profoundly

Academically yours

Sd/-

Co-ordinator

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT
A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories
www.ijrcm.org.in

69