



## **Impact of Organization's Culture on Employees' Commitment: Evidence From Five Homogeneous Units Under A Group Of Company Operating In Different States In India**

**Anuj Kumar Sinha**

(Research Scholar, NIT Durgapur)

anuj.ksinha@ymail.com

**Rakesh Kumar**

(Scholar, IPCC-ICAI Kanpur)

**Dr. P P Sengupta (HOD)**

(Department of Humanities & Social Science NIT- Durgapur)

**Dr. Gautam Bandyopadhyay (HOD)**

(Department of Management Studies NIT- Durgapur)

### **Abstract**

This study is aiming at investigating the impact of four dimensions on organizational culture which includes: 1. Training & Development, 2. Reward & Recognition, 3. Teamwork and 4. Communication over organizational commitment on the basis of response from the Management Staff categories within five units a group company Using Reliability Analysis and Factor analysis. This company is engaged in manufacturing capital goods serving to the core industries in the country.

Keywords: Organizational culture, Organizational commitment, Reliability Analysis and Factor analysis, manufacturing capital goods in India.

### **Introduction**

Organizational culture is an effective tool helping an organization quantifying business function (Gray et al., 2003) which is developed either by its Employer , or a conscious effort on the part of management to improve upon the performance and efficiency. Whichever the way it is developed, is identifiable through its people. Study has revealed that Organizational Culture has its impacts on the feelings, interactions, thoughts, and organizational performance (Saeed and Hassan, 2000).

This study has been chosen to examine the relationship within this five homogenous group of a Company under study. Research has substantiated that four core dimension of Organizational Culture adopted have a significant impact over Employee's Organizational Commitment

Employee's commitment is a very crucial factor in achieving organizational success (Pfeffer, 1998). All the units covered under this Group of a Company cater to the need of core industries in India which plays an important role in country and the world economy. Numerous studies reveal that an inspiring organizational culture conceives a stronger employee's commitment in the organization and the less likely the employees is to leave (Guest, 1991; Shore and Martin, 1989). Unfortunately this topic has relatively a very limited empirical study over the antecedents of organizational commitment (Lok and Crawford, 2004) more so today when industries around the globe are facing tremendous challenge over people issue in terms of preserving intellectuals/ skill, which fascinated me to chose this study in such particular group of company where each products are highly customized and costlier as such creating and maintaining a conducting work atmosphere for the people are utmost important.

## **2. Objectives**

This study is being made with an objectives to examine whether the four dimensions of Organizational Culture (Training & Development , Rewards & Recognition, Teamwork and Employees Organizational Communication) has influence over Employees' Organizational Commitment relying on the response from Management staff categories employed in five homogeneous units using Reliability and Factor Analysis:

## **3. LITERATURE REVIEW OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE**

**3.1.**Organizational culture defines a system of belief , shared values & , assumptions which dictates how human resource employees should behave in the organizations. Such shared values strongly influence the employees in the organization and portrays that how they should act , wear dress code and the way to do their jobs.

Research suggests that organizational culture has a considerable influence on organizational behavior, especially about the efficiency, effectiveness, and commitment of the employees. Research evidence (Clugston, 2000; Deal and

Kennedy, 1982; Denison, 1984; Denison, 1990; Kotter and Heskett, 1992; Peters and Watermann, 1982; Rowe et al., 1992; Wasti, 2003) This shows that an appropriate organizational culture needs to be developed in the Company for achieving organization success.

Researchers and Academicians are in agreement that it's an unifying patterns that are shared, learned and embraced upon by organizational members individually and at group level (Lawson and Shen (1998). As per (Chow et al.2001) organizational culture has tremendous influence over the people towards achieving desired result /outcomes in terms of loyalty, satisfaction and their commitment. In the organization questionnaire under this study developed by Idris, 2001 & Lau and Arumugam (2006) & Ooi have been adopted with certain modification to measure the impact of all the four dimensions which are very important determinants in keeping the employees highly motivated for their commitment, loyalty and organizational success.

### **3.2 Employees Commitment**

In accordance with Mowday, 1979; Mowday et al. 1982 ,employees organizational commitment is perceived into a psychological attachment by their employees in organization. Every employee of an organization should have strong Commitment to remain associated for achieving the desired goals of the Organization.

This study with some modification has been adapted from Mowday et al (1979) which will reveal about how extensively employees willingness to remain associated with the organization and desire to put effort in their organization . People with strong commitment wishes their stay longer in the organization (Ghani et al.2004). Employer should support the value proposition of their employees and their involvement for achieving organizational goal and objectives.

## **4. Hypotheses**

- (i) “Training & Development” is perceived as a positive strength by the Employees towards commitment in the organizations.
- (ii) “Reward & Recognition” is perceived as a positive strength by the employees for organizational commitment within their organizations.
- (iii) “Teamwork” is perceived as a positive strength by the employees for organizational commitment within their organizations.
- (iv) organizational communication is perceived as a positive strength by the employees for organizational commitment within their organizations.

## **5. Research Design**

This study examines impact of Organizational Culture on Employees Commitment on following four dimension :

1. Training & development influences Employees Commitment
2. Reward & Recognition influences Employees Commitment
3. Teamwork influences Employees Commitment
4. Communication influences Employees Commitment

## **6. Sample Selection**

This study examines Three Levels of Executives (Sr Management, Middle Management, Jr Management) Consisting of five units and their corporate office all having a homogenous range of product serving to the core industries, located in the state of Jharkhand, West Bengal Gujarat and Bangalore (Karnataka) .

## **7. Questionnaire Design**

Construction of raw questionnaire has been based on a slightly modified version developed by Ooi and Arumugam (2006) & Lau and Idris, 2001 to measure impact of Organizational Culture four dimensions over Organizational Commitment of Employees which consists of:

Section A :Six questions under “Training and Development” dimensions focused on encouragement over education ,resources availability , awareness of Quality management tools, providing specific skilled training ,concern for career development and confidence & capability for more responsibility .

Section B: Eight questions under “Reward and Recognition”. Dimensions focused on creating improved working environment, compensation system, quality work rewards and recognition, Suggestions system and reward, clear communication over reward & penalty, reward for Innovation, performance-related rewards and equitable approach in hiring, Compensation, recognition and promotion.

Section C: Seven questions under “Teamwork” .dimensions framed on Group work assignment of , working in team than individual, Workplace decisions through consensus, Cooperative approach by other departments , Opinion count, cross functional interaction for interdepartmental issue, cooperation for job participation.

Section D: Six questions under “Organizational Communication”, dimension drawn on regularly feedbacks over important things among teams, continuous communication between management and staffs, Sharing relevant information’s, Sharing of parameters of performance, Sharing of departmental performance by HOD’s, having regular open forum.

Section E: Ten questions under “Employees Commitment, dimension adapted from Mowday et al (1979) with little modification relevant for this study all focusing over attitude of the employees which includes : their effort beyond normal parameters , speaking highly of the organization ,loyalty to the organization, accepting job to be part of the organization , caring about fate of the organization, choosing best organization over other, Speaking of highly about organization, capitalizing my talent for job performance, feeling of Organizational problem as of own, sticking to the organization in rest of the career.

Section F: The last section are showing demographic profile i.e, age, Qualification, Experience & Position/Designation among others. In this section Questions have been put to respond in a categorical form.

## **8. Collection of Data**

In all Five Units and their corporate office of homogeneous group of company , hard copy of 300 questionnaires were distributed amongst executives categories through their locational HR department out of which 159 valid response received .

## **9. Research Construct**

In order to examine the extent of Employees Commitment , request made to the respond rating using a 5 - point scale from 0 - Not Relevant, lowest 1 being strongly disagree and to highest 5 being strongly agree.

## **10. Statistical Methods**

Sample population in this study collected during January Jan 2015 to Dec 2015. Study is based on having 159 valid response received for observation under this study Initially Reliability analysis have been observed on the data which is set to make information more reliable, consistent and authentic. Later on applied Factor analysis using statistical software (SPSS) version 20.2

## **11. Reliability Test Analysis**

### **11.1 Cronbach’s Alpha**

Through the use of reliability, questionnaire helps in measuring the title under study consistently at different times and across the different populations as well. Reliability can be assessed in a different ways. Chronbach’s alpha is designed for measuring internal consistency; whether the entire items within instrument have been measuring the same thing or not. On the same scale as a Pearson r (correlation coefficient) and varying between 0 and 1, we can measure Alpha. Though there is possibility of having negative value, these value points a scale where few items measure opposite against of what other items measure. While assessing items in the instrument, finding nearer to alpha is to 1.00 shows higher the internal consistency.

Conceptually, coefficient alpha can be taken as the correlation between a test score and the other tests having equal length which are drawn randomly out of the same population. Formula which determines alpha is very simple and which helps in use of various items in scale (k) and the average correlation between the pairs of items

$$r: \alpha = \frac{kr}{1 + (k - 1)r}$$

In this process if number of items under scale (k) increases, value of  $\alpha$  becomes larger. Also, when inter- correlation between items is large, the corresponding  $\alpha$  will also indicate as larger.

## 11.2 Analysis of Principal Components Analysis

Mathematically PCA is applied for data reduction. It is called an orthogonal linear transformation. This process can transform into a new set of factors which are uncorrelated in each other from an existing set of variables. This statistical approach figure out the variance covariance structure in a set of variables through few linear combinations of those variables. The factors having maximum variance, may produce best linear combinations. Formation of factors are generally restrained only when it is revealing an unexplained variance in factor extraction method. Without losing its logical relationships of variables this method can helps in identifying or reducing of the number of factors which may support to the research scholar.

Suppose random vector  $X' = [X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p]$  is having covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  with the eigenvalues  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3 \geq 0$ .

Now considering the linear combinations

$$= X = a_1 X_1 + \dots + a_p X_p$$

$$= X = a_1 X_1 + \dots + a_p X_p \text{ -----(1)}$$

$$= X = a_1 X_1 + \dots + a_p X_p$$

Then, obtain

$$\text{Var } (X) = \sum_{i=1}^p a_i^2 \lambda_i \text{ ----- (2)}$$

$$\text{Cov } (X) = \sum_{i,k=1}^p a_i a_k \lambda_i \text{ -----(3)}$$

Here PCA relating to those uncorrelated linear combinations  $Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_p$  whose variances in (2) are equally maximum as it could be.. The first PCA here is with maximum variance.

Var () = It is very clear that Var () = can increase through multiplying any  $a_1$  by some constant. For removing such indeterminacy, it is very easy to restrict out coefficient vectors pertaining to unit length. So It is defined as:

First principal component = linear combination  $a_1 X$  that maximizes Var (X) subject to equal to 1

2<sup>nd</sup> principal component = linear combination X that maximizes

$\text{Var}(X) \text{ subject to } = 1 \text{ and } \text{Cov}(X, X) = 0$

At the  $i$ th step,  $i$ th principal component = linear combination  $X$  that maximizes 213

$\text{Var}(X) \text{ subject to } = 1 \text{ and } \text{Cov}(X, X) = 0 \text{ } k < i$

The linear combination  $Z = CX$  have  $= E(Z) = E(CX) = C \text{ ----- (4)}$

$= \text{Cov}(Z) = \text{Cov}(Cx) = C$

### 11.3 Key Terms Implication: Factor Analysis

#### 11.3 (a) Variance

This analysis can best fit the factors over a scatter diagram of responses the way that factors express the variance which is attached to the responses to each other statement. This methods supports in getting factors in such a manner that whatever the variance related to each statement under the study are fully explained and understood by the researcher.

#### 11.3.(b) Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin - statistics

KMO in the statistics can help in predicting when data are likely to appear factor well, based on correlation and partial correlation. KMO is used in respect of each individual variable and with the sum i.e, overall statistic of KMO. KMO have variance from 0 to 1.0 and KMO overall should result in 0.60 or higher to go forward in factor analysis. In case it does not reduces the indicator variables in connection with lowest values of individual KMO statistic, so long the KMO rises overall above 0.60 (few research scholar are lenient in accepting it with 0.50 cut-off). For computing KMO overall, the numerator, except .0 self-correlations of variables with themselves, it should be the sum of squared correlations of each variables in respect to the analysis (denominator would be same sum and plus sum of squared partial correlations of each variable I.e, with each variable  $j$ , so that other analysis are under control. Closure to 1 shows that patterns of correlations is relatively compact and hence analysis should yield to a very distinct and reliable factors. Though Kaiser (1974) has remarked favorably towards accepting values bigger than 0.5 as for barely acceptable ( as values lower than this ,suggest for either collecting more data or give a rethought over which variables to be included). Further, it is to be understood that between 0.5 and 0.7 values it should be considered as mediocre, between 0.7 and 0.8 are good, between 0.8 and 0.9 are great and values above 0.9 are superb (Hutcheson & Sofroniou, 1999).

#### 1213 (c ) Sphericity statistics - Bartlett test

In statistics, Bartlett test relating to sphericity, is used to find presence of correlations within the variables. This process supports in statistical probability pointing that the at least some of variable is having substantial correlations amount matrix. This

test can often be used prior PCA or factor analysis, tests so as to learn whether data arrives from multivariate normal distribution is having zero covariances.

### 11.3(d) Eigenvalues

This application *make linear transformations very easy to understand*. The eigenvalue on given factors can measure variance for total variables that is accounted for in respect of that factor. Eigenvalues ration is ratio of explanatory importance for the factors relating to variables. In case a factor shows low eigenvalue, then it is to be presumed that it is supporting with the contribution with explanation of variances in that variables and then it need to be treated as redundant in respect of more important factors.

### 11.3(e) Varimax

Use of varimax rotation is most common which involves scaling of loadings. It can be done by dividing them to the relevant corresponding communality as herembelow:

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{ij}^* = \hat{l}_{ij}^* / \hat{h}_i \hat{h}_j$$

In this process loading of the variable  $i^{\text{th}}$  over the  $j^{\text{th}}$  factor after rotation, here  $\hat{h}_i$  is communality of variable  $i$ . What is needed here is to obtain the rotation which can help in maximizing this quantity.

For obtaining the maximum quantity, Varimax procedure selects rotation as denoted her below

$$V = \frac{1}{P} \sum_{j=1}^m \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^p (\tilde{\gamma}_{ij}^*)^4 - \frac{1}{P} \left( \sum_{i=1}^p (\tilde{\gamma}_{ij}^*)^2 \right)^2 \right\}$$

It is sample variances to have standardized loadings in all the factors which is , summed over the  $m$  factors. What we are required here is to find a factor rotation which can maximizes to this variance.

### 11.3(f) Factor loading:

Factor loadings provide support in finding how much a factor explains a variable in factor analysis. This is also known for component loadings under PCA, which is correlation coefficient between the columns (factors) & rows (variables). As similar to Pearson's  $r$ , in squared factor loading defines variance percent with the indicator variable expressed by all the factor. To get percent of variance in variables



accounted for by all factors, sum total of squared loadings factor required to be added for that column I,e factor and then it is to be divided by the number of variables.

### **11.3(g) Communality:**

Communality refers to common variance proportionately available in the variable. The communalities towards the  $i$ th variable is to be computed by taking sum of squared loadings over the variable as shown here below:

$$\hat{h}_i = \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{l}_{ij}^2$$

Communality means a squared variance-accounted-for statistic revealing as to what extent variance within the measured variables are reproduced through the latent factors under the model. Contrary to this as to how much conceptually the variance are measured/observed. Variable having no specific variance or otherwise random variance also, will produce a communality of 1; however a variable which does not share its variance over any other variable will have a communality of 0. In factor analysis, interest in finding common underlying dimensions within the data and primary interest only in the common variance. Therefore, while running a factor analysis it is understood fundamentally that how much of the variance present in our data common variance is. This gives a logical halt: for doing factor analysis, we need to understand the proportion of common variance available in data, yet the only option to measure the extent of the common variance is by doing a factor analysis. Immediately after underlying factors are extracting, the new communalities need to be calculated so as to represent multiple correlation between the variable and with the factors extracted. Hence, the communality can be called for measuring of the proportion of variance expressed by extracted factors.

### **11.3(h) Extraction:**

Extraction in the statistic facilities in determining the factors out of large set of variables. Egenvalues after extraction is same as it is PCA extraction, however in other methods of extractions, eigenvalues after extraction will go down in proportion to lower than the initial counterparts. SPSS can prints "Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings" and even with respect to PCA, though eigenvalues would vary from initial and extraction eigenvalues, but their total would be the same.

### **11.3(i) Total Variance - explained criteria:**

One goal of multivariate analysis, is to express why observations, people in such cases give answer, differently over the survey conducted. In factor analysis questions under groups survey are varying in each other. This methods facilitates to model in a regression or anova as because this can reduce the larger numbers of variables in a smaller set of factors. Factor used here is to represent a percent over total variance. Factors which are not representing so much variance may not be so useful even in the final model also. This takes in repetition to reaching out at the optimal number of the factors. The canonical resource in respect of factor analysis is Kim & Mueller (1978). . Some researchers use to have enough factors to account for 90% (sometimes 80%) of variation. In case the researcher's aim is to emphasizing for Parsimony, the criterion can be considered to go for as low as 50% in multivariate analysis.

***Reduction of variables under various dimensions using Reliability & Factors Analysis for employee Table: 1***

<b>Reliability Test &amp; Factors Analysis</b>																				
Item	Company	Initial Variable	Reliability					Modified Variables					Eigen Values	%Age Explained	Communalities					
			C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5			C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	
<b>Trainning Development</b>	C1	TD1, TD2, TD3, TD4, TD5, TD6	n=6,α=.882	n=6,α=.851	n=6,α=.788	n=6,α=.661 n=5,α=.678 n=4,α=.678 n=3,α=.680 n=2,α=.661	n=6,α=.830 n=5,α=.850	TD1,	TD1,	TD1,	TD2,	TD2,	TD3,	3.877	77.536	TD2=.885 TD2=.966 TD3=.939 TD4=.990 TD5=.096	TD1=.693 TD2=.480 TD3=.650 TD4=.713 TD5=.715	TD1=.695 TD2=.597 TD3=.688 TD4=.717	TD2=.755 TD3=.757	TD2=.816 TD3=.635 TD4=.704 TD5=.510 TD6=.655
	C2							TD2,	TD2,	TD2,		3.251		65.022						
	C3							TD3,	TD3,	TD3,		3.198		63.969						
	C4							TD4,	TD4,	TD4,		1.515		75.743						
	C5							TD5,	TD5,	TD5,		66.389		66.389						
<b>Reward &amp;</b>	C1	RR1, RR2, RR3, RR4, RR5,	n=8,α=.785 n=7,α=.876 n=6,α=	n=8,α=.913	n=8,α=.940	n=8,α=.879 N=7,α=.899	n=8,α=.891 N=7,α=.893	RR3,	RR1,	RR1,	RR2,	RR2,	4.36	87.202	RR3=.989 RR4=.830 RR5=.	RR1=.694 RR2=.707 RR3=.	RR1=.381 RR2=.780 RR3=.	RR2=.757 RR3=.771 RR4=.	RR2=.578 RR3=.435 RR4=.	
	C2							RR4,	RR2,	RR2,	RR3,	RR3,	5.037	62.96						

<i>recognition</i>	C3	RR5, RR6, RR7, RR8	.906 n=5,α= .949			N=6,α= .910		5, RR 7, RR 8	3, RR 4, RR 5, RR 6, RR 7, RR 8	3, RR 4, RR 5, RR 6, RR 7, RR 8	4, RR 5, RR 6, RR 8	4, RR 5, RR 6, RR 7, RR 8	5.9 67	74.5 87	854 RR7= 940 RR8= 747	640 RR4= 550 RR5= 636 RR6= 650 RR7= 635 RR8= 524	643 RR4= 876 RR5= 720 RR6= 884 RR7= 882 RR8= 801	751 RR5= 778 RR6= 631 RR7= 539 RR8= 666	366 RR5= 508 RR6= 691 RR7= 666 RR8= 432
	C4												4.1 66	69.4 35					
	C5												3.6 77	52.5 25					
<i>Team Work</i>	C1								T W 1, T W 2, T W 3, T W 4, T W 5, T W 6, T W 7	T W 1, T W 2, T W 3, T W 4, T W 5, T W 6, T W 7	T W 4, T W 5, T W 6, T W 7	T W 2, T W 3, T W 4, T W 5							
	C2												3.6 82	52.5 95					
	C3		n=7,α =- 1.195										3.3 28	55.4 65					
	C4	TW1, TW2, TW3, TW4, TW5, TW6, TW7	n=6,α =- 1.575	n=7,α =.838	N=7,α =.793	n=6,α =.805	N=7,α =.814	n=6,α =.813	n=5,α =.818	n=6,α =.810	n=5,α =.804	n=4,α =.798	n=4,α =.852	2.5 16	62.8 89				
	C5		n=5,α =- 1.641			n=4,α =.798								2.7 74	69.3 53				
	C1	OC1, OC2,	n=6,α =.714	n=6,α =.863	n=6,α =.829	n=6,α =.744	n=6,α =.399	O C	O C	O C	O C	O C	2.5 50	63.7 49	OC1 =.874	OC1 =.776	OC1 =.69	OC1 =	OC1 =.36

<b>Organizational Communication</b>	C2	OC3, OC4, OC5, OC6	n=5, $\alpha$ =.743 n=4, $\alpha$ =.778		n=5, $\alpha$ =.912	n5=, $\alpha$ =.735 n4=, $\alpha$ =.700 n4=3, $\alpha$ =.696	n=5, $\alpha$ =.520 n=4, $\alpha$ =.669 n=3, $\alpha$ =.802	1, O 1, C 2, O 3, C 6	1, O 2, C 3, O 4, C 6	1, O 2, C 3, O 4, C 6	2, O 3, C 6	1, O 3, C 4, O 5, C 6	3.603 1.146 3.745 1.878 1.679	60.048 19.107 74.904 62.588 55.96	OC2 =.805 OC3 =.588 OC6 =.283	OC2 =.856 OC3 =.731 OC4 =.757 OC5 =.809 OC6 =.819	0 OC2 =.79 1 OC3 =.88 0 OC4 =.61 1 OC5 =.77 3	OC2 = OC3 = OC4 = OC5 = OC6 =	0 OC3 =.73 0 OC4 =.58 9	
	C3																			
	C4																			
	C5																			

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<b>Employees' Commitment</b>	C1							E C 2, E C 5, E C 6, E C 8, E C 10	E C 2, E C 6, E C 8, E C 10	E C 1, E C 2, E C 3, E C 4, E C 5, E C 6,	E C 1, E C 2, E C 3, E C 4, E C 5, E C 6,	E C 1, E C 2, E C 3, E C 4, E C 5, E C 6,	3.487 1.046 3.422 3.745 4.833 1.569 7.260 1.532	69.735 20.929 68.436 74.904 48.329 15.688 72.600 15.317	EC2 =.986 EC5 =.988 EC6 =.784 EC8 =.919 EC10 =.855	EC2 =.493 EC6 =.602 EC7 =.797 EC8 =.749 EC10 =.781	EC1=.750 EC2=.756 EC3=.874 EC4=.721 EC5=.874 EC6=.641 EC7=.537 EC8=.652 EC9=.735 EC10=.864	EC1=.651 EC2=.419 EC3=.748 EC4=.742 EC5=.485 EC6=.579 EC7=.576 EC8=.738 EC9=.788 EC10=.674	EC1=.854 EC2=.989 EC3=.740 EC4=.917 EC5=.872 EC6=.688 EC7=.989 EC8=.967 EC9=.989 EC10=.787		
	C2	EC1, EC2, EC3, EC4, EC5, EC6, EC7, EC8, EC9, EC10	n=10, $\alpha$ =.703 n=8, $\alpha$ =.765 n=7, $\alpha$ =.776 n=6, $\alpha$ =.831 n=5, $\alpha$ =.854	n=10, $\alpha$ =.857 n=9, $\alpha$ =.859 n=8, $\alpha$ =.860 n=6, $\alpha$ =.863 n=5, $\alpha$ =.881		n=10, $\alpha$ =.930	n=10, $\alpha$ =.875	n=10, $\alpha$ =.945													
	C3																				
	C4																				
	C5																				



## **12. Analysis of the above table:**

Initially the questionnaire have been framed on the basis of the Training & Development with 6 Questions, Reward and Recognition with 8 Question, Team Work with 7 Questions ,Organizational Communication with 6 Questions and Employees Commitment with 10 Questions. However after having the Reliability analysis and Factor Analysis on the basis of respondents answer using 5 point Liker Scale (from 0/1 to 5) the relevant questions are proved under different dimensions, which are given in Table 1:

## **13. Conclusion and Implications**

The results of the study based on application of statistical tools showed reasonably significant on the determination of the attributes of various dimensions of corporate culture shown in Table 1. The limitations of the paper is the number of the observations, otherwise it could have depicted more elaborately.

This study, in summary, focuses an exploratory reports examining relationship between organizational culture and employees' organizational commitment within the context of Five units under a group of company engaged in manufacturing of customized product (heavy equipments) in India . Authors of Empirical study claims (e.g., Saeed and Hassan, 2000; Chow et al., 2001), organizational culture has a very significant impact over personnel attitudes towards their commitment in the organizations. The Five units of this Group of company yield test shows that employees' perceptions of four organizational culture dimensions are positively related to their commitment, and employees who are perceiving a greater awareness over these dimensions displaying more positive feeling and satisfactory reaction towards the organizational commitment. The findings will have a significant contribution and provide a better understanding of the influence of organizational culture contexts on commitment among employees under this group of company and also such other Industries / manufacturing sector. The authors suggest that adopting and practicing these dimensions will yield better and enduring results in the organization. The attributes identified by this analysis may supports the organization towards creating understanding over the development of a theoretical base for the application and also prescribes potential clue to top management to review organizational culture dimensions of those units for further improvement.

## References

- 1] Bartlett, K.R. (2001). The relationship between training and organizational commitment: A study of healthcare field. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 12(4), pp 335-352
- 2] Brunetto, Y and Farr-Wharton, R. (2004). Does the talk affect your decision to walk: A comparative pilot study examining the effect of communication practices on employee commitment post managerialism. *Management Decision*. 42(92/4), pp 579-600
- 3] Kanter, R.M. (1968). Commitment and social organization: A study of commitment mechanism in Utopian communities. *American Sociological Review*. 33(4), pp 499- 517
- 4] Karia, N and Ahmad, Z.A (2000). Quality practices that pay: Empowerment and teamwork. *Malaysian Management Review*, 35(2), 66–76.
- 5] Kotter, J.R and Heskett, J.L. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*. New York: Free Press
- 6] Lawson, R.B and Shen, Z. (1998). *Organizational psychology: Foundation and applications*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press
- 7] Maloney, W.F and Federle, M.O. (1990). *Organizational culture in engineering and construction organizations*. Source Document 52. Austin, TX: Construction Industry Institute.
- 8] Meyer, J.P, Stanley, D.J, Herscovitch, L and Topolaytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, pp 20-52
- 9] Morrow, P.C. (1997). The measurement of TQM principles and work-related outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behaviors*, 18, pp 363-396
- 10] Mowday, R.T, Porter, L.W and Stress, R.M. (1979). The measures of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 22(8), pp 90-96
- 11] Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolaytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20–52.
- 12]. O’Driscoll, M.P and Randall, D.M. (1999). Perceived organizational support, satisfaction with rewards and employee job involvement and organizational commitment. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48, 197–209
- 13] Ooi, K.B and Arumugam, V. (2006). The influence of corporate culture on organizational commitment: Case study of semiconductor organizations in Malaysia. *Sunway Academic Journal*, 3, pp 99-115



- 14]. Ricardo, R and Jolly, J. (1997). Training of teams in the workplace. S.A.M Advanced Management Journal, 62(2), p 4.
- 15]. Robbins, S. (2001). Organizational behavior: Concepts, controversies, applications. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- 16] Saeed, M and Hassan, M. (2000). Organizational culture and work outcomes: Evidence from some Malaysian organizations. Malaysian Management Review. 35(2), pp 54-59
- 17]. Zigon, J. (1997). Team performance measurement: a process for creating team performance standards. Compensation and Benefits Review, 29(1), pp.38–47.
- 18]. Schein, E.H. (1992). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass
- 19]. Smidts, A., Pruyn, A., & van Riel, C. (2001). The impact of employee communication and perceived external prestige on organization identification. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 1051–1062.
- 20]. Stough, S., Eom, S., Buckenmyer, J. (2000), —Virtual teaming: a strategy for moving your organization into the new millennium, *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, Vol. 100, No. 8, pp. 370-378