

# Organizational Culture As A Predictor Of Industrial Relations : A Study Of Indian Industries

*\* Premasish Roy*

## INTRODUCTION

Industrial peace is indispensable for the smooth functioning of an organization. Active presence of harmonious and good Industrial Relations (IR) generating amity and goodwill between the partners in an industry can only bring in industrial peace. The strike on June 03, 2011 and the worst ever industrial violence on July 18, 2012 that left one senior official dead and nearly 100 injured at Maruti Suzuki's Manesar plant in Haryana shows that workers' rights are still a simmering issue. Maruti Suzuki declared an indefinite lockout at the Manesar plant following the violence. The company's General Manager of Human Resources - Awanish Kumar Dev had both arms and legs broken by his attackers, unable to leave the building that was set ablaze, and was charred to death. The incident is the worst-ever for Suzuki since the company began operations in India in 1983. This unfortunate incident illustrated the unity among the company's workers, but with workers and unions across states voicing support, the issue flared up into a wider industrial dispute, giving strong signals of a resurgence of trade union activity in the country.

Everything is becoming more and more complex in an era of transition from global recession to global recovery. Industrial Relations are also getting complex and critical day by day. Of late, the industrial unrest has again geared up in India. Indian industries during 2008 -2012 witnessed many industrial unrests. The violence at Maruti's Manesar plant is the one of the worst-ever industrial disputes to have occurred in India. Ashok Leyland, Hyundai, Honda Motorcycles, General Motors are among some other big names in India that have faced labour problems. Therefore, it is high time to study how organizational culture influences industrial relations in such a transitional period. In the present paper, an attempt has been made to probe how in a phase of 2008-2011, organization culture could be the predictor of industrial relations. Managers are becoming more and more disappointed with conventional IR policies, which are usually stagnant and are based on safety of law, caution, and fear of unions. It is also gradually felt that despite clash of interests between unions and the management, the IR climate needs to be changed to improve the business environment. It has also been realized that fire fighting to douse the conflict is a temporary solution. There has to be some permanent solution with a long term perspective. For this permanent solution with a long term perspective, industries should comprehend the Organization Culture (OC), and must take adequate measures to fine tune it to optimize IR. OC is the commonly held and relatively stable beliefs, attitudes and values that exist within the organization (Williams, Dobson and Waters, 1989).

In the present paper, an attempt has been made to argue on two issues. First, OC is a Predictor of IR. And second, in spite of the notional and distinctive existing OC, IR can be optimized by controlling a few critical dimensions of OC.

## RESEARCH GAP

Extensive and elaborate studies on Organization Culture (OC) mostly began after the World War II. Research on OC started more methodically since sixties of the twentieth century. Starting with Ray D. (1960), Etzioni (1961), Goffman, E. (1961), to Hofstede (1991,1994,1998), Schein (1971,1994), Frederick and Deshpande (2007), Hoon Song (2008) etc., much work has been done over the development and process of change of OC. Some researchers suggested that culture may be an important factor in determining how well an individual fits into an organizational context. Researchers have conceptualized post – merger change processes as cultural integration processes and attempted to explain problems and failures by cultural differences. But exploring the role of OC and its different parameters, dimensions etc. upon Industrial Relations (IR) of a concerned organization has not been categorically established. Not much work has been done in this area till now. Even if it has been undertaken by any research scholar , no published work thereof has been available. The present work is an approach towards this end. It is expected if any

---

*\* Assistant Professor, International Institute of Business Studies (IIBS), Kamal Gazi, N.S.C. Bose Road, Kolkata - 700103.  
E-mail: prem771@rediffmail.com*

correlation in dimensions of OC and factors of IR can be established, and also if the critical determinants of OC can be identified, then perhaps, by monitoring these critical determinants of culture, an optimized IR may be established thereof.

## **ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE (OC)**

As an individual possesses a personality – a set of relatively stable traits- so does an organization. A Culture is the set of important assumptions (often unstated) that members of a community share in common. OC has many intricacies. It is quite tough to jot down everything related with it, and it is even tougher to manage it (Baker, 1980). It has an entire gamut of things - starting from the physical setting of the organization to the ways people interact amongst each other within the organization. Simply, OC includes everything of values, attitudes and beliefs that underlies all the organizational activities. It is usually formed over the years through a blend of strong personalities, distress and positive strengthening. In most organizations, it is intensely embedded and is very hard to change.

## **INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS (IR)**

IR centers on human relations between management/employers and workers/unions in the process of production/service (Rastogi, 1948). The three parties involved here have three different perspectives and aims. If these three aims and perspectives are immaculately integrated, then it helps in the smooth functioning and maintenance of healthy IR. These perspectives are as follows:

- 1)** The management aims to achieve the best results with optimum inputs, maximizing returns on capital, improving wage and working conditions of workers, and offering better compensation to managers for improving and maintaining healthy relations between employees and employers.
- 2)** Workers and trade unions strive to safeguard the benefits of workers. It could be better wages, working conditions, autonomy in work, and redressal of grievances vis-à-vis to improve the productivity, cut-down waste, having healthy relations with the management and for the overall improvement of the industry.
- 3)** The government always looks for healthy IR for materializing sound economic and social development.

## **THE CONCEPT AND NEED OF OPTIMIZATION OF IR**

In industry, there are some key inputs – man, machine, material and working capital. Since there cannot be much frequent change in installed machines, etc., the management tries to optimize man power, quality and quantity of raw materials. Quality of raw materials and human resources, both adequately cause an effect upon the quality of finished products. These major factors do have a wide range of effects upon a wide spectrum. Workload is amplified upon individuals. Low-paid workers, presently termed as contract labourers, are utilized. This has a poor effect upon the employment potential. As a result, it puts a harmful effect upon “welfare facilities” and “safety and security” and other dimensions of OC. These bring feelings of insecurity, instability, etc. in the minds of employees. Furthermore, once the workload is increased upon workmen, up to a certain extent, it is accepted by the workmen, but beyond this stage, they become unwilling to absorb the pressure, and grievances are bound to creep up among the employees. These sorts of grievances are mostly ignored by employers, and this also causes a negative effect upon the “Grievance Handling” dimension of OC. Senior management executives are selected on the basis of their potential capability to reduce the number of hands in industries, and increase the workload upon the workers to reduce the average production cost (Sarkhel & Ganguly, 2008). The joint decision of employers and employees participating in such a type of decision is never considered. The concept of participative management is totally ignored. Thus, it has been observed that many such dimensions of OC are mostly ignored by the employers, and this eventually gives rise to a conflict amongst the employers and employees. This sort of dispute, if not handled properly, may create industrial unrest, interruption in production, even intimidation/assault of members of the management, etc., and finally causes poor organizational health. It is being observed that both the internal and the external environment of an organization effects and changes the OC. Therefore, if the critical determinants of OC are identified and taken care of, then perhaps, an optimized IR would be established for a better organization.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

It is the objective of every organization, whatsoever is its nature, to maintain an IR which will be conducive for the achievement of organizational goals and objectives. For this, optimization of IR is indispensable. Therefore, an attempt has been made to find out the critical determinants of OC, which when cared for can optimize certain constructs of IR for better IR and subsequently, better organizational performance. More specifically, the study aims at the following :

- i) To find out whether IR can be predicted by OC;
- ii) To explore the extent to which IR can be optimized by identifying the critical determinants of OC.

## THE HYPOTHESES

- i) The critical determinants from among the independent variables will be positively related to the dependent variables, and will be significant.
- ii) The critical determinants in two different organizations will not be similar.

## RESEARCH DESIGN & METHODOLOGY

For this study, a questionnaire was designed by combining both the constructs of OC and IR.

❖ After undergoing intensive study of different philosophies and concepts, *12 dimensions of OC were chosen*. These are:

- 1) Masculinity And Femininity :** The manner in which roles and emotive responses are divided according to gender. This practice dimension reflects traditional gender roles that associate males with assertiveness, and females with nurturance, and extends these into the organizational domain (Hofstede, 1980).
- 2) Grievance Handling :** It is the ability and the degree of competence in solving the complaint filed by an employee and claiming unfair treatment.
- 3) Individualism & Collectivism :** Is it the individual performance or the group performance (collective effort) that is regarded and rewarded? Organizations where individualistic values are espoused are considered instruments to serve individual owners, employees, and customers. In contrast, under collectivism, organizations are considered as providers of a social context to give meaning and purpose to the activities of the people (Hofstede, 1980).
- 4) Power Distance :** Power Distance is the different attitudes to inequality between people. High – power distance cultures tend to value the following elements: hierarchy, fixed roles, authoritarian decision-making styles, and conformity. Low-power distance cultures, on the other hand, tend to value these elements: low hierarchical structure, independence, individual initiative, freedom and consultative decision-making styles (Hofstede, 1980).
- 5) Value :** Value represents stable and life-long belief about what is important. Value is evaluative – it sets standards and norms.
- 6) Knowledge And Well Being :** Is basically the process of creating knowledge, using knowledge for strategic decision-making, facilitating the innovation of products and services, turning them into marketable forms, and managing their interface with the surrounding contexts- regional, national and global. At the surface level, organizational knowledge is the understanding of organizational structures, systems, rules, regulations and activities. And at a deeper level, it is the understanding of the principles, philosophy, beliefs and values that shape and sustain the surface-level features of organizations.
- 7) Uncertainty Avoidance :** Uncertainty avoidance is the level of acceptance of an unknown future. High – uncertainty-avoidance cultures tend to exhibit the following characteristics: a preference for engaging in risky behaviour (such as initiating legal action), rather than waiting to see how a situation will unfold; security through predictability and routine; adherence to rules, regulations and operating procedures; traditional gender roles; controlled presence of innovators; and belief in specialists and experts. Low – uncertainty-avoidance cultures tend to exhibit these characteristics: patience in taking action; belief in the importance of emotive or intuitive responses to

situations; freedom in gender roles; support for innovation and experimentation; and belief in generalists (Hofstede, 1980).

**8) Norms :** Norms are significant elements of the organization's social environment and evolve out of the organization's values. They are the unwritten rules of behaviour – the informal rules of the game telling employees what they are supposed to be saying, believing and doing what is right and what is wrong. Norms are generally passed on to new employees by word of mouth, and are enforced by the social approval or disapproval of one's behaviour in terms of its congruence or incongruence with prevalent norms.

**9) Diffuse And Specific :** In specific cultures, authority relationships are limited to the work situation only and are not maintained outside of it, whereas in diffuse cultures, one is a “boss”, and is regarded so by employees and others, within and outside the organization (Fons Trompenaars, 1997).

**10) Neutral And Affective :** Refers to how one's emotions are expressed. In certain cultures, emotions are restrained rather than expressed freely, which also governs relationships at work. While in some other cultures, emotions are freely expressed in interactions with one another - both at work and outside work (Fons Trompenaars, 1997).

**11) Universalism And Particularism :** The espoused values are deterministic, irrespective of situations or the focus is on exceptional nature of the present circumstances with the rules used only as guidelines to interpret and solve the present problem (Fons Trompenaars, 1997).

**12) Achievement And Ascription :** Depends upon how individuals are accorded their status. Is it based on one's achievements or ascribed to one by virtue of age, experience, education, caste, family lineage and such other factors (Fons Trompenaars, 1997).

❖ **The researcher selected eight factors of IR . These are:**

**1) Social Factors :** Matters like creed, social values, norms, social status (high or low) , etc.

**2) Economic Factors :** Comprises of type of company or ownership – whether individual, joint venture, domestic or MNC. It also includes labour markets, source of labour, differential of wage and economic status etc., which directly or indirectly affects the IR system.

**3) Institutional Factors :** Includes items like state policy, labour laws, voluntary codes, collective bargaining agreements, labour unions, employers' organizations/federations etc.

**4) Technological Factors :** Includes items like processes of work, type of technology, research and development activities, adaptability to changing trends etc.

**5) Political Factors :** Includes political parties, governments, issues related to the government and nation, political philosophy, change of government and many more.

**6) Psychological Factors :** Includes the level of motivation of employees, perception, attitude towards work, attitude of owner towards its employees, dissatisfaction and alienation of both the employees and the employers.

**7) Enterprise Related Factors :** Factors incorporate leadership or management style, OC and climate, adaptability to change, vision, mission and philosophy of the organization.

**8) Global Factors :** Global factors basically include issues like global technology transfer, international relations, global conflicts, dominant economic-political ideologies, global cultural milieu, economic and trading policies of power blocks, international trade agreements and relations, international labour agreements etc.

Thus, after the selection of eight suitable constructs of IR and twelve dimensions of culture, a questionnaire was designed by combining these two.

These questionnaires were given to the employees of several organizations, and the responses were collected from the respondents accordingly. The validity and the reliability of the questionnaire was estimated. Inter-item correlation test was undertaken to find out ultimately the cronbach alpha coefficient. The cronbach alpha coefficient was found to be quite favourable. It is suggested that there is adequate inter-item agreement among the individual's scores. The split –half test was also undertaken. The high value of the reliability coefficients indicates that the items used in the questionnaire is capable of eliciting quite consistent and reliable responses. Therefore, all the items in the questionnaire are highly correlated and homogeneous. They faced validity and item validity test were also

Table 1 : Inter-Correlation Matrix Between The Dimensions Of OC And Factors Of IR																					
		Dimensions of Organization Culture (OC)										Factors of Industrial Relations (IR)									
		Masculinity & Femininity	Grievance Handling	Individualism	Power Distance	Value	Knowledge & Well being	Uncertainty Avoidance	Norms	Diffuse & Specific	Neutral & Affective	Universalism & Particularism	Achievement & Ascription	Social Factor	Economic Factor	Institutional Factor	Technological Factor	Political Factor	Psychological Factor	Enterprise Related Factor	Global Factor
Correlations	Masculinity & Femininity	1																			
	Grievance Handling	.525**	1																		
	Individualism	.387**	.613**	1																	
	Power Distance	.409**	.359**	.075	1																
	Value	.483**	.502**	.403**	.367**	1															
	Knowledge & Well being	.603**	.577**	.472**	.0228	.521**	1														
	Uncertainty Avoidance	.590**	.605**	.553**	.0177	.464**	.613**	1													
	Norms	.543**	.673**	.511**	.377**	.461**	.645**	.592**	1												
	Diffuse & Specific	.339**	.497**	.403**	.0137	.0203	.287*	.377**	.380**	1											
	Neutral & Affective	0.02	.304**	.453**	.0087	.266*	.0036	.0221	.0218	.245*	1										
Dimensions of Organization Culture (IR)	Universalism & Particularism	.521**	.549**	.580**	.0073	.463**	.679**	.634**	.616**	.503**	1										
	Achievement & Ascription	.604**	.678**	.698**	.288*	.515**	.744**	.687**	.731**	.428**	.0202	.650**	1								
	Social Factor	.409**	.512**	.376**	.247*	.382**	.377**	.504**	.417**	.296*	.243*	.445**	.454**	1							
	Economic Factor	.465**	.562**	.760**	.016	.506**	.664**	.629**	.571**	.472**	.239*	.738**	.715**	.402**	1						
Factors of Industrial Relations (IR)	Institutional Factor	.584**	.765**	.551**	.512**	.516**	.496**	.647**	.659**	.638**	.358**	.503**	.638**	.509**	.543**	1					
	Technological Factor	.539**	.481**	.514**	.0094	.373**	.865**	.608**	.559**	.354**	-0.015	.729**	.673**	.281*	.649**	.447**	1				
	Political Factor	0.074	0.164	.272*	0.093	0.181	0.105	.233*	.241*	.581**	.543**	.240*	0.206	0.480**	.271*	.318**	0.19	1			
Factors of Industrial Relations (IR)	Psychological Factor	.683**	.719**	.484**	.649**	.464**	.586**	.482**	.657**	.519**	.297*	.552**	.634**	.389**	.474**	.684**	.513**	.332**	1		
	Enterprise Related Factor	.665**	.797**	.706**	.340**	.702**	.766**	.778**	.740**	.413**	.320**	.725**	.822**	.549**	.710**	.696**	.591**	0.227	.702**	1	
	Global Factor	.308**	.544**	.537**	.0046	.246*	.387**	.440**	.593**	.576**	.0165	.556**	.626**	.300*	.566**	.396**	.486**	.243*	.429**	.498**	1
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).																					
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). N- 73																					
Source: Author's Research																					



<b>Table 2: Factor Analysis of Dimensions of IR</b>						
<b>Total Variance Explained</b>						
<b>Component</b>	<b>Initial Eigenvalues</b>			<b>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>% of Variance</b>	<b>Cumulative %</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% of Variance</b>	<b>Cumulative %</b>
1. Social Factor	4.237	52.966	52.966	4.237	52.966	52.966
2. Economic Factor	1.054	13.179	66.145	1.054	13.179	66.145
3. Institutional Factor	.857	10.718	76.863			
4. Technological Factor	.593	7.414	84.277			
5. Political Factor	.466	5.827	90.103			
6. Psychological Factor	.323	4.039	94.142			
7. Enterprise related Factor	.287	3.584	97.726			
8. Global Factor	.182	2.274	100.000			
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						
Source: Author's Research						

<b>Table 3 : Factor Analysis of Dimensions of OC</b>						
<b>Total Variance Explained</b>						
<b>Component</b>	<b>Initial Eigenvalues</b>			<b>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>% of Variance</b>	<b>Cumulative %</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% of Variance</b>	<b>Cumulative %</b>
1. Masculinity & Femininity	6.111	50.923	50.923	6.111	50.923	50.923
2. Grievance Handling	1.278	10.648	61.571	1.278	10.648	61.571
3. Individualism	1.077	8.973	70.543	1.077	8.973	70.543
4. Power Distance	.791	6.591	77.134			
5. Value	.553	4.608	81.742			
6. Knowledge & Wellbeing	.464	3.864	85.606			
7. Uncertainty Avoidance	.400	3.330	88.936			
8. Norms	.360	2.996	91.932			
9. Diffuse & Specific	.297	2.472	94.405			
10. Neutral & Affective	.274	2.285	96.690			
11. Universalism & Particularism	.259	2.161	98.850			
12. Achievement & Ascription	.138	1.150	100.000			
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						
Source: Author's Research						

undertaken. These tests results showed that there is an adequate sense of validity in the questionnaire. The Table 1 shows the inter-correlation matrix between all the dimensions of OC and all the factors of IR. The matrix reveals that the dimensions of OC and factors of IR are significantly inter-correlated. However, certain dimensions of OC and factors of IR are not significantly inter-correlated. This is because of the inherent characteristics of dimensions of OC

<b>Table 4(a) : Model Summary of Regression Analysis (N = 73)</b>				
<b>Model</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>RSquare</b>	<b>Adjusted R Square</b>	<b>Std. Error of the Estimate</b>
1	.703 <sup>a</sup>	.494	.472	.33259
a. Predictors: (Constant), Var.3, Var.1, Var.2				
Source: Author's Research				

Table 4(b) : ANOVA <sup>b</sup> (N = 73)						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	7.441	3	2.480	22.423	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	7.633	69	.111		
	Total	15.073	72			
a. Predictors: (Constant), Var.3, Var.1, Var.2						
Source: Author's Research						

Table 4(c) : Coefficients <sup>a</sup> (Showing The Outcome of Regression Analysis, N = 73)						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.896	.148		6.036	.000
	Var.1 (Masculinity & Femininity)	.145	.065	.225	2.222	.030
	Var.2 (Grievance Handling)	.188	.058	.385	3.265	.002
	Var.3 (Individualism)	.117	.055	.232	2.131	.037
a. Dependent Variable: Var.4 (IR)						
Please note: Var.1: Masculinity & Feminity (Independent Variable of OC)						
Var.2: Grievance Handling (Independent Variable of OC)						
Var.3: Individualism (Independent Variable of OC)						
Var.4: IR (Dependent Variable)						
Source: Author's Research						

and factors of IR. This reflects the true state of IR and OC in the organization. Although, a few factors were poorly inter-correlated, yet, they influenced as a whole or are significantly inter-correlated with other factors of IR and OC. The researcher made an attempt to identify the dimensions of OC, which are critical determinants for influencing the IR. The best approach to identify such a combination of predictors is of course the multiple regression technique. In this research study, we have 12 dimensions of OC, which are treated as independent variables. However, on the other side too, we have eight factors of IR. The researcher administered factor analysis technique on both the dimensions of OC and IR to find out the percentage of variance of dimensions of both OC and IR. The Table 2 shows the percentage

Table 5: Factor Analysis of Dimensions of IR of Organization A (N = 38)						
Total Variance Explained						
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1. Social Factor	3.771	47.136	47.136	3.771	47.136	47.136
2. Economic Factor	1.272	15.901	63.037	1.272	15.901	63.037
3. Institutional Factor	.934	11.674	74.711			
4. Technological Factor	.841	10.518	85.229			
5. Political Factor	.524	6.554	91.783			
6. Psychological Factor	.315	3.933	95.716			
7. Enterprise related Factor	.258	3.223	98.938			
8. Global Factor	.085	1.062	100.000			
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						
Source: Author's Research						

of variance.

It is clear from the Table 2 that the percentage of variance of the Social Factor is the highest, followed by Economic Factor and Institutional Factor. The rest of the factors are dropped. This percentage of variance is used as a basis for applying the weighted average techniques to convert all the factors of IR into one dependent variable. The Table 3 shows the percentage of variance of the dimensions of OC. It is clear from the table that the percentage of variance of Masculinity & Femininity is the highest, followed by Grievance Handling and Individualism. The rest of the dimensions are dropped. This process would mitigate the problem of multicollinearity. Next, a regression technique is administered by taking Masculinity and Femininity, Grievance Handling, and Individualism as three independent variables of OC and IR as the dependent variable. It is clear from the Table 4(a), Table 4(b) and Table 4(c) that the three

<b>Table 6: Factor Analysis of OC of Organization A (N = 38)</b>						
<b>Total Variance Explained</b>						
<b>Component</b>	<b>Initial Eigenvalues</b>			<b>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>% of Variance</b>	<b>Cumulative %</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% of Variance</b>	<b>Cumulative %</b>
1. Masculinity & Femininity	5.849	48.742	48.742	5.849	48.742	48.742
2. Grievance Handling	1.498	12.481	61.223	1.498	12.481	61.223
3. Individualism	1.087	9.062	70.285	1.087	9.062	70.285
4. Power Distance	.947	7.890	78.175			
5. Value	.623	5.190	83.364			
6. Knowledge & Wellbeing	.495	4.128	87.492			
7. Uncertainty Avoidance	.363	3.025	90.517			
8. Norms	.313	2.606	93.122			
9. Diffuse & Specific	.284	2.363	95.485			
10. Neutral & Affective	.255	2.121	97.606			
11. Universalism & Particularism	.161	1.344	98.950			
12. Achievement & Ascription	.126	1.050	100.000			
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						
Source: Author's Research						

<b>Table 7(a): Model Summary of Regression Analysis of Organization A (N=38)</b>				
<b>Model</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>R Square</b>	<b>Adjusted R Square</b>	<b>Std. Error of the Estimate</b>
1	.745 <sup>a</sup>	.556	.516	.33711
a. Predictors: (Constant), Var.3, Var.1, Var.2				
Source: Author's Research				

<b>Table 7(b) : ANOVA<sup>b</sup> Organization A (N=38)</b>						
		<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
1	Regression	4.831	3	1.610	14.170	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	3.864	34	.114		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>8.695</b>	<b>37</b>			
a. Predictors: (Constant), Var.3, Var.1, Var.2						
b. Dependent Variable: Var.4						
Source: Author's Research						



<b>Table 7 (c): Coefficients<sup>a</sup> (Showing The Outcome of Regression Analysis of Organization A (N=38))</b>						
<b>Model</b>		<b>Unstandardized Coefficients</b>		<b>Standardized Coefficients</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
	<b>B</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>	<b>Beta</b>			
1	(Constant)	.949	.190		4.990	.000
	Var.1 (Masculinity & Femininity)	.248	.087	.405	2.866	.007
	Var.2 (Grievance Handling)	.181	.078	.373	2.308	.027
	Var.3 (Individualism)	.047	.078	.088	.610	.546
a. Dependent Variable: Var.4 (IR)						
Source: Author's Research						

<b>Table 8 : Factor Analysis of Dimensions of IR of Organization B (N = 35)</b>						
<b>Total Variance Explained</b>						
<b>Component</b>	<b>Initial Eigenvalues</b>			<b>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>% of Variance</b>	<b>Cumulative %</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% of Variance</b>	<b>Cumulative %</b>
1. Social Factor	5.271	65.889	65.889	5.271	65.889	65.889
2. Economic Factor	.806	10.079	75.967			
3. Institutional Factor	.768	9.602	85.569			
4. Technological Factor	.382	4.778	90.347			
5. Political Factor	.318	3.969	94.316			
6. Psychological Factor	.255	3.186	97.503			
7. Enterprise related Factor	.122	1.523	99.026			
8. Global Factor	.078	.974	100.000			
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						
Source: Author's Research.						

<b>Table 9 : Factor Analysis of OC of Organization B (N = 35)</b>						
<b>Total Variance Explained</b>						
<b>Component</b>	<b>Initial Eigenvalues</b>			<b>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>% of Variance</b>	<b>Cumulative %</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% of Variance</b>	<b>Cumulative %</b>
1. Masculinity & Femininity	6.931	57.756	57.756	6.931	57.756	57.756
2. Grievance Handling	1.291	10.754	68.510	1.291	10.754	68.510
3. Individualism	.942	7.849	76.359			
4. Power Distance	.755	6.292	82.652			
5. Value	.638	5.319	87.971			
6. Knowledge & Wellbeing	.445	3.709	91.679			
7. Uncertainty Avoidance	.268	2.231	93.911			
8. Norms	.255	2.126	96.037			
9. Diffuse & Specific	.200	1.664	97.701			
10. Neutral & Affective	.131	1.089	98.790			
11. Universalism & Particularism	.088	.732	99.522			
12. Achievement & Ascription	.057	.478	100.000			
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						
Source: Author's Research.						

dimensions of OC are the critical determinants of IR. These three determinants together explain 49.4 percent of the variance in IR. The value of  $R^2$  of the above multiple regression is .494, which is indeed quite high in social research. We can, therefore, say with a high degree of confidence that a simultaneous improvement in the said three dimensions of OC is likely to bring about healthy IR.

However, we must resist the temptation of generalizing the findings of a single study. Therefore, it was decided to re-analyze the parameters by taking the data of two different organizations. The same questionnaire was administered in two different organizations. Organization A had 38 respondents, and Organization B had 35 respondents. Now, let us study the Organization A: It is clear from the Table 5 that the percentage of variance of the Social Factor is the highest followed by Economic Factor, Institutional Factor and the Technological Factor. The rest of the factors are dropped. This percentage of variance is used as a basis of applying the weighted average techniques to convert all the factors of IR into one dependent variable.

Table 10(a):Model Summary of Regression Analysis of Organization B (N=35)				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.850 <sup>a</sup>	.722	.695	.49526
a. Predictors: (Constant), Var.3, Var.1, Var.2				
Source: Author's Research.				

Table 10(b) : ANOVA <sup>b</sup> Organization B (N=35)						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	19.752	3	6.584	26.842	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	7.604	31	.245		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>27.355</b>	<b>34</b>			
a. Predictors: (Constant), Var.3, Var.1, Var.2						
b. Dependent Variable: Var.4						
Source: Author's Research.						

Table 10 (c): Coefficients <sup>a</sup> (Showing The Outcome of Regression Analysis of Organization B (N=35))						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	<b>B</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>	<b>Beta</b>			
1	(Constant)	1.811	.358		5.063	.000
	Var.1 (Masculinity & Femininity)	.291	.156	.200	1.864	.072
	Var.2 (Grievance Handling)	.601	.143	.585	4.204	.000
	Var.3 ( Individualism)	.208	.150	.196	1.381	.177
a. Dependent Variable: Var.4 (IR)						
Source: Author's Research.						

It is clear from the Table 6 that the percentage of variance of Masculinity & Femininity is the highest followed by Grievance Handling and Individualism. The rest of the dimensions are dropped. This process would mitigate the problem of multicollinearity. Now, a regression technique is administered by taking Masculinity and Femininity, Grievance Handling and Individualism as three independent variables of OC and IR as the dependent variable (Refer to Tables 7(a), 7(b) and 7(c)). A comparison of regression analysis of Organization A (N-38) with Organization in General (N-73) and Organization B (N-35) was done after administering regression techniques in Organization B (N-35). Now let us study Organization B (N-35). It is clear from the Table 8 that the percentage of variance of the Social Factor is the highest followed by the Economic Factor and the Institutional Factor. The rest of the factors are dropped. This percentage of variance is used as a basis of applying the weighted average technique to convert all the factors of

IR into one dependent variable. The Table 9 shows the percentage of variance of the dimensions of OC of Organization – B (N = 35). It is clear from the Table 9 that the percentage of variance of Masculinity & Femininity is the highest followed by Grievance Handling and Individualism. The rest of the dimensions are dropped. This process would mitigate the problem of multicollinearity. Now, a regression technique is administered by taking Masculinity and Femininity, Grievance Handling and Individualism as the three independent variables of OC and IR as the dependent variable (Refer to Tables 10(a), 10(b) and 10(c)).

Table 11: Critical Determinants Of OC Of Three Different Samples		
Organization A (N 38)	Organization B (N 35)	Organization (General) (N 73)
Predictors	Predictors	Predictors
Var.1 (Masculinity & Femininity)	Var.2 (Grievance Handling)	Var.1 (Masculinity & Femininity)
Var.2 (Grievance Handling)		Var.2 (Grievance Handling)
		Var.3 (Individualism)
R <sup>2</sup> = .556	R <sup>2</sup> = .722	R <sup>2</sup> = .494
Source: Author's Research.		

Given the fact that the two sub-samples are drawn from two very different organizations, it should be of interest to find out whether the determinants of OC happen to be the same or different. Regression analysis was carried out separately for the two sub-samples, and the results of the same are presented. The predictors of OC reported for Organization A (N = 38), Organization B (N = 35) and Organization in General (N = 73) are summarized in the Table 11 for the sake of quick reference and comparison.

## CONCLUSION

It is clear from the findings of this paper that the OC does indeed influence the level of IR in India. As OC is the outcome of many organizational policies and practices, it is not necessary that in every organization, the same set of dimensions of culture must explain the impacting factor of IR. This is because each organization is a unique social system in terms of the sum total of its policies, procedures, practices and many more.

The results of the regression analysis have thrown up completely different sets of dimensions of OC as predictors of IR. This shows that the determinants of IR are highly organization specific. Therefore, it is not necessary that the “predictors” of IR found in this study would predict IR in all other organizations.

Here arises a question – what then, is the significance of this study? In tune with similar findings of earlier studies, this study has revealed that OC indeed influences IR. This study is based on a fairly large number of dimensions of OC. Each organization should look after all of these aspects so as to create a healthy culture which, in turn, would improve IR. From an academic standpoint, it helps in establishing that IR is not an entirely queer phenomenon as it is possible to predict it on the basis of certain situational factors, which are possible to control. It may not be possible to generalize the findings of a single study such as this, its findings are of definite use for the organizations covered by the study.

## REFERENCES

- 1) Berry, J.W. (1980). “*Social And Cultural Change - Handbook of Cross Cultural Psychology.*” Boston: Allyn & Bacon, pp. 239-252.
- 2) Blauner, R. (1964). “*Alienation & Freedom.*” Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 23-27.
- 3) Edwin Baker, L. (1980). “Managing Organizational Culture.” *Management Review*, Volume 69, Issue 7, pp.51-61.
- 4) Fahlbeck, R. (1996). “Reflections On Industrial Relations.” *International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations*,

Volume 12, Issue 4, p.289.

- 5) Friedlander, F.E., M.M. Cherner, and L. Mahar (1976). *"Improving Leadership Effectiveness: The Leader Match Concept."* New York: Wiley, pp. 7-45.
- 6) Galbraith, J. (1977). *"Organization Design, Reading Mass."* Addison-Wesley, pp. 5-28.
- 7) Grusky, D. (1962). "Authoritarianism And Effective Indoctrination: A Case Study." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Volume 7, Issue 1, pp. 79-95.
- 8) Hofstede, G. (1984). *"Culture's Consequences: International Differences In Work-Related Value."* Abridged version. London: Sage, pp. 7-95.
- 9) Hofstede, G. (1994). *"Uncommon Sense about Organization: Case Studies and Field Observations."* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, pp. 120-128.
- 10) Kotler, J.P. (1973). "The Psychological Contract." *California Management Review*, Volume 15, Issue 3, pp. 91-99.
- 11) Lawrence, P.R. and J.W. Lorsch. (1967). *"Organization and Environment: Managing Differentiation And Integration."* Boston: Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, pp. 45-78.
- 12) Lawrence, P.R. and J.W. Lorsch. (1969). *"Developing Organizations: Diagnosis and Action."* Reading Mass: Addison Wesley, pp. 23-35.
- 13) Lieberman, S. (1956). "The Effects Of Changes In Roles On The Attitudes Of Role Occupants." *Human Relations*, Volume 9, Issue 4, pp. 385-402.
- 14) Litwin, G.H. and R.A. Stringer (1968). *"Motivation And Organizational Climate."* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- 15) Luthans, F. (1976). *"Introduction to Management: A Contingency Approach."* New York: McGraw-Hill, pp. 45-88.
- 16) Margulies N. and A.P. Raia. (1978). *"Conceptual Foundations of Organizational Development."* New York: McGraw Hill, pp. 28-76.
- 17) Mukherjee A. (2011). "Lockdown and After." *Outlook*, July, pp. 46-47.
- 18) Mukherjee A.N., (2010). "Spearheading Developmental Culture: A Case Study." *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, Volume 3, Issue 11, pp. 30-37.
- 19) Pareek U. (2006). *"Organizational Culture And Climate."* Hyderabad: The ICFAI University Press, pp. 7-72.
- 20) Ramaswamy U. (1981). *"Industry And Labour: An Introduction."* Calcutta: Oxford University, pp. 45-58.
- 21) Ramaswamy, E.A. (1984). *"Power and Justice: The State in Industrial Relations."* Calcutta: Oxford University Press, pp. 25-27.
- 22) Rana Geeta and Garg Pooja (2011). "Measuring Organization Culture In Different Organizations - An Empirical Study." *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, Volume 4, Issue 2, pp. 34-38.
- 23) Rastogi, T.N. (1948). *"Indian Industrial Labour."* Bombay: Hind Kitabs, p. 107.
- 24) Richardson, J.H. (1959). *"An Introduction To The Study Of Industrial Relations."* London, UK: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., pp. 39-63.
- 25) Sarkhel, J. & Ganguly D. (2008). *"A Study Of Organizational Culture."* Calcutta: Book Syndicate (P) Ltd., pp. 1-44.
- 26) Schein, E.G. (1971). "The Individual, the Organization And The Career: A Conceptual Scheme." *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, Volume 7, Issue 4, pp. 401-26.
- 27) Singh K. (2005). *"Organizational Change and Development."* New Delhi: Exel Books, pp. 45-70.
- 28) Sinha J.B.P. (2004). *"Multinationals In India: Managing the Interface of Cultures."* New Delhi: Sage, pp. 45-122.
- 29) Sinha, J.B.P., P. Gupta, S. Singh, E.S. Srinivas, and V.S.R. Vijaykumar (2001). "Societal Beliefs, Organizational Climate, and Managers' Self-perception." *Vikalpa: The Journal For Decision Makers*, Volume 26, Issue 1, pp. 33-46.
- 30) Tagiuri, R. and G.H. Litwin (1968). *"Organizational Climate: Exploration of A Concept."* Boston: Harvard University Press, pp. 43-56.
- 31) Trompenars, F., and Charles Hampden-Turner (1997). *"Riding The Waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity In Global Business."* New York: McGraw-Hill, pp. 2-14.
- 32) Vroom, V.H. and P.W. Yetton. (1973). *"Leadership And Decision Making."* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, pp. 33-43.
- 33) Williams, A. P. Dobson and M. Waters, (1989). *"Changing Culture - New Organizational Approaches."* London: Institute of Personnel Management, p. 11, pp. 10-67.