CHAPTER - I

INTRODUCTION

Tracing back to the history of business environment in the early years, trading patterns and markets were stable, technology was static, customers were passive, speed in getting to the market was secondary, competition was limited to sectors and regions and hierarchies were generally accepted in all walks of life. No more, since 1990’s India has been almost continually buffeted by change. Customers demand the businesses to do better, cheaper, faster, employees want to control more than ‘stop button’ on the assembly line. The 20th century saw nations around the world becoming part of the global village with trade barriers between them reduced or removed completely.

Globalization of trade and economy has led the multinational companies to take a deep root in India. The holistic paradigm shift to a single global economy has opened up new opportunities. Multinational companies have gained ground in India after having signed many collaboration agreements with Indian companies.

The regulations of WTO and also Indian Government policies further opened the flood gates for the multinational companies to enter the Indian industrial sector. The multinational companies brought not only the technology but also new waves of business techniques into India. Multinational companies from the United States have the largest share of FDI [foreign direct investment]
in India followed by those of United Kingdom, Japan, West Germany, France, Switzerland and Canada. Multinational companies in India, the functioning of which is based on certain challenges such as cross cultural behavior, competition, technology up gradation, customer driven markets etc. have to simultaneously capture global scale efficiency, respond to the fast driven consumer goods industry {FMCG} and develop a world wide learning capability that drives continuous innovation. They are in search of foreign markets for two reasons – First, to create a market for their product which means managing the brand becomes more important, and secondly, to find quality human talent from every corner of the globe which is the key to create the latest state of the art product.

The importance of human resources has been highlighted in the present era which gravitate organization to be flexible, that has strong values, a robust performance ethic and provides challenging work on the latest technology.

This has led the companies to proactively take measures on three fronts:

- creating an organizational ambience where talent can bloom
- putting in place systems that helps in unleashing their potential; and
- Building a reward and recognition that provides value for the people

Though the multinational companies are backed by their own marketing and publicity strategies, they face serious challenges from the human resources sector - problems like motivation, performance appraisal, job stress, conflict management, organizational changes, upgrading the talents etc., are causing threats to the functioning of the multinational companies. To face these challenges each MNC adopts its own strategies in Human resource areas.
HUMAN RESOURCES

HR (Human resources) is the human labour, physical abilities and mental abilities that produce the goods and services of businesses. In a business, the term human resources are often used to refer to management of the people employed by the business. Human resources management specialists recruit and interview employees, advice on hiring decisions in accordance with policies and requirements that have been established in conjunction with management, provide training to enhance employee skills, and develop compensation plans and incentive programs to motivate employees. In some businesses this is called personnel management. Human resources are human wealth or means that can be drawn on. Human wealth or human capital of an organization can be treated as its human resources. For any individual, corporation they represent the total of the inherent abilities, acquired knowledge and skills as exemplified in the talent and aptitudes of its employees.

GENESIS

Classical economists have classified organizational resources in different ways –land, labour, capital and entrepreneur and to match their contribution by remuneration, theories of rent, wages, interest and profit had been developed. However, such classifications do not meet the requirements of the contemporary organizations because it has missed a vital organizational resource that is management. Another classification is in the form of various M’s – Men, money, material and machinery. In this classification, one may find that the total organizational resources are grouped into two broad categories –
financial/physical resources and human resources. Both these resources are used as intervening variables for acquiring various inputs from the environment for its conversion process to produce output back into the environment. One of the main inputs for doing this conversion is the human resources. Jucius has called these resources as human factors which refer to a ‘whole consisting of interrelated, interdependent and interacting psychological, physiological and ethical components’.

Human resource consists of people and their characteristics at their work either at the national level or at organizational level.

Megginson has defined human resources as follows: ‘From the national point of view, human resources are knowledge, skills, creative abilities, talents and attitudes obtained in the population; whereas from the viewpoint of the individual enterprise, they represent the total of the inherent abilities, acquired knowledge, and skills as exemplified in the talents and aptitudes of its employees’

The human resources of an organization represent its largest investment. In addition to wages and salaries, organizations often make sizeable investment in their human resources by way of recruiting, hiring and training people to fulfill its needs for well – trained and experienced staff.

---

HUMAN RESOURCES - PAST AND PRESENT

Modern human resource management is radically different from personnel management of decades ago. Since the turn of the century, the managerial philosophy that has defined the personnel function, has undergone significant changes. In the last eighty years, both the scientific management approach and human relations approach have appeared and declined and currently what has popularly become known as the human resource approach has emerged.

SHIFT TO HUMAN RELATIONS MANAGEMENT

Scientific Management

The early part of 1900s generally considered the most effective means of managing employees – constant supervision and threats of the loss of their jobs. Before the advent of scientific management all employees were considered equally productive, and if their productivity did not measure up, they deserved to be quickly terminated. The founders of the scientific management movement believed differently, Instead of simply relying on the use of fear and intimidation, Frederick Taylor and Frank and Lillian Gilbreth, Henry Gantt believed that managers should take a scientific and objective approach in studying how work can be most efficiently designed. Taylor, the father of scientific management and others employed scientific data collection and analysis methods in research laboratories, found that instead of a boss’s subjective judgment, fair performance standards for each job could be determined. The results of scientific movement techniques received wide
spread praise in 1914. However the movement’s treatment of the worker – someone motivated solely by money – led to problems.¹

During the 1930’s and 1940’s with impetus provided by the classic Hawthorne studies, management’s attention shifted from scientific management to human relations. The study demonstrated that employee productivity was affected not only by the way the job was designed and the manner in which employees were rewarded economically but also by certain social and psychological factors. Hawthorne researchers Elton Mayo and F. J. Roethlisberger² discovered that employees’ feelings and emotions and sentiments were strongly affected by such work conditions as group relationships, leadership styles and support from management, and those feelings could in turn have a significant impact on productivity. The shift to human relations was also influenced by the growing strength of unions. But this approach failed to consider the concept of individual differences, and failed to recognize the need both for job structure and for control on employee’s behavior. Thus the human relations approach fell out of favour with management during the 1950’s and 1960’s and now it is considered as Human Resources Management.

The 1970’s experienced the HR approach as research in the behavioral sciences showed that managing people as resources rather than as factors of production or as human beings who act solely on the basis of emotions that could result in the real benefit to both the organization and the employee. The

---

¹ Thomas Boyle–Wall Street Journal; 2010; Dow Jones and Company Publications.
term human resources like many other terms in management literature – is hard to define with clarity. Nonetheless, a number of principles provide the basis for human resource approach.

Employees are investments that will, if effectively managed and developed, provide long term rewards to the organization in the form of greater productivity, policies, programs and practices which must be created that satisfy both the economic and emotional needs of employees.

A working environment must be created in which employees are encouraged to develop and utilize their skills to the maximum extent.

Fig. 1.0 Human Resource Approach
HR programs and practices must be implemented with the goal of balancing the needs and meeting the goals of both the organization and the employee.

By the 1980s the term Personnel management played an important role in the management concepts. Training and industrial relations were considered to be the specialist fields outside the main stream of personnel management. However it had a functional outlook. Storey considered that personnel management ‘had long been dogged by problems of credibility, Marginality, ambiguity and a trash-can labeling which has relegated it to a relatively disconnected set of duties – many of them tainted with a low status connotation’.

For some HRM, [human resource management] was simply a matter of re-labeling Personnel to redress the situation. It was considered to be a old wine in a new bottle. Personnel function was considered to be only concerned with blue-collar or operating employees. Peter F.Drucker, a management scholar stated that the job of personnel was ‘partly a file clerk’s job, partly a social – worker’s job, partly fire-fighting, heading off union trouble’.

CONCEPT OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

The HRM function emerged and is concerned with much more than simple filing, house keeping and record keeping. For many years HRM function had not been linked to the corporate profit margin or what is referred to as the bottom line. The role of HRM in the firm’s strategic plan and overall strategy was usually couched in fuzzy terms and abstractions. HRM was merely a tagalong unit with people –oriented plans, not a major part of planning or strategic thinking. Because of the recognition of the crucial

importance of people, HRM in an increasing number of organizations has become a major player in developing strategic plans. It is currently much more integrated and strategically involved.

Human resource management can be defined to be that part of management concerned with: all the decisions, strategies, factors, principles, operations, practices, functions, activities, and methods related to the management of people as employees in any type of organization; all the dimensions related to the people in their employment relationships and all the dynamics that flow from it (including the realization of the potential of individual employees in terms of their aspirations); all aimed at adding value to the delivery of goods and services, as well as to the quality of work life for employees, and hence helping to ensure continuous organizational success in transformative environments.¹

HRM makes to organizational effectiveness and includes the following:

- Helping the organization to reach its goals
- Employing the skills and abilities of work force efficiently
- Providing the organization with well – trained and well-motivated employees
- Increasing to the fullest the employees job satisfaction and self – actualization
- Developing and maintaining a quality of work life that makes employment in the organization desirable
- Communicating HRM policies to all employees
- Helping to maintain ethical policies and socially responsible behavior
INCREASING IMPORTANCE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

The human resources is being given increasing significance in modern organizations. There has been a greater application of the fact that the more an organization invests in its human resources, the greater the return whatever the investment is likely to be. In fact the potential for the development of human resources is unlimited.

The following diagram gives a view of model of HRM

Fig.1.1 Robbin’s Model of Human Resource Management
EMERGING CHALLENGES IN HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

The last decade of 20th century has brought a revolutionary change in business management practices across the world and India has not been an exception to that. These changes have put various challenges before the management to adopt new strategies for managing businesses at work; it has to encounter these challenges effectively in order to enable the organizations to achieve their objectives.

Following trends which are emerging at the global level as well as in India have far reaching impact on human resource management practices –

- Globalization of economy
- Corporate restructuring
- Emphasis of total quality management
- Newer organizational designs
- Emphasis on knowledge management

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

In the recent past the role of human resource development is emerging as one of the key factors for the success of the organizations. Human resource development strategies aim at upgrading, updating and improving the existing human resource to the level of demanding the requirements of the industries. Industries at present are, concentrating in imparting new dimensions to the working techniques with the help of various training and developmental programs.
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The present scenario in the industries, is the optimum utilization of existing human resource. To achieve this goal each industry follows its own HR practices in the areas right from man power planning to the exit of the employees. In between, each industry concentrates its policies based upon its own environment. After the entry of multinational companies into Indian Industrial Sector the dimensions of HR practices have drastically changed. MNCs introduce new techniques in their policies relating to recruitment, motivation, quality of work life, performance appraisal, training and so on, from time to time.

But the success of the policies of these organizations depends on the outlook, perception, acceptance and approval of employees who are the beneficiaries of such policies. Employees of the organization may differ in their involvement and commitment in the achievement of the organizational goals. The reason may be their approach and attitude towards the policies of the organization. So, each organization has to monitor, observe, investigate and analyze its employees’ reaction and action towards its policies so as to take remedial actions instantly. Thus this study aims at examining employee’s outlook towards the organizational policies of PepsiCo India holdings Private limited, one of the popular MNCs in India.
OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To study the theoretical aspects of HRD practices in Pepsico India holdings P Ltd and the impact of the elements, key organizational areas covered by the training programs in achieving the organizational objectives and climate.

2. To examine the motivational techniques and their impact on the attitude of the employees and organizational climate.

3. To analyze the work environment, inter-personal relationships among the employees and their impact on the organizational climate.

4. To study the existing organizational culture and its contribution for training, motivation and inter-personal relationships to build organizational climate.

5. To analyze the influence of demographic variables on different HRD elements and to offer suggestions for up-grading the HRD measures in the organization.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study focuses on the work force of Pepsico India holdings P Ltd relating to 4 areas – Motivation, training, work environment, organizational culture and climate particularly with respect to manufacturing sector. The responses were skewed toward employees of the two plants – Madurai and Mamandur plant near Chennai –both plants located in Tamil Nadu. The study runs through the period between 2014 and 2016. The study considers information supplied by the company as authentic. The study provides an overview of HRD practices of Pepsico India Holdings P Ltd. and does not
reflect any general scenario of other MNCs. Out of the Universe, One-sixth of the associates and one-fourth of executives are drawn from as the sample. Since HRD strategies mostly relate to executives than to associates major representation is being given to executives in the present study.

METHODOLOGY

The study is conducted using descriptive and analytical type of methodology.

DATA FOR THE STUDY

The study is conducted with the help of both primary and secondary data.

SOURCES OF DATA

The primary data is collected from the employees of the organization in the form of questionnaire. There are 2 types of questionnaire for executives and associates separately. The response of executives and associates are obtained in the form of 5-point scale. Several statements are included for every HRD element to get proper response from the executives and associates.

Reliability – The statements included in the questionnaire were subjected to test of reliability using cronbach alpha criterion.
ASSOCIATES

1. Reliability Statistics for the Elements of training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.268</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Reliability Statistics for Effectiveness of training supportive activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.587</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Reliability Statistics for Quality of Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.689</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Reliability Statistics for Areas to be improved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.764</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Reliability Statistics for Organizational Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.458</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Reliability Statistics for motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.848</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Reliability Statistics for work environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.585</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Reliability Statistics for organizational culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.857</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Reliability Statistics for organizational climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.759</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of associate the statements for the elements of training program, quality, achieving the organizational objectives, training supportive activities, motivation, work environment, organizational culture and organizational climate, the cronbach alpha obtained as inter correlated coefficient for each statement included in the domain of above mentioned variables are given by:

1. Elements of Training – 0.268
2. Effectiveness of Training – 0.587
3. Quality of training - 0.689
4. Areas to be improved – 0.764
5. Organizational Objectives – 0.458
6. Motivation – 0.848
7. Work environment – 0.585
8. Organizational Culture – 0.857
9. Organizational Climate – 0.759

So, the above mentioned values imply that the statements considered for the above mentioned variables are highly reliable
EXECUTIVES.

1  Reliability Statistics for Elements of training program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.321</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2  Reliability Statistics for quality of training program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.498</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3  Reliability Statistics for organizational objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.678</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4  Reliability Statistics for Effectiveness of Training Supportive activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.032</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5  Reliability Statistics for motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.505</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6  Reliability Statistics for interpersonal relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.612</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7  Reliability Statistics for work environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.860</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8  Reliability Statistics for organizational culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.463</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9  Reliability Statistics for organizational climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.726</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statements regarding the elements of training program, quality, achievement of organizational objectives, training supportive activities, motivation, interpersonal relationships, work environment, organizational culture, and finally the organizational climate statements were subjected to reliability tests using Cronbach Alpha criterion and the following means of the interrelated coefficient are obtained:

1. Elements of training program – 0.321
2. Quality of training program – 0.498
3. Organizational objectives – 0.678
4. Effectiveness of training program – 0.032
5. Motivation – 0.505
6. Interpersonal relationships – 0.612
7. Work environment – 0.860
8. Organizational culture – 0.463
9. Organizational climate – 0.726

So the statements included in the questionnaire are highly reliable.

**SAMPLE UNIT**

The sample for the study is drawn from the two levels namely executive level and associate level with respect to the manufacturing sector situated at Mamandur near Chennai and Madurai in Tamil Nadu.

**SAMPLE SIZE**

The sample size is 400 divided between 300 associates and 100 executives drawn out of 1986 associates and 281 executives respectively.

**SAMPLE SELECTION**

The sample is selected based on stratified random sampling. The organization has 9 departments and one-sixth of the associates and one-fourth of the executives in each department approximately are selected on the random sampling basis. The collected data samples in terms of associates and executives were subjected to the reliability of distribution using Kolmogrov-Smirnov test. It was found that the variables considered for the analysis are exactly satisfying the normal probability distribution. The Statistics is asymptotically significant for all the variable at 5% level of significance.

**SAMPLE COLLECTION**

The primary data is collected from the selected respondents with the help of undisguised, structured, close ended questionnaire. The questionnaire is consisting of multiple choice questions using 5 point scaling technique.
A separate questionnaire is designed for associates and executives. Both questionnaires are divided into 7 areas – Personal, motivation, training, attitude, work environment, culture and climate. A pilot study is conducted on 50 associates and 25 executives before finalization of the questionnaire.

DATA ANALYSIS

The following statistical tools are used to obtain torrent of results regarding the objective of the study.

1. K-means cluster analysis is used to identify different clusters of associates and executives based on their response in the questionnaire.

2. Discriminant analysis is used to check the reliability of classified clusters of executives and associates based on training, motivation and organizational climate.

3. Multiple regression analysis is exploited to find the impact of independent variables on the dependent variables in the context of the study that is the impact of HRD elements and organizational culture on organizational climate. The general linear regression model with K explanatory variables is of the form:

\[ y = b_0 + b_1 x_1 + b_2 x_2 + \ldots + b_n x_n + u \]

where

\[ x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_n \] are the explanatory variables, \( y \) is the dependent variable, \( b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n \) are the unknown parameters and \( u \) is the error term.

The F-test was used to study the explanatory power of regression. The value of F was derived on the basis of following formula:

\[ F = \frac{R^2 / (K - 1)}{(1 - R^2) / (N - K)} \]
where K = total number of variables in the model and N = Total number of observations.

4. The generalized linear model \{GLM\} is used to find the impact of multiple independent variables on the multiple dependent variables. In this case, multiple independent variables are also considered as covariates.

5. The non-parametric chi-square test was applied to examine the association between demographic variables and clusters of executives and associates based on training, motivation and climate. The chi-square value was calculated as under:

$$\chi^2 = \frac{\sum (O - E)^2}{E}$$

where O = observed frequencies

E = expected frequencies

6. The parametric tests t-test, F-test and analysis of variance are used to identify the statistical significance in Multiple regression analysis.

7. The diagrammatic representation like Pie-charts, simple bar diagram and multiple bar diagrams are used to express the contribution of variables schematically.

HYPOTHESES

1. There is no significant impact of training, motivation, work environment, and inter-personal relationships on the organizational climate.
2. The organization culture will not predict training aspects, motivational aspects, work environment and inter-personal relationships to build organizational climate.

CHAPTERIZATION

Chapter 1 – Introduction deals with the concept of Human resources, its genesis, Human resources development, Human resources management, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, scope and limitations of the study and methodology.

Chapter II – Review of related literature elaborately explains review of related literature in HRD practices.

Chapter III – Clearly explains the profile of the company, human resource development strategies with respect to other multi-national companies.

Chapter IV – Training – deals with different elements of training, areas covered in the training programs and organizational objectives achieved through training programs.

Chapter V – Motivational practices – Elaborates different aspects of motivation, work environment and the change in the attitude of the employees due to motivation.

Chapter VI – Summary, findings, conclusion and suggestions - summarizes all the results aroused through statistical analysis and the conclusions obtained to offer the suggestions.
CHAPTER - II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The study concentrates on examining the Human resource policies of PepsiCo limited and the employee’s attitudes towards them. The study is designed with the help of previous studies conducted by various researchers.

THE STUDY SHALL FOCUS ON SOME OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Human resource management:

A study on team rewards by Lucy Newton McClure in (2011) “More and more companies are turning to work teams as a means of achieving success; team usage has been found to be linked with a number of important outcomes including productivity, customer satisfaction higher job satisfaction, improved safety etc. Group incentive plans in general and especially team rewards are critical to fostering the team based work environment seems at cross-purposes with desired functioning of the team”.1

S.Viramgami – Bhiloda(2012) -Indian journal study of employee motivation with reference to Gujarat Electricity board – objective of the study was to find the monetary and non – monetary motivators provided by the board; to put forward a prospective model for motivation with a view to make motivational practices more effective with special reference to GEB. The findings were – Majority of all classes of employees disagree with motivating for performance by the existing monetary and non-monetary incentives. Some

---

categories of employees do not have probability of receiving reward. How much effort an employee will put in his work is affected by two factors – the first is the value of reward that he hopes to receive as a result of putting effort and the second is the probability of receiving rewards.¹

**Ashok Gagate. B (2012)** – An evaluation of *factor influence of white collar professional employee’s perception of job satisfaction and motivation* had identified the top 5 motivating factors that influence professional employee’s perception of job satisfaction and motivation. The factors include compensation, personal growth, job security, advancement and fair company policies. The result of the study revealed that there were no significant differences in motivation factors as perceived by professional employees belonging to different races, age groups and gender.²

**Peter and Neal (2013)** identified 6 factors such as growth and advancement, work itself, material and physical provision elements, interpersonal relationship, concern about fairness in organizational practices and personal problems. Frequency of motivating and de-motivating items correlated highly with responses to the questionnaire. Some items were frequently mentioned as de-motivators and others as motivators which are consistent with the general notion underlying the two factor theory of motivation.³

**Whyte William. F (2014)** observed that money was no longer a motivating factor; He also found that power was the most important motivational tool – the power to set goals and standards, to regulate the working methods and to have a role in determining rewards.⁴

---

³ Machungwa Peter and Schmutt Neal – Work Motivation in a Developing Country, University of Zambia, Michigan State University, 2013.
M. George Jennifer and R. Gareth Jones (2010) cited that the various effects of motivation upon mental health revealed that self actualizing worker with the content and process of his work tasks has a greater probability of attaining job satisfaction and mental health than the deficiency motivated employee interacting with the contextual environment in his job. Concurrent with this dichotomous model of self – actualization versus deficiency –need motivation, it was found that self actualization is a better performer on the job than his counterpart who is motivated by deficiency needs.¹

A study by C.Balaji (2010) on the organizational commitment as part of Human resources management throws light on the relationship between organizational commitment and special characteristics of HRM and found out that there is a positive relationship between age, experience and level in the organization and organizational commitment.²

Omer Bin Sayeed (2009) studied ‘perception of organizational commitment’ –preliminary findings and scale construction ‘published in the Indian journal of social work, July 1989 has found that a positive management and worker relationship among individuals exist besides demographic and career factors and concluded that fringe benefits are more important in inducing the organizational commitment than salary’.³

Trans-cultural management competencies (2013) – A study by Seema Sanghi -The study was conducted on 388 Indian UK based managers. The objective of the study was to redefine the competencies and rank them to reflect the current business environment. Due to rise in the globalization, more and

more companies had to assign employees to manage business overseas or deal with employees from different culture. Continuing sensitivity to events, social skills and abilities, awareness of cultural differences, understanding the importance of relationships for value and respect and the cultural differences have emerged as elite competencies deemed to be vital in achieving trans cultural management excellence. 

**Organizational culture and commitment in Public limited company** - study by S.Kaliyamoorthy and R. Mohan Kumar (2011), Alagappa University - The study with an enumeration of the respondents perceptions about various work related and organization related cultural feature was conducted from a group of 30 employees and 20 executives selected from various units of public limited companies. It concluded that there were implications that affirm both the positive and negative points about the organizational culture prevailing in the organization. The findings suggest the management to enhance the quality of its culture, which constitute the commitment of the people in the concern. 

**Alienation, Satisfaction and commitment among industrial employees** – A study by S.F.Chandrasekhar (2014) with respect to public and private sector undertakings - The study attempts to explore the relationship between work alienation, job satisfaction and organizational commitment among 259 workers, supervisors and executives from public and private sector undertakings. Results reveal that employees from public sector undertakings are found to be experiencing more alienation from work, less satisfaction with jobs and more committed to organizations than their counterparts. Implications are drawn for future research directions.

---

2. Journal of Indian Management and Strategy - October to December 2011– Pages 44 to 47.
**Human resource value addition (2013) - a quantitative approach by Sayeed Firoj Ali** - The study was designed to explore the strength of association between organizational culture, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction among employees working in a private sector textile unit in Bangalore. The study showed a positive correlation between some dimensions of organizational culture, commitment and job satisfaction. An attempt was made to quantify the impact of organizational culture on the employee’s level of commitment and job satisfaction. The findings of the study brought the importance of certain dimensions of organizational culture such as experimentation, collaboration and confrontation on enhancing the employee’s level of organizational commitment and job satisfaction. This indicates that the organization needs to give importance to these aspects of culture to being in high level of motivation and morale among its employees.¹

**Employees retention in cross-cultural environment – a challenge for the future organizations – B.K. Punia and Laxmi (2012) –** proved that finding and hiring good people is really a tough task but retaining them can be even tougher. The study focused on multinational companies in India, where new entrants in the job market retain only the best talent with them, Diversity management has contributed much to cater to the needs of various cultures and sub-cultures effectively. It is true that cultural diversity has challenged the task retention as may also include the personal bias of the employers that is whom to retain and whom not to. But if coping strategies are designed properly and executed effectively this challenge can definitely be converted into opportunity.²

---
Excellence through Human resources development by M.R.R. Nair and T.V. Rao (2010) an edited compendium, focused on chief executives, views and experiences on HRD. It also dealt with the HR philosophy importance, macro level issues, expectations of the like managers and workers from HRD, role of HRD managers, dimensions of developing HRD facilitators and programs.¹

Readings in HRD (2009) – T.V. RAO edited compendium- focused on HRD instruments like performance appraisal, potential appraisal, counseling, training and rewards and implementation of the same in different organizations. It also dealt with HRD in government systems, primarily focused on educational systems.²

H.R. Alva (2008) in his work – HRD for workers - responding to change the HMT experience - 1991-92 was a year of radical change for public sector in this country. Liberalization, disinvestments and globalization being the buzz wards was a hard look in the way the business was carried on in the past. Importance of national culture in determining HRM and other management practices can be traced back to the 1960s.³


³ Kerr et al., 2008.
was operational in nature, a number of suggestions has also been offered on the basis of findings.\(^1\)

*Management of human assets* by M.G. Rao (2006) threw light on complexities of managing human beings in present day organizations. Various aspects of HRM in relation to small scale units operating in industrial estates have been presented initially followed by the theoretical presentation on HRD, different aspects of training, organizational development, employee participation etc. The effects of training and developmental activities have also been put to close examination; it also attempted to find how employee related activities flourish in other sectors like government, co-operative.\(^2\)

Keith C.D. Souza (2008) in his work ‘*HRD as a means of integration provides*’ – In the early phases of industrialization, the fundamental relationship between the worker and the organization was akin to that of a master and a servant, social and economic conditions necessitated dependence of employees on organization for satisfaction of their material needs, with the development of society and improvements in the conditions of workers, there was a gradual shift in workers to what are popularly referred to as higher order needs.\(^3\)

Miss. Charumathi.B (2008) conducted a comparative study on *HRD in select public sector and private sector banks in Tamil Nadu in 1994*. She has analyzed Indian Bank and Indian overseas bank in Public sector and Lakshmi Vilas and Karur vysya bank in Private sector. She found that HRD tasks


relating to supporting of unions and associations are adequately performed in both the group of banks.¹

William Purcell, Stephen Nicholas, David Merrett (2009) - a study on the transfer of human resource management practice by Japanese Multinationals to Australia- Do the size of the Industry matter? The paper examines management and HRM practices adopted by Japanese Multinational enterprises and the transferability of Japanese HRM in the Australian host country situation and concluded that the HRM practices do not change with the size of the industry.²

HRM (2009) P. Subba Rao – a compendium – presented various developments in HRM in a comprehensive form. It also attempted to look into current trends in HR function with a view to outline future development that are likely to take place in the years ahead. It also discussed in a lucid manner, the topics such as job evaluation, employee benefits, recruitment and selection, line staff conflicts, social responsibility policies along with current topics such as organizational culture and climate, organizational effectiveness, participative management, quality of work life, and organizational development.³

A study by Tuang Chang Huang (2014) in November - Are the human resource practices of effective firms distinct from those of poorly performing ones? – the study concluded that the strategic importance of human resources and their contribution to the effectiveness of business firms are receiving increasing importance world wide.⁴

A study of HRD practices in Major paper Industries in TamilNadu – with special reference to HRD systems in TNPL [Tamil Nadu News print and papers limited] & Seshayee Paper and boards limited was conducted by R. Elangovan (2000). The study identified certain problems relating to implementation of HRD practices in both paper industries.¹

Mr. Gnanasekaran (2000) conducted a study on HRD practices in Chennai Port trust – a systematic HR planning is followed in Port Trust.²

Managing Human resources in IT companies–Dr. Sasmita Palo (2012) Berhampur University Orissa -Information technology is the fastest growing and most profitable industry across the globe today. It hires highly skilled and talented man power that need to be properly nurtured, managed and motivated. The study seeks to examine the role of HR professionals and various HRM practices undertaken in IT companies - five leading IT companies in India were selected for the purpose. The study concluded that all the IT companies in India are high organic structures having flexible network of multi-talented people performing multi-talented tasks. Such companies treat their employees as the most valuable corporate assets. They expect them to be self –driven, good team players and perform a variety of jobs there by creating their own opportunities for life long learning. They strive to provide a supportive work culture, and conducive environment to automatically bring the best out of the existing work force. The software packages such as Human Resource Information System (HRIS) charting software [organization chart and flow chart] HR enter pro etc. have made their work easier, simpler, faster and innovative. Though many IT companies claim during the period of study that they have a strategic connection between their HR strategy and business policy and HR professionals play a key

role in business decision in practice, it has been observed that the HR functionaries have rarely an alignment with the real business. In nut shell, the HR professionals in IT companies need to be business partners, facilitators of change process, multilingual, cultural and generalists with multiple specialties.¹

**HRM in public versus private sector – How wide the gulf is – Srinivas R. Kandula (2011)** – Doctorate in HRD from XLRI, Jamshedpur-The study concluded that even though the objectives of HRM are same across the organizations, they differ in their approaches and practices in attaining these objectives. The general business environment of private sectors can be classified into 2 – first one as organizations operating in stiff domestic and global competition and second one is limited to domestic competition. These differences within public and private sector make them differ in their practices and approaches of Human resource management. In a tautological sense, private organizations in high competition and limited competition may not be the same in their practice of HRM and so is the case with public sector which is in monopolistic form from that of open competition.²

**Indian Nationalized banks – Where is awareness of HRD practices – Dr. M.K. Patel (2011)** - The study aimed to compare High performing nationalized bank with low performing nationalized banks in Gujarat State. Data collected from 100 employees and the major focus of an appraisal system is development of Individuals and improving the quality of work life to ultimately result in achieving organizational effectiveness. In order to raise the level of motivation of employees the banks undertake several measures and also continued efforts through a series of educative literature and providing appropriate form for skill identification. By and large banks have come to

---

¹ JIMS Jan – March 2012, Page 57.
² Personnel Today – Jan to March 2011, pg.27.
recognize that HRD is more than a training program. The study concluded that low performing banks are required to take a serious look at the HRD variables and educate the employees. If these concepts are made clear and employees trained, to be retained, to accept future challenging roles the organization has otherwise good potential for development. In the banking and other service organizations as in new millennium no institution can survive in without consciousness of quality of work life in the era of global village and computerization of banking industry.¹

The changing business environment and HR – a study by Harsh.V. Trehan and Prof. Papori.T (2003) - The study focused on the effect of globalization and the strategic role by HR concepts in HR related to recruiting and retaining and recharging existing human resource, training and development, job analysis etc. It concluded that in the fast paced globally competitive business scenario, efforts to heighten Productivity and profitability never ends. Organizations are becoming more and more dynamic in nature in order to be more responsive to the demands of the market place and the challenge of managing people effectively has never been greater. Strategic HR plans are required for wiser management of people, thus maximizing productivity, profitability and quality. To fulfill this responsibility, the HR function will have to adopt a new role of strategic partners in business.¹

Challenge of global competition – HRD strategy – a compendium by Davinder Sharma (2003) Some of the strategies – successful organization will have to spearhead the path of progress and ensure that they share the vision of the organization and make it widely known – ensure that the top management instill a sense of challenge and commitment with the organization – ensure formal performance on an informal stage, make information widely shared and

to build networks, Promote healthy competition to enable organization to function simultaneously.\(^2\)

_Human resource function – The new profit center_ – A case study by Prof. M.S.Turan and Dr. Pradeep Gupta (2009) on Hindustan Lever limited - Hindustan lever’s HR policies and practices have contributed significantly to achieve an enviable track record of growth. The company has been recognized with innovative HR practices in many professional forums enabling the organization to meet the demands in the wake of competitive pressures released by reforms, liberalization and globalization. Five strategic decision making categories have been identified which are – resourcing, performance management, rewards, management development, and employee retention. The dimensions of performance management in terms of economic value added, customer value added and employee value added have been identified.\(^3\)

_From machine to man – a paradigm shift- a study by Prof. P.K.Chopra, Prof. Sameer Sharma (2003), director, member of board of studies, Barkatullah university VNS Institute of Management, Bhopal - The HRD concept, popular in the 1980’s and 1990’s has viewed human beings as the most valuable resources. However, whatever great value is attached to human beings in organizations, treating them as one of the many organizational resources, lacks the human touch in this approach. This article attempts to make a comparison between use of human beings versus their use as machines or in other words, their mechanical use. It concluded that in the dawn of a new era intellectual capital can rightly be called as an intangible asset. As human beings are the prime creators and users of Knowledge, their management will always be

---

1 January to March 2003 – Personnel Today.
2 JIMS April – June 2003, Page 41.
3 JIMS July to September 2009, Page 41.
a challenge. This calls for an in depth understanding of the differences between the mechanical uses of human beings versus the delicate human use. Modern day organizations have only one choice, that is to give due importance to human beings with all their characteristics, in their scheme of things.

After achieving a benchmark through machine use of human beings one can further go on achieving new land marks or heights only through human use of human beings. Humanizing management is a challenging task and is highly rewarding. The outcome of human resource use – brings high caliber, strong integrity towards work and positive attitude, best people are attracted because of group value, sense of enjoyment, comradeship, readiness to tackle challenging tasks, people are awake, alert, motivated, members of the group know each other well, openness to learn and improve continuously, every one feels that their time is well spent, group has the right balance of people… and so on.¹

**HRD general practices in drugs and Pharmaceutical industry** – a study by M.K. Patel and Bhuvana K.Iyer (2014) - The study deals with HRD general practices in drugs and pharmaceutical industry based on the primary data collected from 125 respondents in 8 pharmaceutical companies in Gujarat State in India – Presents a good picture indicating that good amount of importance is given to human resources both at the policy level and practice level. It concluded that Human resources are treated as extremely important resources in the organization. There is a vast scope for acquiring new skills and development and employees feel that they have a good scope of acquiring new skills and self development in their respective organizations. There exists a healthy sign of team spirit and co-operation among employees. The employees seem to understand and co-operate each other in the organization. Work oriented behavior is encouraged by the management. The study shows that all the
sample organizations care a lot for quality of work life that employees have in the organization.²

*Frontiers of management science – Training and development of executives* - by T. Jogaiah (2013) were a vigorous and in-depth study on training and development of executives in Indian power sector, first of its kind in the country. Apart from providing a strong conceptual foundation on training and development activities, it covered exhaustive study of power sector, problems and prospects concerning personnel policies. It embodied results of a probe into executive training and developmental methods, techniques, achievements and failures of Andhra Pradesh state Electricity Board.

The views of all executives were also incorporated.²

*Mrs. C. Gargava* in her work *challenges in the 2010s* - The critical role of HRD in the new economic order found the bases of HRD as to develop a work force with characteristics, HRD department will be required to re-orient itself to provide direct support to organization in the areas given below:

- *Training and development for individuals and groups* specifically aimed at providing necessary support to business and technological objectives; of organization.

- *Providing support to employees and families* equipping them with coping and other skills in the changing scenario.

- *Continuous monitoring and updating personnel policies*, to check effectiveness and avoiding redundancy of the same.

---

• **Extending HRD function, to all managers and supervisors** who would actually be involved in implementing HRD efforts.

• **Developing employee involvement** and active role of union in technology upgradation. ¹

**Training trends in Indian Industry** by Punam Sahgal and Roopashree Shankar (2015) – a case study – The study focuses on current management practices, the services that are valued from a training vendor and the growth of electronic learning market in corporate India. The study was undertaken to gain deeper insight into critical areas related to the training and development function and the evolving role of training professionals. It concluded that the organizations rely on external training providers for a variety of services while the practice in most companies is to seek support from training vendors for design and delivery of training, there is a considerable awareness and need felt to outsource activities like needs assistant and evaluation of training. The market for soft skills and IT training has outpaced the demand for functional training. The training market in India is large and there are vast opportunities for external suppliers to provide a mix of products and services.²


1 Mrs. C. Gargava – Doctoral Thesis - 2010.

Designing HRD training for the development of organization – a study by Dr. Anuradha. R (2014) faculty T.A.Pai management institute, Manipal – The study was a documentation of HRD program offered to the entire workforce of a development organization operating in Karnataka. Enabling individual and the group to learn through process mode, internalize the need for changing the style, skill, behaviour and mind set were the primary objectives of training. The study concluded that the organizational effectiveness depended upon the individual effectiveness. It is the responsibility of the individual to commit for the organizational goal. It is the responsibility of the employees to create a conducive culture within an organization. The image of the organization enhances with the enlightenment of its people.¹

Training and development in smaller organizations – Kailash B. L. Srivastava. (2013) Assistant professor IIM, Kharagpur - Most of the literature on human resources training and development are based on the observations of large scale organizations, but there is no evidence that it would also be applicable to management of people in smaller organizations. The study provided that the way in which training is organized in smaller organizations/firms depends upon a number of factors such as value attached to training, extent and type of training imparted, pace of change affecting skills within the organization, emphasis on personal qualities, cost of training and the benefits from it. He concluded that there is little evidence related to smaller organizations that training has helped the organization to grow. The reason is that in most of the organizations, results of training are not being documented and there is no analysis on return on such investments since it is largely informal in nature. Therefore, attention should be paid on the importance of

¹ Indian Journal for Training and Development, Volume 38, July to December 2014.
informal as well as formal processes of learning in order to develop valued tacit and explicit knowledge and skills.¹

Baldev Sharma and Shailendra Singh [1991] did a comparative study of 
public sector organization and one private sector organization and made an 
attempt to find out the factors responsible for the influence of organizational commitment.²

**Performance appraisal** - a study by N.G.Nayak (2013) – The study focused on the need for appraisal in an organization – to identify ways of improving business performance through improvement in individual performance, to bring about a common understanding between the employees achievements and job related behaviour – assess the employee’s contribution and use that as a basis for stimulating and supporting the employee’s development. It concluded that “performance appraisal is one of the best one of the methods of motivating the employees and their all round development and achievement of organization’s objectives in a perfect manner when the performance appraisal is introduced and implemented properly. The management’s part in designing and the executive’s part in implementing the performance appraisal are most important.³

**The impact of contextual internal process factors on cross- functional team effectiveness in an R& D set up** – a study by Prabhati Pati (2013)- The study attempts to understand the impact of contextual and internal process factors on CFT effectiveness, It tried to evaluate the impact of contextual and internal process factors separately on team effectiveness and to identify

---

¹ Journal by Indian Society for Training and Development 2013.
management intervention, Internal process include - importance of team work, open communication, priority goal setting, efficiency, effort and creative strategy. It concluded that, formal as well as informal groups have become an important feature of the 21st century organizational settings for achieving organizational objectives through team work. However to be globally competitive integration of capabilities at different levels and units is extremely necessary more so in R & D where CFT’s have to be carefully nurtured to provide intellectual leadership and competitive edge through process, products and technological innovations.¹

Observing the cultural values of an organization by a survey of Globalized workers- How the changes in organizational vision impact people’s perception- a Study by Guilherme Azevedo and Helene Bertrand (2013), conducted to verify some of the impact of change on worker’s perception in Brazil. The objective of the study was – how the changes on Organizational vision are related to the advent of globalize workers and to exploring some data on people’s perception. The study concluded as long as globalization is recognized as a multi-dimensional phenomenon, the various groups of global workers and the changes on organizational vision are certainly interconnected.²

Attitude of people in coimbatore city towards multinational corporations – a study by Prof. R.Vijay Kumar (Senior faculty), and Feroz Khan,(2014) PGDIB, GRD school of commerce and International business, Coimbatore -The objective of the study was to find out the attitude of the sample respondents in Coimbatore district towards MNCs and to find out the factors that influence their attitude towards the MNC s. The study revealed that the majority of the sample respondents strongly agreed that the MNCs will assist in attaining the

improvements in the areas like employment generation, better utilization of resources, creating a healthy competition in the market, development of infrastructure, employing modern methods of production, providing revenue to Government, development of ancillary industries, ensuring the quality exports from the country and also assist in the overall economic development of the country.¹

**Organizational decline and turnaround management** – a study by Busher Raina, Pradip Chanda, D.P.Mehta, Sunil kumar and Maheswari (2013)– The study focused on certain challenges in the existing business environment – like leadership difficulties in adapting to changes, labor unrest, etc. It concluded that ‘People need to be constantly told about the strengths of the organization to bring back their self esteem and pride in the organization and it is important to create a VENTURE- TEAM environment whereby traditional interdepartmental barriers are broken and the cross flow of information is facilitated and encouraged. The strategy trap in the mind of a turnaround manager can have far-reaching consequences for the company. Too great a focus on products and efficiency in traditional functions makes the company vulnerable to duplication and substitution. If one wants to revive an organization, he should by all means opt for the command and control model of leadership.¹

CHAPTER – III

COMPANY PROFILE

INTRODUCTION

India liberalized its policy towards the Multinational companies since 1991 and they have entered in various sectors from infrastructure like energy to consumer goods. 30% of the world output is contributed by MNCs. 73 million people are in direct employment representing 10% of the world employment in non-agricultural sector. In India, of the top 500 companies, about 75 were MNCs by market value. 40% of the world trade is intra firm trade of MNCs and 25% of global manufacturing activity is undertaken by them.

EVOLUTION OF MNCs

Most of the successful foreign companies have progressed from the stage of International companies to Multinational companies. International companies apply corporate strategy developed for the home country to its foreign subsidiaries. Multinational companies apply unique corporate strategy for each country according to the nature of the market. At present, most of the foreign companies are reaching a transnational stage, where a company distinguishes through market research what is global and universal and what is country specific and unique. The present business environment suggests that companies have to simultaneously capture global scale efficiency, respond to global market needs and develop a world wide learning capability that drives continuous innovation.

1 The Journal for Decision Makers – Vikalpa Indian Institute of Management,
PEPSICO INTERNATIONAL

The Indian soft drink market is very wide and big to control as India has all types of natural seasons and different locations have different culture. Pepsi is a multinational company and is popularly known as Pepsico International. It is a U.S. based company & at present it is operating in 195 countries. Its turnover was $ 31.6 billion in 1996 and ranked 21st among 500 U.S companies. It is a diversified company and it is operating successfully in soft drinks industry as well as in fast foods and the restaurant business. The only rival of Pepsi at the international level is coca–cola. Coca cola has focused itself only in the soft drinks market. Pepsi was established in the year 1898 and have been thirst quenchers for 100 years as global brands. PepsiCo Incorporation was found by Donald M. Kendall, President and CEO of Pepsi cola and Herman W. Lay Chairman and CEO, Frito-Lay through the merger of two companies. Pepsi – cola was created in the late 1890’s by Caleb Bradham, a New Bern, N.C. pharmacist. Frito-Lay Incorporation formed by the 1961 merger of Frito company founded by Herman w. Lay in the year 1932.

Pepsico had 36,000 employees in 1970 which rose to 49000 employees in 1975 and crossed 1, 00,000 employees in the year 1980. The Aquafina bottled water was tested in the market in the year 1994 and it had 4,70,000 employees world wide in the year 1995. It became the third largest employer in 1995, it launched www.Pepsi.com online website in the year 1996. In the year 2001 it introduced credit card vending.
COMPANY PROFILE - PEPSICO INDIA HOLDINGS P LTD. AND ITS PERFORMANCE

In India, the company is engaged in manufacturing of packaged bottles, snack foods, fruit products, mineral water, potato product, milk malted foods, beverages and aerated water. The Subject acts as manufacturers and dealers in all kinds of food and food products and beverages. It also acts as holding company for various Pepsico companies in India. It imports from United States of America. It also exports to U.S.A. The company is from Pepsi cola group. The brand names of the company are Pepsi or Mirinda or 7up. The company is under collaboration with PepsiCo capital corporation, the Netherlands. Its major customers are wholesalers and retailers. It is in the trade terms with Agra Beverages corporation Limited, India, Pearl drinks Private Limited, India, Steel city Drinks Beverages Limited, India, Dhilon Kool drinks and Beverages Limited, India, Daryani Beverages Limited, India, Varun Beverages Limited, India and Pearl Beverages Limited, India.

In India Pepsico entered in the year 1989. India, by the world standards, the per capita consumption of three servings is rock bottom, less even than our neighbours Pakistan and Bangladesh. There are 3,60,000 retailers stocking soft drinks in India. According to one study, it takes an average Indian 1.5 hours of work to be able to buy a bottle; in other countries the norm is 5 minutes. Pepsico in India is a fully owned 100% subsidiary. Pepsico holdings have undertaken an organization structure revamp with 5 market units being defined according to regions. In addition to the north, east, west and south market units, a central market unit has also been defined. The intermix of company owned bottling
operations [COBOs] and franchisee owned bottling operations [FOBOs] within the market unit is expected to help provide senior resources pool of line and staff managers, impact both COBOs and FOBOs and enable transference of best practices both ways, according to the company. In a significant restructuring exercise, PepsiCo India Holdings has split its soft drinks and other beverages businesses into two separate units. Under the new business structure, PepsiCo’s 100% juices, juice-based beverages and bulk water project have been clubbed together and will operate as a single business entity as part of the company’s new business division. In line with global trends, the domestic market too is visualizing healthy growth of non-aerated beverages. In India, product such as juices, juice-based drinks and retail packaged water have been registering high growth rates. The period between 1999 and 2002 has seen the juices category grow over 20% and juice based drinks registered growth rates of 12% and packaged water by 20% PepsiCo’s soft drinks business on the other hand has spun off as a separate operating division. It has seen a tremendous growth in the calendar year 2002 with industry having grown by 35%. The growth has come primarily on account of price rationalization, higher penetration in rural markets and capacity expansion.

PepsiCo has price / earning ratio of 23 over many years. It puts emphasis on increasing revenues. PepsiCo concentrates on celebrity advertising and blow out marketing campaigns & Pepsi cola interest in bottlers are about two-thirds of their volume. Economies of scale in bottling, at the plant and multi-plant levels have greatly increased in recent years. This development has made it easier to run a captive bottling operation, as the number of separate bottling plants required for national distribution has been decreased drastically. To the extent
that there are economies of scale in management the relative disadvantage of captive distribution from added managerial resources is reduced.

In the year 1998, Pepsi cola celebrated 100th anniversary with first world wide bottler’s conference held in Hawaii. In the year 2003 PepsiCo beverages international bottling plant at Madurai, India won a golden peacock award for environment management during the 5th world congress on environmental management. PepsiCo’s success is the result of superior products, high standards of performance, distinctive competitive strategies and the high integrity of employees. Its mission is to be the world’s premier consumer products, to produce healthy financial rewards to investors, to provide opportunities for growth and enrichment to employees. One of the strongest in PepsiCo’s armory is the flexibility allowed by its parent company to its employees in making independent decisions. Every manager and sales person has the authority to take whatever steps he or she feels will make consumers aware of the brand and increase the sales and consumption. As a matter of fact it provides budgets to people within which to work. No questions are asked as to what they do, what is important to the parent company is the performance and results.

Pepsi concentrates on the organizational commitment and pride of the company workers. The HR professional concentrates on improving marketing skills. The HR contribution in Pepsi lay in designing a role where an employee could learn on tough jobs. The company believed that the HR function is not for a behavioral therapy or to act as a psychiatrist, not a social service department. On the other hand, the HR role was to create systems, processes and practices to help the organization to cope with the market pressures and to build capabilities
to become more competent. The strong message that is envisaged is that any HR intervention would succeed only if there was something in it [in terms of deriving a tangible advantage] for the functions, the organization and the HR professional. The learning from the Pepsi was that hard work on the job with the line of sight on the task is the best form of training and development. Therefore the focus in

Relatively little training

- Hiring occurs at all levels
- Relatively little job security
- Performance-based salary increase
- Relatively high turnover
- Focus on innovation, autonomy and flexibility.

The company believes that it is as important to retain the person as it is to hire the right person. Therefore the salary packages are extremely competitive. The organization structure basically starts with the customer executive, the person in touch with the consumers and he is the most important person. All the energy of the organization is driven towards supporting that person who is the front-runner. The associates call the chief executive officer as supporters or facilitators who provide the right type of training, motivation to grow and optimize their own performance. The intrinsic part of the organization make every employee so powerful to attain greater heights.
Fig. 3.1 Organization Structure of Pepsi Co India Holdings Pvt. Ltd.,
Fig. 3.2 Composition of Human Resources Department
About the plant in Tamil Nadu the following table represents the activity undertaken either by the company or the HR department or other departments:

**TABLE 1: HR DEPARTMENT’S ACTIVITY WITH RESPECT TO PLANT IN TAMIL NADU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>HR department</th>
<th>Other departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance benefits administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel record keeping or information system</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion or transfer or separation processing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage or salary administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workmen’s compensation administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO compliance or affirmative action</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay roll administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job description</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary procedures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition programs or awards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint procedures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public or media relations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management or business insurance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Company records
There are 42 manufacturing plants situated in whole India out of which 2 plants are situated at Tamil Nadu – one at Mamandur, Chinglepet and another at Madurai. The sales offices in India - South market unit – 5; West market unit – 6; East market unit – 4; Central market unit – 4, North market unit –4. India stands in the global level with respect to the products manufactured by the company as – Based on volumes- 38\textsuperscript{th} and based on quality – 5\textsuperscript{th}. The Mamandur plant has the classification of employees as:

The plant was started in the year 1994. The plant was bought from Mr. Adiakalraj in the year 1994. The total number of employees with respect to this plant – 1147 the categories of employees- 6 grades of employees with the 6\textsuperscript{th} grade as the highest in salary. Grade 1 – 329; grade 2 – 435; grade 3 – 125; grade 4 – 120; grade 5 – 115; grade 6 –23 numbers. The grades 1 to grade 4 are designated as associates and grades 4 to grade 6 are designated as executives.

The Madurai Plant was started in the year 1989 and has the classification as follows:

Total number of employees with respect to this plant – 1123; the categories of employees – grade 1 – 423; grade 2 – 281; grade 3- 130; grade 4 – 143; grade 5 -121; and grade 6 -22;. The grades 1 to 4 are designated as associates and grade 5 and grade 6 are designated as executives.

India stands in the global level with respect to the products manufactured by the company based on volumes – 38\textsuperscript{th} and based on quality -5\textsuperscript{th}. 
### TABLE 2: SHARE OF MARKET BY PEPSI IN THE WORLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Market share [in %]</th>
<th>[world] Pepsi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East central Europe</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### TABLE 3: PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per capita consumption [in bottles]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United states</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srilanka</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be observed from the above table that the per capita consumption share of India in bottles stands less than other countries in the world.

**TABLE 4 : PEPSI IN INDIA WITH THE PARAMETERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Pepsi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total current investment in India</td>
<td>500 crores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New investments</td>
<td>300 crores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of owned bottling plants</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of franchisees</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees</td>
<td>12400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESPONDENTS PROFILE

TABLE 5: NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES AT MAMANDUR PLANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Strength [in number]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade I</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade II</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade III</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade IV</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade V</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade VI</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Company records
Grades I to IV - Associates
Grade V & VI - Executives
From the above Table it can be inferred that most of the employees fall in the grades I & II

Graph 3.1  Strength of Employees (Mamandur Plant)
### TABLE 6: STRENGTH OF EMPLOYEES – MADURAI PLANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Strength [in number]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade I</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade II</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade III</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade IV</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade V</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade VI</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Company records; Grades V and Grade VI – Executives; Grades I to Grade IV – associates;

**Graph 3.2** Strength of Employees (Madurai Plant)
TABLE 7: CATEGORIES OF THE EMPLOYEES (ASSOCIATES) SELECTED FOR THE STUDY AT MAMANDUR PLANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>% of employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade I</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade II</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade III</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade IV</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table, shows that most of the respondents for the study from Mamandur Plant are grade 1 and grade 3 categories of associates.

Graph 3.3 Associates of Mamandur Plant taken for the study
TABLE 8: CLASSIFICATION OF RESPONDENT EMPLOYEES INTO DIFFERENT CATEGORIES FOR THE STUDY – MAMANDUR PLANT – EXECUTIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>% of employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade V</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade VI</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 3.4 Executives of Mamandur Plant taken for the study
TABLE 9: CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES (ASSOCIATES) SELECTED FOR THE STUDY – MADURAI PLANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade I</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade II</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade III</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade IV</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table it can be inferred that most of the respondents selected for the study from Madurai plant are grade I and grade II.

Graph 3.5 Associates of Madurai Plant taken for the study
TABLE 10 : CLASSIFICATION OF RESPONDENT EMPLOYEES – MADURAI PLANT - EXECUTIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade V</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade VI</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 3.6  Executives of Madurai Plant taken for the study
TABLE 11: TOTAL RESPONDENTS TAKEN FOR THE OF STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Mamandur plant</th>
<th>Madurai Plant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 3.7 Associates and Executives in total (both the plants) taken for the study

TABLE 12: AGE WISE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSOCIATE [BOTH MAMANDUR AND MADURAI]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>% of employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 – 35 years</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40 years</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Company records

Most of the respondents fall in the age group of 35-40 years.
TABLE 13 : AGE WISE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS – EXECUTIVE [BOTH MAMANDUR AND MADURAI]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>% of employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-35 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source : Primary Data

Most of the respondents fall in the age group of 35-40 years.

TABLE 14 : WORK EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENTS - ASSOCIATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work experience</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>% of employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 years</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 years</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 15 yrs</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source : Primary Data

Most of the associate respondents are of 10 to 15 years of experience.

Graph 3.8 Work Experience of Associates
### TABLE 15: WORK EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENTS – EXECUTIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work experience</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>% of employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 15 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

Most of the executive respondents are of 10 to 15 years of experience.

Graph 3.9  Work Experience of Executives
### TABLE 16: AGE WISE CUM DEPARTMENT WISE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS - ASSOCIATE OF BOTH THE PLANTS TAKEN FOR THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Accounts or finance</th>
<th>Purchase</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Quality control</th>
<th>Human resource</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Time office</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 to 35 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 40 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

### TABLE 17: AGE WISE CUM DEPARTMENT WISE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS – EXECUTIVE OF BOTH THE PLANTS - TAKEN FOR THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Accounts or finance</th>
<th>Purchase</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Quality control</th>
<th>Human resource</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Time office</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 to 35 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 40 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data
TABLE 18: TABLE REPRESENTING MONTHLY REMUNERATION OF ASSOCIATE AND EXECUTIVES OF BOTH THE PLANTS TAKEN FOR THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly remuneration</th>
<th>Executives</th>
<th>Associates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 10,000</td>
<td>5 [5]</td>
<td>61 [20.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000-15000</td>
<td>26 [26]</td>
<td>83 [27.7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20000 and above</td>
<td>57 [57]</td>
<td>34 [11.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 [100]</td>
<td>300 [100]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data
Bracket represents %

The remuneration of most of the executives fall in the category of Rs.20,000 and above.

Remuneration of most of the associates fall in the category of Rs.15,000 to 20,000.

Graph 3.10 Monthly remuneration of associates and Executives taken for the study
TABLE 19: DEPARTMENTWISE DISTRIBUTION OF THE ASSOCIATES AND EXECUTIVES OF BOTH THE PLANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current position</th>
<th>Executives</th>
<th>Associates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>4 [4]</td>
<td>31 [10.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality control</td>
<td>22 [22]</td>
<td>47 [15.7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 [100]</td>
<td>300 [100]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data
Bracket represents %

From the above table it can be observed that both executives and associates are mostly found in technical departments like quality control and production.
CHAPTER - IV

TRAINING

DEFINITION

Training can be defined as the process which helps people to learn. From an organization point of view it would have a specific aim of making the employee more effective in his work. Training in organization is oriented more towards the needs of the organization rather than the individual. However, organizations are waking up to the individual needs of the employees too and are mixing the training programs so that both the needs are met.

Recognition of the importance of training in recent years has been heavily influenced by the intensification of overseas competition and the relative success of economies of Japan, Germany etc., where investment in employee development is considerably emphasized. Technological developments and organizational change have gradually led some employers to the realization that success relies on the skills and abilities of their employees, and this means considerable and continuous investment in training and development.

This has also been underscored by the rise in human resource management with its emphasis on the importance of people and the skills they possess in enhancing organizational efficiency. Such HRM concepts as commitment to the company and growth in the quality movement have led the
senior management to realize the increased importance of training and long-term development.

The Manpower services commission which was set up by the employment and training act in 1981 defined training as: ‘A Planned process to modify attitude, knowledge or skill behaviour through learning experience to achieve effective performance in an activity or range of activities. Its purpose, in the work situation, is to develop the abilities of the individual and to satisfy the current and future needs of the organization’. ¹

Dale s. Beach defines training as ‘the organized procedure from which people learn knowledge and skill of a definite purpose’.¹

Training and development according to Wexley K and Latham ‘planned efforts by organization to increase employees competencies’.²

**TRAINING IN PEPSICO**

The Company has a corporate HR department which acts as a central coordinating centre for the training of all its plants. The company has a comprehensive training calendar giving details of training plan for the year. The HR manager prepares a list of training needs for all departments. HR manager discusses their training requirements with corporate HR head of training so that a training calendar is made for the succeeding year. There are two levels where training is undergone – associate and executive.

¹ Manpower Services Commission 1981.
In Pepsi Co executives and the associates are trained in India only. Training calendar is formed depending on the personal development agenda set by the immediate boss and the self. Also the organization has specific training agenda for the whole year. Apart from this there is also a system called CDAP [Career Development Action Plan] in which there are action plans for 3 year and 5 year developments for each individual. Some of the areas of training program at the shop floor level – manufacturing and warehousing, foreign matters and quality scores, safety training, slice bottle water training. First aid training, leadership training programmes, millennium Pepsi selling and distribution, new Pepsi cola international inspection training, quality of work life, statistical problem solving techniques. PepsiCo has managed to get the best talent available in the country to build its strengths. The company has highly comprehensive training packages for the new employees who join in, where in the track performance is reviewed. The executives work with the individual to try and find our their skill ‘gaps’ and bridge them to enhance their capabilities, leading to excellence in performance.

The training programs in PepsiCo are driven by 2 factors – the skill sets required by the individual to transact successfully with the market and the areas in which the individual feels that he needs to develop. On the basis of this, the executives create capability agenda, which will allow the individual to develop in a holistic manner.

The areas of training program at the supervisory and the middle level grades are – on the job training which includes job rotation and committee

assignments and off the job training includes role playing and conferences and discussions.²

**ON THE JOB TRAINING**

**Shadowing and job rotation**

This method usually aims to give trainee managers a feel for the organization by giving them experience of working in different departments. It is a version of training by switching roles, provides an excellent learning experience for workers and suitably fits with the HRM concept of team working and empowerment where the managers are encouraged to take greater responsibilities for their work and that of the team.

**Committee assignments**

A group of trainee’s are given and asked to solve an actual organizational problem. The trainees’ solve them jointly which also develops team work.

**OFF THE JOB TRAINING**

Sometimes it becomes necessary to get people away from the work environment to a place where the frustrations and bastle of work are eliminated. This enables the trainee to study theoretical information or be exposed to new and innovative ideas. The problem arises when those ideas or learning experiences do not appear to relate to the work situations.

---

² Source : Secondary Data.
Role playing

A method of human interaction that involves realistic behaviour in imaginary situation. This method is also useful for developing interpersonal interactions and relations.

Conference / discussions

This method involves a group of people who pose ideas, examine and share facts, ideas and data, test assumptions and draw conclusions all of which contribute to the improvement of job performance. Discussion has the distinct advantage over the lecture method where it involves two-way communication and hence feedback is provided. The participants feel free to speak in small groups. The success of this method depends on leadership qualities of the person who leads the group. **No other training methods are emphasized in the company.**
TABLE - 20: AREAS OF DECISION MAKING RELATING TO TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Centralized</th>
<th>Decentralized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee orientation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical process</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional skill</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Company records

From the above table it can be inferred that the decisions regarding specific training areas such as strategic management, management skills, leadership, team building, communication, employee orientation are to a large extent taken centrally. Centralized decision making processes result in adopting a consistent approach and ensures that training is aligned to the corporate strategy. Areas such as technical process, functional skill, process improvement, communication, where decisions are decentralized training is driven by the needs of the concerned department or unit and relate to specific role or the job requirements. This also suggests that decisions are taken with active involvement of managers and individual employees themselves.
TABLE - 21 : TRAINING COST PER MAN DAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average cost per day [in Rs.]</th>
<th>Associates (number)</th>
<th>Executives (Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 1000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 to 5000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 10000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000 to 20000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source : Company records

As per the above table the company at an average spends more than 2 crores on associates for training and around 3 crores on executives for the purpose of training.

**Bar diagram :**

Graph 4.1 Training cost per Man-day
### TABLE - 22 : PARTICIPATION IN THE TRAINING PROGRAMME (YEAR 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the program</th>
<th>No. of associates participated</th>
<th>Number of Executives Participated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter personal skill</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive work culture</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skill</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management skill</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process improvement</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial skills</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source : Company records

As per the above table it can be found that the training programme which is attended by the associates mostly is in the area related to interpersonal skills followed by communication and team building where as in the case of executives it is leadership followed by team building and financial skills which are mostly attended.
TABLE - 23 : PARTICIPATION ASSOCIATES IN TRAINING PROGRAMME (YEAR 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of training</th>
<th>Number attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First aid training</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire fighting</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety training</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing and warehousing</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepsi –cola inspection training</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slice bottle water discussion</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism and its effect</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total quality assurance</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency preparedness</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source : Company records

While giving training to operators it can be found from the above table that much importance is given to manufacturing and warehousing followed by total quality assurance, first aid training, fire fighting and safety training.

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Globalization implies competition on a world wide basis, establishing new imperatives towards global scale operations, product or service standardization and the international distribution of value-adding activities. As a result it means a total shift in ‘mind set’ to doing business. Managers are expected to become globally competent where their ability to adapt and match their style to that of different cultures will play an important role in both their personal and their companies success or failure. Meeting that challenge
requires dynamic, creative, well-trained personnel, highly competent in functional skills and equally competent in managing variety of cultural setting.

**Definition**

Culture refers to symbols, language, ideologies, rituals and myths.

Hofstede defines culture as ‘culture is the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group; from another. Culture in this sense, include systems of values and values are among the building blocks of culture.

Edgar Schien defined culture as ‘a pattern of basic assumptions – invented, discovered or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with the problems of external adaptation and internal integration – that has worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems’. 

Howard M. Schwartz defines the implication of culture as ‘culture gives people a sense of how to behave and what they ought to be doing’. 

Culture is otherwise defined as an informal, shared way of perceiving life and membership in an organization that binds members together and influences what they think about themselves and their work.

---

In the words of Stephen Robbins, organizational culture is a relatively uniform perception held by the organization, it has common characteristics and can distinguish one organization from another, it integrates individual group and organization system. Hence organizational culture refers to the prevailing pattern of values, attitudes, beliefs, assumptions, expectations, activities, interactions and norms, sentiments and artifacts shared by the members of the organization.  

As human beings are continuously activating the process of culturing by producing and reproducing the social realities in ways like boring, exciting, puzzling, etc., business organizations are also basically the human organizations. Just as in the families, the children absorb the culture from their parents, the same way the employees in the organizations absorb the culture from their seniors, peers and leaders. It means when a person joins the organization he joins the culture of that organization and way of life of that organization. Hence, culture is the pattern of behaviour that is handed down by the previous generation to next generation, or culture is a set of shared values and beliefs that are common to a group of people. These values and beliefs shape the behavior of an individual and the groups within the organization.

Each organization has its own set of unique characteristics and properties, which makes it different from others. The organization by building suitable developmental culture can both increase the employee’s performance as well as can raise the exit barriers. Organizational culture basically is an umbrella term which encompasses many sub-processes as shown in the figure below:

---

Organizational culture is a judicious mix of organizational philosophy, team work, group norms, management support systems, reward systems, decision making styles and conflict resolution modes of management. Organizational philosophy is the manifested and practiced core values in the organization as perceived by its employees. Sound organizational philosophy will facilitate good team work, which can be referred as the degree of mutual dependency between peer group members of the organization to foster unification in the group activities. Synchronized group activities will help in forming positive group norms, which are set standards of the behavior to be adhered to by the employees within the department or the organization. This entire process will lead to a performing management support system wherein
the superiors are accessible to their subordinates to provide clear communication and help in accommodating new ideas of their subordinates thereby creating an innovative culture.

Further innovative culture will ease proper organization of work to put forward clear job objectives and performance expectations for the subordinates and making the job assignments more challenging and rewarding for the subordinates. Hence reward system also plays its role, which should be encouraging and competitive to keep the employees intact with the organization. The decision making in the organizations is also dependent on its culture to a greater extent. Wherever possible decisions related to employees jobs should be taken after wider consultation with the employees across the hierarchical levels/strata within the organization. These all make the culture very positive and performing and employees are encouraged to speak up. Conflicts related to their life within the organization, without undue fear of being punished by superiors and to the extent to which the they are resolved by the superiors.¹

**ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE**

Campbell *et al.*, define organizational climate as ‘a set of attributes specific to a particular organization that may be induced from the way that organization deals with its members and its environment. For the individual

---

¹ **References:**
members within the organization, climate takes the form of a set of attitudes and expectancies which describe the organization in terms of both static characteristics [say degree of autonomy] and behavioral outcome, contingencies.¹

Organizational culture and climate are interchangeably used quite often. But there is a difference between the two. Culture is more comprehensive and focuses on the total values and norms that guide behavior of its members. Organizational climate on the other hand, emphasizes work environment.

Climate in natural sense is referred to as the average course or condition of the weather at a place over a period of year as exhibited by temperature, wind velocity and precipitation. However, it is quite difficult to define organizational climate incorporating the characteristics of natural climate one way to conceptualize the organizational climate are to consider its potential properties. Forehand and Gilmer² feel that climate consists of a set of characteristics that describe an organization, distinguish it from other organizations, are relatively enduring overtime and influence the behavior of people in it.

FACTORS INFLUENCING ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

Researchers in organizational climate have used data relating to individual perception of organizational properties in identifying organizational climate. Lit win and stringer in their study have included six factors, which

---

affect organizational climate. These are organizational structure [perception of the extent of organizational constraints, rules and regulations] individual responsibility [feelings of autonomy of being one’s own boss] Rewards [feelings related to being confident of adequate and appropriate rewards, Risk and risk taking [perceptions of the degree of challenge and risk in the work situation], warmth and support [feelings of general good fellowship and helpfulness prevailing in the work settings] and tolerance and conflict [degree of confidence that the climate can tolerate differing opinions].

Schneider and Bartlett identified six items that is managerial support, managerial structure, concern for new employees, inter-agency conflict, agent dependence and general satisfaction.

Taguri has identified 5 factors in organizational climate on the basis of information provided by managers. These are Practices relating to providing a sense of direction or purpose to their jobs, opportunities for exercising individual initiative, working with a superior who is highly competitive and competent, working with co-operative and pleasant people and being with a profit minded and sales oriented company.

The results of these studies show that it is very difficult to generalize the basic contents of organizational climate based on these studies. Other studies in this respect also do not elicit different result and present the vastly different

---

1 G.H.Litwin and R. Stringer Influence of Organizational Climate on Human Motivation – Paper Presented in Organizational Climate, Michigan March 1966; Quoted in Campbell et al.
3 R.Taguiri, ‘Comments on Organizational Climate’, Quoted in Campbell et al., p.392.
orientations or sets. However, 4 basic factors that influence organizational climate in general are:

Individual autonomy, degree of structure imposed upon the position, reward orientation and consideration and warmth and support.$^1$

The objective of performing an employee climate assessment is to identify the key areas which are hindering production, reducing effectiveness and which might generate unexpected costs in the future.

**ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AT PEPSICO**

At PepsiCo there exists a healthy organizational climate which positively impacts the bottom line. Six critical climate dimensions identified for the purpose are:

- Clarity- everyone in the organization knows what is expected to be performed by him;
- Standards – challenging, but attainable goals are set;
- Responsibility – employees are given authority to accomplish tasks;
- Flexibility – there are no unnecessary rules, policies and procedures;
- Rewards – employees are recognized and rewarded for good performance;
- Team commitment- People are proud to belong to the organization.

Every job in the company is filled with best people on earth. The company treats each other with respect, fostering an atmosphere of caring, open communication and candor among employees. The company emphasizes to a
great deal on personal integrity and believe that long-term results from real accomplishments are the only fair way to judge performance. It respects individual differences in culture, ethnicity and colour. PepsiCo is committed to providing a work place free from all forms of discrimination. Annual employee reviews are made incorporating the need to ‘act with integrity’, to create a positive work environment and ‘to align and motivate teams’. However, senior management is held accountable for results. Corporate programs chartered out for training employees how to work and manage in an inclusive environment. Offering a work place where diversity is valued helps the company to build top quality work force which is considered so crucial for the success of the company enabling to attract and retain great people from a wide spectrum of backgrounds.

---

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Executives Training Objectives – To study the achievement of executive training objectives, a linear regression technique is adopted.

Linear Multiple regression analysis [ Executives]

The objectives of the training program is considered as dependent variable and the three variables of the training of executives [1]elements of training program [ii] Quality of the training program [iii] training supportive activities in department are considered as independent variables.

TABLE 24 : REGRESSION FOR OBJECTIVE (EXECUTIVES)

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.770(a)</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>2.38473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), Effectotal, Extotal, Qualtotal

ANOVA(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>795.496</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>265.165</td>
<td>46.627</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>545.944</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5.687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1341.440</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), Effectotal, Extotal, Qualtotal
b  Dependent Variable: Objetotal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>19.623</td>
<td>3.242</td>
<td>6.053</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>-.605</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.484</td>
<td>-7.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-1.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>1.429</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>10.671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Objetotal

It is found in the regression analysis that the co-efficient of determination R-square between the three independent variables and one dependent variable is 0.593 and it can be inferred that 59.3% variation in dependent variable ‘objectives of the training program’ is being explained by the above mentioned 3 independent variables.

As far as the individual contributions of the dependent variables are concerned, supportive training programs in the departments has higher contribution [.79] followed by the elements of training program[.48] and the quality of training program do not have significant role to explain the variation in the objective of training program to the executives.

The ANOVA table for regression showed the significant value [.000] at 5% level of significance to support the best fit regression.
## TABLE 25: GLM FOR EXECUTIVES, ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, ELEMENTS, QUALITY, SUPPORTIVE PROGRAM.

### Multivariate Tests (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>40.847(a)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>40.847(a)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>40.847(a)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>40.847(a)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orculvatotal</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>1.841(a)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>1.841(a)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>1.841(a)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>1.841(a)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orculbetota</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.421(a)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.421(a)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.421(a)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.421(a)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orculprtotal</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>9.861(a)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>9.861(a)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>9.861(a)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>9.861(a)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Exact statistic  
b  Design: Intercept+Orculvatotal+Orculbetota+Orculprtotal
## Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>39.925(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.308</td>
<td>1.560</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td>147.546(b)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49.182</td>
<td>3.573</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>93.171(c)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31.057</td>
<td>9.525</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>668.007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>668.007</td>
<td>78.298</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td>1139.769</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1139.769</td>
<td>82.801</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>87.873</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87.873</td>
<td>26.950</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oculvatotal</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>22.479</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.479</td>
<td>2.635</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td>2.096</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.096</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>9.118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.118</td>
<td>2.796</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oculbetota</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>2.987</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.987</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orculprtotal</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>21.643</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.643</td>
<td>2.537</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>45.105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.105</td>
<td>13.833</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>819.035</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8.532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td>1321.454</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>13.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>313.019</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>88002.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td>162270.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>33131.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>858.960</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td>1469.000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>406.190</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .046 (Adjusted R Squared = .017)
b R Squared = .100 (Adjusted R Squared = .072)
c R Squared = .229 (Adjusted R Squared = .205)
In this analysis it is found that the GLM is not fit for the variables values of the organization, beliefs of the organization where as it fits for the variable practices in the organization. The independent variable practices in the organization of organization culture is creating enormous impact on the quality of training program and effective supportive training program with significant F-values F=9.898 and F=13.833

It is inferred that the executives felt the present practice in the organization is in favour of training programs with quality and effective supportive program in every department.

**TABLE 26 : CLUSTER ANALYSIS FOR CLIMATE OF EXECUTIVES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clitotal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Cases in Each Cluster**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>100.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 4.2 Cluster Analysis for Climate (Executives)

DISCRIMINANT

Tests of Equality of Group Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Performance Standards</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>40.333</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Helping Subordinate</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>20.001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Commitment</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>11.783</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Team</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>30.035</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Co-operation and Solidarity</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>11.569</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive Plans</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>13.915</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belongingness</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>16.508</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Team</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>38.422</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting Relationship</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>19.704</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Canonical Discriminate Functions Eigenvalues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.603(a)</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.340(a)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*First 2 canonical discriminant functions were used in the analysis.*

### Wilks’ Lambda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Function(s)</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 through 2</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>227.367</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>27.225</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total climate score of executives is classified into 3 clusters by means k-means cluster analysis. In these clusters it is identified that the executives in the first cluster feels climate is not satisfactory with mean 21.13 and the executives in the second cluster are in the view that the climate is satisfactory with mean 30.39 and third cluster executives express the climate of the organization is good and suitable for the employees with mean 37.93.

The classified clusters are checked for the reliability using the discriminate analysis. The 9 variables of climate are suitable for the classification of clusters due to the significant in the table test of equality of group means with significant f-values and wilks’ Lambda values.

The canonical correlation co-efficient [1] .940 [2].504 obtained through discriminate analysis for the climate variables are highly significant for the 2 discriminate functions. Chi-square value 222.367 and chi-square value 27.225 respectively are highly significant. These values reveal that the cluster classification of climate score is highly reliable at 5% level of significance.
TABLE 27: CLUSTER WISE IMPACT OF TRAINING ON THE CLIMATE OF THE ORGANIZATION. (EXECUTIVES)

Climate = 1

Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.044(a)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>2.17958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), Effectotal, Qualtotal, Extotal
b  c  climate = 1

ANOVA(b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.994(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>199.524</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199.913</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), Effectotal, Qualtotal, Extotal
b  Dependent Variable: Clitotal
c  climate = 1

Coefficients (a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>29.008</td>
<td>4.972</td>
<td>5.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Dependent Variable: Clitotal
b  climate = 1
Climate = 2

Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.811(a)</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>1.30941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Effectotal, Qualtotal, Extotal
b climate = 2

ANOVA (b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>72.741</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.247</td>
<td>14.142</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>37.720</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110.462</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Effectotal, Qualtotal, Extotal
b Dependent Variable: Clitotal
c climate = 2

Coefficients (a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>20.478</td>
<td>3.935</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>5.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>-.758</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>-.606</td>
<td>-4.340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Clitotal
b climate = 2
Climate = 3

Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.564(a)</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>2.25642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a Predictors: (Constant), Effectotal, Qualtotal, Extotal
- b climate = 3

ANOVA (b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.019</td>
<td>3.735</td>
<td>.025(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a Predictors: (Constant), Effectotal, Qualtotal, Extotal
- b Dependent Variable: Clitotal
- c climate = 3

Coefficients (a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>49.010</td>
<td>11.946</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td>-.432</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>-.545</td>
<td>-3.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a Dependent Variable: Clitotal
- b climate = 3
In this analysis the climate score is taken as dependent variables and elements of training program, quality of training program, effective supportive training activities in the department are taken as independent variables. The result is given in terms of the cluster groups. In first cluster, the regression does not fit properly \( [F=0.027] \) and the independent variables do not explain the variation in the organizational climate where as second cluster and cluster 3 are possessing the impact of dependent variables , the regression on cluster 2 is meaningful with \( F \)-value 14.142 and the variables quality, supportive training program with \( \beta = -0.721 \) and \( \beta = -0.606 \); explain the variation organizational climate, similarly in cluster 3 the variable quality of training program significantly explain \( \beta = -0.545 \) the organizational climate . So it is found that the executives who are not satisfied by the organizational climate are accusing the quality of training program and other elements of the training program., whereas the executives in the cluster 2 and 3 are simultaneously appreciating the quality of the training program and satisfied by the organizational climate.
### TABLE 28: CLUSTER ANALYSIS FOR ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES OF ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS (EXECUTIVES)

**Final Cluster Centers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objetotal</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>22.52</td>
<td>25.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Cases in each Cluster**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>100.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.3 Cluster analysis for organizational goals (Executives)
Discriminate

Tests of Equality of Group Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of Responsibility</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.480</td>
<td>52.550</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Skills</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>24.532</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength as a leader</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>54.390</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Performance</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>24.135</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase basic knowledge of management</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>14.455</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Mentoring Relationship</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>20.409</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY OF CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS

Eigenvalues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.171(a)</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.293(a)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a First 2 canonical discriminant functions were used in the analysis.

Wilks' Lambda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Function(s)</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 through 2</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>233.699</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>24.283</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The total scores of the achievement of objectives of the organizational goals of executives is classified into 3 clusters namely moderately achieving the objectives with center 22.52, frequency 63; highly achieving with center 25.85, frequency 34 and not all achieving with center 6 and frequency 3. The reliability of classified clusters is achieved by the discriminant analysis. The F-values in the tests of equality of group means are highly significant and the canonical correlation co-efficient is very high for the two discriminant functions [.944,.476] respectively together with significant chi-square values 233.699 and 24.283 for the two discriminant functions forces to accept the cluster with full reliability for further analysis.

TABLE 29: THE IMPACT OF CHANGES IN SUBORDINATES AFTER ATTENDING THE TRAINING AND OBJECTIVES IN THE VIEWS OF EXECUTIVES.

Objective. = 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.418(a)</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>1.49837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), New ways to improve skills, Willingness for new skills, Complete Assigned tasks, Fewer Errors
b Objective. = 1
ANOVA (b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>27.499</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.875</td>
<td>3.062</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>130.216</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157.714</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), New ways to improve skills, Willingness for new skills, Complete Assigned tasks, Fewer Errors
b Dependent Variable: Objetotal
c Objective. = 1

Coefficients (a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>24.500</td>
<td>1.539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness for New Skills</td>
<td>-1.500</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>-.231</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer Errors</td>
<td>-2.147</td>
<td>1.582</td>
<td>-.602</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Assigned Tasks</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>1.498</td>
<td>-.294</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Ways to Improve Skills</td>
<td>-2.583</td>
<td>1.570</td>
<td>-.793</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Objetotal
b Objective. = 1

Objective. = 2

Model Summary(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.659(a)</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.74242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), New ways to improve skills, Willingness for new skills, Complete Assigned tasks, Fewer Errors
b Objective. = 2
The multiple regression analysis on cluster of executive with respect to achievement of objectives and change in the nature of employees after attending the training.

In this analysis the total score of achievement of organizational objectives is considered as dependent variables with respect to their 3 clusters and 4 variables of changes in the employees after participating in the training programs are considered as independent variables. The regression with respect to first cluster
of executives with F-value 3.062 do not explain any changes in the executives belong to cluster one after attending the training whereas the regression with respect to the second cluster of executives explain 43.3% of the variables of the achievement of objectives, with f-value 5.570 and in this cluster at 5% level of significance two changes completing the assigned tasks, finding ways to new skills with Beta values .726 and .622 respectively are explaining the total score of achievement of objectives in the second cluster. In the third cluster regression does not fit due to low frequency.

TABLE 30 : ASSOCIATION BETWEEN SATISFACTION AND CLUSTERS OF OBJECTIVES. (EXECUTIVES)

Overall Satisfaction* Recluster Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recluster</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some what Satisfied</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some what dissatisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.4 Overall Satisfaction and Cluster (Executives)
Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>9.201(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>9.776</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 1 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.08.

The association between overall satisfaction and the clusters of executives of achievement of organizational objectives – The non-parametric chi-square test is used to find variables and it is found at 5% level of significance, there is no association [chi-square =9.201] between clusters and overall satisfaction.

TABLE 31: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN SKILLS AND CLUSTERS OF OBJECTIVES. (EXECUTIVES) SKILL LEVEL OF EMPLOYEE* RECLUSTER CROSSTABULATION

Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Level of Employee</th>
<th>Recluster</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than Average</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morethan Average</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>13.375(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>13.441</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 1 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.72.

The association between skill level of the employees after attending the training and the clusters of executives in the achievement of organizational objectives is tested by the non-parametric chi-square test with chi-square value 13.375 at 5% level of significance. It is found that there is association between above mentioned variables. So, on the whole it is concluded that the satisfaction of the training is entirely different phenomenon of executives and it will not predict the achievement of the organizational goals whereas change in the skills of the employees in the view of executives predicts the achievement of organizational goals.

TABLE 32: IMPACT OF CHANGE IN BEHAVIOUR OF SUBORDINATES ON OBJECTIVES. (EXECUTIVES)

Objective. = 1

Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.806(a)</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.98535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Increased personal effectiveness, better team work, reduced employee complaints, Reduced absenteeism, Increased output.
b Objective. = 1
### ANOVA(b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.474</td>
<td>21.088</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Increased personal effectiveness, better team work, reduced employee complaints, Reduced absenteeism, Increased output  
b Dependent Variable: Objetotal  
c Objective. = 1

### Coefficients(a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>23.000</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>23.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better team work</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced absenteeism</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Output</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced Employee Complaints</td>
<td>-.643</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>-.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Personal Effectiveness</td>
<td>-3.200</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>-.739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Objetotal  
b Objective. = 1

c Objective. = 1

### Objective. = 2

### Model Summary(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.270(a)</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.93452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Reduced employee complaints, better team work, increased output.  
b Objective. = 2
The multiple regression analysis on the dependent variable achievement of objectives of organizational goals and the 5 independent variables behaviour of subordinates after attending training viz., better team work, reduced absenteeism, increased output, reduced employee complaints, increased personal effectiveness, with respect to 3 clusters of executives

In this analysis it is found that in the first cluster of executives who moderately believe that the training achieves the objectives of the organization, the regression with R-square value .649 and F-value 21.088 is highly
significant and the explanatory variable at 5% level of significance is increased personal effectiveness with Beta-value -.739 where as with respect to the second and third cluster the regression does not fit significantly.

So it is concluded that the executives in moderate cluster feel that the training increased the personal effectiveness of the employees which in turn helps to achieve the organizational objectives.

**TABLE 33 : IMPACT OF CHANGES OF SUBORDINATES IN BUILDING THE CLIMATE (EXECUTIVES)**

Climate = 1

**Model Summary(b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.388(a)</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>2.03476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Increased personal effectiveness, better team work, reduced absenteeism, reduced employee complaints.

b climate = 1

**ANOVA(b,c)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>30.164</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.541</td>
<td>1.821</td>
<td>.143(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>169.749</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199.913</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Increased personal effectiveness, better team work, reduced absenteeism, reduced employee complaints.

b Dependent Variable: Clitotal

c climate = 1
### Coefficients(a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>28.286</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>52.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better team work</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>2.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced absenteeism</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>1.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Employee Complaints</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Personal Effectiveness</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Dependent Variable: Clitotal  
b  climate = 1

### Climate = 2

### Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.562(a)</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>1.89698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), Increased Personal Effectiveness, Increased out put, Reduced employee complaints, Reduced absenteeism  
b  climate = 2

### ANOVA(b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>34.892</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.723</td>
<td>2.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>75.569</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110.462</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), Increased Personal Effectiveness, Increased out put, Reduced employee complaints, Reduced absenteeism  
b  Dependent Variable: Clitotal  
c  climate = 2
Coefficients(a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>23.000</td>
<td>1.897</td>
<td>12.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced absenteeism</td>
<td>-2.692</td>
<td>1.969</td>
<td>-.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Output</td>
<td>-5.000</td>
<td>2.323</td>
<td>-.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced Employee Complaints</td>
<td>-.800</td>
<td>2.078</td>
<td>-.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Personal Effectiveness</td>
<td>-3.000</td>
<td>2.078</td>
<td>-.574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Clitotal
b climate = 2

**Climate = 3**

Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.253(a)</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>2.64375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Reduced employee complaints, Reduced absenteeism, better team work
b climate = 3

ANOVA (b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>11.504</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.835</td>
<td>.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>167.746</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>179.250</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Reduced employee complaints, Reduced absenteeism, better team work
b Dependent Variable: Clitotal
c climate = 3
The linear multiple regression analysis on the dependent variable climate of the organization of executives and the independent variables better team work, reduced absenteeism, increased output, reduced employee complaints and increased personal effectiveness revealed that cluster one comprising the executives who feel the climate is not satisfactory does not fit good regression [F=1.821] but they are affected by the variable better team work, which has the impact on the first cluster [Beta .405] whereas the second cluster consists of moderate climate executives feel that the training reduce absenteeism with Beta value -.646 and the third cluster is not affected by any of the variables with F-.549 . so it is concluded that the behaviour of employees after attending the training is not that much building the good organizational climate

**TABLE 34 : THE IMPACT OF INPUT PROVIDERS AND OBJECTIVES (EXECUTIVES)**

**Regression**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), Subordinates, participants, Supervisors, Peers.

a  Dependent Variable: Clitotal
b  climate = 3
The linear multiple regression analysis on the dependent variable achievement of objectives of the organization of the executives and the 4 independent variables input providers of assessment of employees during training is performed and found that all the independent variables are equally explaining the variation of 41% \([f\text{-value 16.481}]\) of the variance of achievement of objectives of organization. The individual Beta values of 4 variables are -.809, -.622,-.683,-.351 respectively. It is concluded that to achieve the organizational objectives through training a collective effort is required from participants of training, supervisor and peers and subordinates.
TABLE 35: THE IMPACT OF DURATION ON THE ASPECTS OF TRAINING. (EXECUTIVES)

Multivariate Tests (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>803.105(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>803.105(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>42.718</td>
<td>803.105(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>42.718</td>
<td>803.105(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>2.479(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>2.479(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>2.479(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>2.479(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>2.479(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>1.152(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td>2.083(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objetotal</td>
<td>108.136(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108.136</td>
<td>8.593</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>28.784(c)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.784</td>
<td>7.474</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clitotal</td>
<td>19.482(d)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.482</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>14958.770</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14958.770</td>
<td>1708.959</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td>27598.290</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27598.290</td>
<td>1843.753</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objetotal</td>
<td>7345.870</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7345.870</td>
<td>583.713</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>4824.586</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4824.586</td>
<td>1252.786</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clitotal</td>
<td>12952.789</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12952.789</td>
<td>352.934</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Type III Sum of Squares</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objetotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>108.136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108.136</td>
<td>8.593</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.784</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.784</td>
<td>7.474</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clitotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.482</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.482</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>857.808</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td>1466.917</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>14.969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objetotal</td>
<td>1233.304</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>12.585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>377.406</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clitotal</td>
<td>3596.628</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>36.700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>88002.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td>162270.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objetotal</td>
<td>54980.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>33131.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clitotal</td>
<td>85813.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>858.960</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualtotal</td>
<td>1469.000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objetotal</td>
<td>1341.440</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectotal</td>
<td>406.190</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clitotal</td>
<td>3616.110</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .001 (Adjusted R Squared = -.009)
b R Squared = .081 (Adjusted R Squared = .071)
c R Squared = .071 (Adjusted R Squared = .061)
d R Squared = .005 (Adjusted R Squared = -.005)

The generalized linear model for the multiple dependent variables, elements of training programs, quality of training supportive program, achievement of objectives and climate of the organization and independent variable duration of training has given a result that the duration of the training creates the impact on achieving organizational goals, and to conduct a training supportive program in the department with F- values 8.593, and 7.474. thus duration of training do not have impact on the elements and quality of training.
**TABLE 36: IMPACT OF CULTURE ON ASPECTS OF TRAINING (EXECUTIVES)**

**Multivariate Tests(b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>8.878(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>8.878(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>8.878(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>8.878(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orculvatotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>1.555(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>1.555(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>1.555(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>1.555(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orculbetota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>3.882(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>3.882(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>3.882(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>3.882(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orculptotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>5.333(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>5.333(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>5.333(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>5.333(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **a** Exact statistic
- **b** Design: Intercept+Orculvatotal+Orculbetota+Orculptotal
Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Training Undergone Duration</td>
<td>6.595(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.198</td>
<td>2.110</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality Department</td>
<td>.310(b)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Work Culture</td>
<td>.791(c)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>2.406</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>2.301(d)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>4.123</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter Personal Skill</td>
<td>.528(e)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>3.878(f)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.293</td>
<td>11.402</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>.564(g)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>2.368</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer XL / Data Entry</td>
<td>.162(h)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Training Undergone Duration</td>
<td>4.690</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.690</td>
<td>4.502</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality Department</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Work Culture</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>1.645</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter Personal Skill</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>6.328</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>8.113</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer XL / Data Entry</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orculvatotal Training Undergone Duration</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality Department</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Work Culture</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>2.126</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>1.747</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter Personal Skill</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>6.768</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>1.804</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer XL / Data Entry</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orculbetota Training Undergone Duration</td>
<td>3.619</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.619</td>
<td>3.474</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality Department</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>2.142</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Work Culture</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>3.159</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>1.381</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter Personal Skill</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>2.054</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>1.418</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.418</td>
<td>12.508</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>2.903</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer XL / Data Entry</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orculproto Total</td>
<td>Training Undergone Duration</td>
<td>4.921</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.921</td>
<td>4.724</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality Department</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Work Culture</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>1.654</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>1.717</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.717</td>
<td>9.229</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter Personal Skill</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>2.859</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>2.543</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.543</td>
<td>22.436</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer XL / Data Entry</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>2.551</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Training Undergone Duration</td>
<td>99.995</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The organizational culture is already existing in the organization, so it is an important factor in deciding relevant areas of training and duration of the training program. This theory is transformed into the statistical domain systematically and the generalized linear model is carried on the respective independent and dependent variables. In the domain of executives, the culture is classified into 3 factors namely value in the organization, beliefs in the organization and practices in the organization. It is found from the analysis that values and beliefs in the organization predicts the total quality assurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Training Undergone</td>
<td>631.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality Department</td>
<td>13.800</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Work Culture</td>
<td>10.519</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>17.859</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter Personal Skill</td>
<td>12.912</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>10.882</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>7.626</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer XL / Data Entry</td>
<td>3.678</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Training Undergone</td>
<td>106.590</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality Department</td>
<td>14.110</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Work Culture</td>
<td>11.310</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>20.160</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter Personal Skill</td>
<td>13.440</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>14.760</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>8.190</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer XL / Data Entry</td>
<td>3.840</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **a** R Squared = .062 (Adjusted R Squared = .033)
- **b** R Squared = .022 (Adjusted R Squared = -.009)
- **c** R Squared = .070 (Adjusted R Squared = .041)
- **d** R Squared = .114 (Adjusted R Squared = .086)
- **e** R Squared = .039 (Adjusted R Squared = .009)
- **f** R Squared = .263 (Adjusted R Squared = .240)
- **g** R Squared = .069 (Adjusted R Squared = .040)
- **h** R Squared = .042 (Adjusted R Squared = .012)
[F=6.768; F=12.508] where as the present practices in the organization predicts team building F=9.229, total quality assurance F=22.436. So it is concluded that the culture of the organization is to construct team building, culture among the employees and producing good quality with efficiency assured and the duration of the training program is not depending on the organizational culture.

The multiple regression analysis on the dependent variable climate of the organization in view of executives, and the independent variables different areas of training undergone by the executives revealed that the independent variables explain 26.5% \([R\text{-square}=0.265]\) of the total variation in the climate and the personality development training alone predicts \([\text{Beta} = 0.577]\) the climate of the organization. Other training programs do not build the climatic conditions.

TABLE 37: CLUSTER WISE CLIMATE AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES. (EXECUTIVES)

Climate = 1

Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.443(a)</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>2.02959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Pay package, experience, designation, age, current position, Education
b climate = 1
### ANOVA (b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>39.262</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.544</td>
<td>1.589</td>
<td>.176(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>160.651</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199.913</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), f Pay package, experience, designation, age, current position, Education
b  Dependent Variable: Clitotal
c  climate = 1

### Coefficients(a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>24.065</td>
<td>2.267</td>
<td>10.615</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.384</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>2.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.596</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>-.261</td>
<td>-1.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>1.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Experience</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Pay</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>1.126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Dependent Variable: Clitotal
b  climate = 1
Climate = 2

### Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.844(a)</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>1.29306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), Pay package, experience, designation, age, current position, Education
b  climate = 2
## ANOVA(b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>78.694</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.116</td>
<td>7.844</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>31.768</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110.462</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Pay package, experience, designation, age, current position, Education
b Dependent Variable: Clitotal
c climate = 2

## Coefficients(a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>25.494</td>
<td>1.442</td>
<td>17.678</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>-.303</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>-.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-1.062</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>-.398</td>
<td>-1.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Experience</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>3.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Pay Package</td>
<td>-1.806</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>-.963</td>
<td>-3.789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Clitotal
b climate = 2

### Climate = 3

## Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.896(a)</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>1.29921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), pay package, designation, education, age, current position, experience
b climate = 3
The cluster wise multiple regression analysis on climate and the demographic variables of the executives gave rise to the result that in cluster one of climate of executives the regression is not significant \(f = 1.589\) and the independent variable age alone predicts the climate [Beta .467] whereas the second cluster regression possess \(R\)-square -.712 that is 71.2% variation of climate and predicts income and [Beta .677] total experience [beta -.963] in explaining the climate and finally the third cluster gave 80.2% \(R\)-square .802 of the variance of climate and the 4 independent variables education [Beta -
posting [Beta .530] experience [Beta 1.117] and income [Beta -.778] are having impact on the third cluster.

So, it is concluded that age is the important factor in the first cluster for their feeling about unsatisfactory climate, the variable experience and income are considered to be very important in building the good climate in the organization. Education and post gives extra satisfaction about the organizational climate.

**TABLE 38 : ORGANIZATIONAL OBJECTIVES AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES OF EXECUTIVES.**

**Objective. = 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.528(a)</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>1.42496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), pay package, designation, current position, age, education experience.
b  Objective. = 1

**ANOVA (b,c)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>44.006</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.334</td>
<td>3.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>113.708</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157.714</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), pay package, designation, current position, age, education experience.
b  Dependent Variable: Objetotal
c  Objective. = 1
Coefficients(a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>-.331</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>-.329</td>
<td>-2.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>1.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Experience</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Pay Package</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>2.638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Dependent Variable: Objetotal
b  Objective. = 1

Objective. = 2

Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.430(a)</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.92382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), pay package education, designation, age, current position, total experience.
b  Objective. = 2

ANOVA(b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5.222</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>1.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>23.043</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.265</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), pay package education, designation, age, current position, total experience
b  Dependent Variable: Objetotal
c  Objective. = 2
In achieving the organizational goal the demographic variables are considered as important factors so the regression analysis on this predicted in the first cluster of executives with respect to the dependent variable fits the good regression [F=3.612] and it predicts the designation of executives [Beta -.329] and salary of the executives with beta -.436 and second cluster with R-square .185 reveals that the variables do not fit good regression though the only independent variable post of the executive explain the variation in the achievement of organizational goals.

So it is inferred that the designation and salary of the executives are vital in explaining the effect of training to achieve the organizational goals.
TABLE 39: LINEAR MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR ASSOCIATES (OBJECTIVE, ELEMENTS, QUALITY, SUPPORTIVE PROGRAM, AREAS TO BE IMPROVED.)

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.405(a)</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>2.83584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Areatotal, Extotal, Qtotal, Efftotal

ANOVA(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>116.511</td>
<td>14.488</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>8.042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Areatotal, Extotal, Qtotal, Efftotal
b Dependent Variable: Objtotal

Coefficients(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>14.679</td>
<td>2.072</td>
<td>7.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qtotal</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Objtotal
In this analysis organizational objective is considered as dependent variable and elements of training program, quality of training program, effectiveness of the training supportive activities in the department and areas to be improved are considered as independent variables. The co-efficient of determination R-Square is .164 which reveals that the independent variables explain 16.4% variation in the organizational objective. The regression for these variables fits best. This is identified due to significant F-value 14.488.

It is found from the co-efficient table that the variable effective training supportive training program has significant contribution with Beta co-efficient value .251 followed by other two variables quality [Beta = .166] and area to be improved in the training program [Beta = .154] where as the elements of training program do not have significant contribution in the regression and do not explain the organizational objectives.

**Table 40 : GLM FOR ASSOCIATES, CULTURE, ALL THE ELEMENTS OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM (ASSOCIATES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypotheses df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>344.783(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>344.783(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>4.723</td>
<td>344.783(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>4.723</td>
<td>344.783(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcuvatotal</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>8.027(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>8.027(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>8.027(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>8.027(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcubetotal</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>4.340(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>4.340(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>4.340(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Hypothetical df</td>
<td>Error df</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>4.340(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcuprtotal</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>19.936(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>19.936(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>19.936(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>19.936(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcuprotota</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>3.271(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>3.271(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>3.271(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>3.271(a)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>292.000</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Exact statistic
b Design: Intercept+Orcuvatotal+Orcubetotal+Orcuprtotal+Orcuprotota

**Tests of Between-Subjects Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>9.192(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.298</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td>392.885(b)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98.221</td>
<td>14.658</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qtotal</td>
<td>1748.475(c)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>437.119</td>
<td>13.068</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td>571.117(d)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>142.779</td>
<td>15.084</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>4674.886</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4674.886</td>
<td>418.794</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td>1681.288</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1681.288</td>
<td>250.913</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qtotal</td>
<td>25916.532</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25916.532</td>
<td>774.775</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td>839.140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>839.140</td>
<td>88.651</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcuvatotal</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>2.441</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.441</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td>94.489</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94.489</td>
<td>14.101</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qtotal</td>
<td>6.213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.213</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td>229.877</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>229.877</td>
<td>24.285</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcubetotal</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td>12.999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.999</td>
<td>1.940</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qtotal</td>
<td>30.797</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.797</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td>93.556</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.556</td>
<td>9.884</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcuprtotal</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>4.775</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.775</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td>41.169</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.169</td>
<td>6.144</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qtotal</td>
<td>1035.511</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1035.511</td>
<td>30.957</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td>179.638</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>179.638</td>
<td>18.978</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcuprotota</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td>33.861</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.861</td>
<td>5.053</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Type III Sum of Squares</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>204.487</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>204.487</td>
<td>6.113</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.538</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.538</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exttotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>3293.005</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>11.163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1976.702</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>6.701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtotalt</td>
<td></td>
<td>9867.872</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>33.450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>2792.363</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>9.466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>149781.000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eff totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>103864.000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtotals</td>
<td></td>
<td>1036654.000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>60330.000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>3302.197</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eff totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>2369.587</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtotals</td>
<td></td>
<td>11616.347</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>3363.480</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .003 (Adjusted R Squared = .011)
b R Squared = .166 (Adjusted R Squared = .154)
c R Squared = .151 (Adjusted R Squared = .139)
d R Squared = .170 (Adjusted R Squared = .159)

The generalized linear model analysis deals with multiple dependent variables and multiple independent variables or co-variates. In this analysis, the different variables of organizational culture i.e., values in the organization, Beliefs in organization, Practices of organization are considered as multiple independent variables and the training variables like elements of training program, qualities of training program, effective training supportive program, areas to be improved in training program are considered as multiple dependent variables.

Generalized linear model clearly tests the effects between the multiple dependent and independent variables individually. The variable values in the organization do not have impact on the elements [F=.219]and quality of training program [F=.186], whereas it has very good impact over effective supportive training program[F=14.10]and areas to be improved in training program [F=24..285]. Therefore it is inferred that the organizational culture prevailing is to increase the effective training program rather than to introduce the innovations in the training program.
Similarly, beliefs in the organization do not have impact on the elements of training [F=.039] qualities of training [F=.921] and effective supportive training program [F=1.94] where it has very good impact over the areas to be improved in training with significant F-value of 9.884.

The two variables practices in the organization completely explain one variable, quality, effective supportive training program and areas to be improved in the training program with respective F-value F=6.144,F-30.957 and F=18.978 and they do not affect the elements of training program.

It is inferred on the whole that the culture of the organization affects the training supportive training program in the departments, quality of training program new innovative ideas in the training program. They do not fix the elements constantly to reach the organizational objectives.

Table 41 : CLUSTER ANALYSIS FOR CLIMATE OF ASSOCIATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Cluster Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clitotal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clitotal</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>29.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Cases in Each Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>300.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph : 4.5 Cluster Analysis for Climate (Associates)

**Discriminant**

Tests of Equality of Group Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rewards outweighing threats</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>17.750</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Team</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>83.413</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing Boss</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>114.062</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belongingness</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>124.225</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring about team</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>134.017</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting Relationship</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>108.946</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Demands Synergy</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>60.362</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY OF CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS**

Eigenvalues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.287(a)</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.164(a)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a First 2 canonical discriminant functions were used in the analysis.
The climate scores of associates are classified into 3 clusters by K-means cluster analysis. In this analysis out of the total of 300 associates, 119 of them belong to cluster 1 with mean of 15.16; 126 of them belong to cluster 2 with a mean of 19.94 and third cluster consists of 55 associates with mean 29.02 in the company. The first cluster of associates feel the organizational climate is not satisfactory and the associates of the second and third cluster feel satisfactory and good organizational climate prevailing in the company.

The classified associate clusters with respect to organizational climate are subject of reliability using the discriminant analysis. In this analysis with respect to variables of organizational climate, the classified clusters are highly reliable due to the F-values for each climate variables and the canonical correlation for each function .929 and .375 and chi-square values 629.499 and 44.607 are highly significant to verify the reliability of cluster analysis.

**TABLE 42 : CLUSTER WISE IMPACT OF TRAINING ON THE CLIMATE OF ASSOCIATES.**

**Regression**

**Climate = 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.455(a)</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>1.79280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Areatotal, Qtotal, Extotal, Efftotal
b climate = 1
ANOVA (b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>95.553</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.888</td>
<td>7.432</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>366.413</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3.214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>461.966</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Areatotal, Qtotal, Extotal, Efftotal  
b Dependent Variable: Clitotal  
c climate = 1

Coefficients (a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized</td>
<td>Standardized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Coefficients</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>18.322</td>
<td>2.492</td>
<td>7.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qtotal</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td>-.411</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>-.421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Clitotal  
b climate = 1

Climate = 2

Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.305(a)</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>1.83538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Areatotal, Extotal, Qtotal, Efftotal  
b climate = 2
ANOVA(b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.473</td>
<td>3.109</td>
<td>.018(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Areatotal, Extotal, Qtotal, Efftotal
b Dependent Variable: Clitotal
c climate = 2

Coefficients (a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>21.259</td>
<td>2.519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qtotal</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Clitotal
b climate = 2

Climate = 3

Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.510(a)</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>2.28582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Areatotal, Efftotal, Extotal, Qtotal
b climate = 3
### ANOVA(b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>91.733</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.933</td>
<td>4.389</td>
<td>.004(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>261.249</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>352.982</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Areatotal, Efftotal, Extotal, Qtotal  
b Dependent Variable: Clitotal  
c climate = 3

### Coefficients (a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>17.259</td>
<td>3.608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>1.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtotal</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>3.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>1.593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Clitotal  
b climate = 3

The linear multiple regression analysis is carried over the dependent variable organizational climate and the independent variables elements of training, quality of training program, effects of supportive training program and the areas to be improved in training.

This analysis is carried with respect to cluster of organizational climate, the first cluster regression significantly fits to explain the climate, the independent variable explain 20.7% of the variation of climate with f-value 7.432, In the variance areas to be improves in training contributes 42.2% of
20.7% of the total variation with beta value -0.421. The regression of cluster 2 indicates 9.3% of the variation of organizational climate, and the F=value 3.109 indicates the good fit of regression. In this regression two variables quality, area have good impact on the organizational climate and the regression with respect to the third cluster is significant with F=value 4.389 and variance 26% of the total variation of climate and the independent variable quality of the training program alone explains the variation in climate with beta value .448.

It is concluded that the associates in the non-satisfactory clusters feel certain areas in the training program needs improvement where as second cluster associates feel both quality and supportive training program in the departments have to be improved and third cluster associates feel to make the training successful, the quality must be improved.

**TABLE 43 : CLUSTER ANALYSIS FOR OBJECTIVES OF ASSOCIATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Cluster Centers</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objtotal</td>
<td>27.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Cases in each Cluster</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>216.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>300.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are two clusters identified in the associates. These two clusters are internally homogeneous and externally heterogeneous. The first cluster has the center 27.45 and the second cluster has the center 22.11. With the respective frequencies 216 and 84. The associates in the first cluster feel that the training program are in favour of meeting out all the organizational objectives and the second cluster associates feel that the organizational objectives are not met by the training programs.

The reliability of the classification of clusters is subjected to reliability test using discriminant analysis. In this analysis all the 7 variables of organizational objectives are significant in explaining the clusters obtained. With significant F-values and wilk’sLambda, the discriminant function exhibit a highly significant correlation co-efficient .801 and chi-square value 302.383 to support the reliability of 2 cluster classification of organizational objectives.
TABLE 44: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CLUSTERS OF ASSOCIATES AND CHANGES AFTER ATTENDING THE TRAINING

Behavioural Change After Training* Objectives

Cross tab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural Change After Training</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.7 Behavioural change (Associates)
Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.801(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction(a)</td>
<td>1.466</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.787</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Computed only for a 2x2 table
b  0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33.88.

Psychological * Objectives

Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.8 Psychological Change (Associates)
Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Computed only for a 2x2 table
b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 40.88.

Physical * Objectives

Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 4.9 Physical Change (Associates)

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.052(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction(a)</td>
<td>7.326</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>7.963</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>8.025</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Computed only for a 2x2 table  
b  0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 34.16.
All the Above * Objectives

Crosstab

Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All the Above</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.10 All the above Change (Associates)

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>10.170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction(a)</td>
<td>8.902</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>9.220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear</td>
<td>10.136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Computed only for a 2x2 table
b  0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.24.
The non-parametric chi-square test is performed on the two variables cluster of associates on objectives and the four variables of changes experienced after attending the training viz. Behavioural changes, psychological changes, physical changes and all the above.

It is found in the analysis that there is no association between behavioural changes [chi-square 1.801] and psychological changes [chi-square - .051] and cluster of associates on the basis of achievement of objectives with the help of training programs. However it is ascertained that there is association between all the 3 variables and the cluster of associates simultaneously with chi-square 10.170.

So it is concluded that both types of cluster associates demand that their training program should comprise of elements oriented with behaviour, psychology, physical qualities to achieve the organizational objectives.

**TABLE 45 : ORGANIZATION CULTURE AND ITS IMPACT ON DIFFERENT AREAS OF TRAINING UNDERGONE BY THE ASSOCIATES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>4.038(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>4.038(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>4.038(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>4.038(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcuvatotal</td>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>5.486(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>5.486(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>5.486(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>5.486(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcubetotal</td>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>2.246(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>2.246(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>2.246(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Hypothesis df</td>
<td>Error df</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>2.246(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcuprototal</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>6.038(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>6.038(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>6.038(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>6.038(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcuprototal</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>3.343(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>3.343(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>3.343(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>3.343(a)</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>288.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Exact statistic  

b Design: Intercept+Orcuvatotal+Orcubetotal+Orcuprototal+Orcuprototal

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Good Manufacturing Practice</td>
<td>1.178(a)</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>4.524</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Work Culture</td>
<td>1.062(b)</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>4.451</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>1.877(c)</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>3.961</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>.488(d)</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>12.607(e)</td>
<td>3.152</td>
<td>6.574</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter Personal Skills</td>
<td>2.434(f)</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>4.576</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>4.990(g)</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>3.217</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>.391(h)</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>2.827</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Good Manufacturing Practice</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>2.412</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Work Culture</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>6.038</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>3.290</td>
<td>3.290</td>
<td>6.861</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intr Personal Skills</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcuvatotal</td>
<td>Good Manufacturing Practice</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>12.158</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Work Culture</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>7.858</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Type III Sum of Squares</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>5.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter Personal Skills</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>6.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>1.472</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.472</td>
<td>3.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcubetotal</td>
<td>Good Manufacturing Practice</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Work Culture</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>1.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>6.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>1.639</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.639</td>
<td>3.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter Personal Skills</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>2.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>2.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>2.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcupertotal</td>
<td>Good Manufacturing Practice</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>1.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Work Culture</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>1.203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.203</td>
<td>10.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>2.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter Personal Skills</td>
<td>1.344</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.344</td>
<td>10.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>3.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcuprotota</td>
<td>Good Manufacturing Practice</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>4.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Work Culture</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>1.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter Personal Skills</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>1.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>3.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>4.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Good Manufacturing Practice</td>
<td>19.208</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Work Culture</td>
<td>17.604</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>34.959</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>96.109</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>141.430</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Type III Sum of Squares</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter Personal Skills</td>
<td>39.232</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>114.406</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>10.205</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Good Manufacturing Practice</td>
<td>22.000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Work Culture</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>43.000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>109.000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>213.000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter Personal Skills</td>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>125.000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>11.000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Good Manufacturing Practice</td>
<td>20.387</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Work Culture</td>
<td>18.667</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>36.837</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>96.597</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>154.037</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter Personal Skills</td>
<td>41.667</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>119.397</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>10.597</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  R Squared = .058 (Adjusted R Squared = .045)  
b  R Squared = .057 (Adjusted R Squared = .044)  
c  R Squared = .051 (Adjusted R Squared = .038)  
d  R Squared = .005 (Adjusted R Squared = -.008)  
e  R Squared = .082 (Adjusted R Squared = .069)  
f  R Squared = .058 (Adjusted R Squared = .046)  
g  R Squared = .042 (Adjusted R Squared = .029)  
h  R Squared = .037 (Adjusted R Squared = .024)
The Generalized linear model [GLM] is used to find the impact of four variables of organizational culture values in the organization, beliefs in the organization, leadership practice in the organization, changes in the organization on the different training programs. Good manufacturing practice, positive work culture, safety, emergency preparedness, team building, interpersonal skill, total quality assurance and time management.

In this analysis, it is found that the generalized linear model fits significantly and the values in the organization predicts good manufacturing practice F=12.16; positive work culture F=7.86, safety F=5.25 Interpersonal skills F=6.39 and quality assurance F=3.8 at 5% level of significance. Beliefs of the organization predicts safety training program with F-value 6.508, Leadership in the organization predicts safety with F=10.152 and interpersonal skills with F-value 10.110, whereas the changes in the organization predicts Good manufacturing practice F=4.878 and time management F=4.489 at 5% level of significance.

So it is inferred that the prevailing organizational culture is always in favour of refining manufacture by means of refining the associates on positive work culture, interpersonal skills, and time management aimed at smooth administration, and the only aspect they view in the point of associates is their safety alone.

**TABLE 46 : DIFFERENT TRAINING PROGRAM AND THEIR IMPACT ON BUILDING CLIMATE OF ASSOCIATES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.582(a)</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>1.66715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Time Managment, Good Manufacturing Practice, Total Quality Assurance, Positive Work Culture, Safety, Interpersonal Skills, Emergency Preparedness, Team Building.
b climate = 1
ANOVA (b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>156.232</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.529</td>
<td>7.026</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>305.735</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>461.966</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Time Management, Good Manufacturing Practice, Total Quality Assurance, Positive work Culture
b Dependent Variable: Clitotal
c climate = 1

Coefficients (a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>16.977</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Manufacturing Practice</td>
<td>-6.977</td>
<td>1.243</td>
<td>-.455</td>
<td>-.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Work Culture</td>
<td>-2.997</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>-.358</td>
<td>-.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>-2.565</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>-.456</td>
<td>-.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>-1.341</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>-.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>-.621</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>-.303</td>
<td>-.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter Personal Skills</td>
<td>-2.311</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>-.420</td>
<td>-.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>-2.977</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>-.272</td>
<td>-.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>-2.406</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>-.287</td>
<td>-.238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Clitotal
b climate = 1

c Climate = 2

Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.252(a)</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>1.88862</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Total Quality Assurance, Good Manufacturing practice, Positive work culture, Emergency Preparedness, Interpersonal Skills, Safety, Team Building
b climate = 2
### ANOVA (b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>28.598</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.085</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>.340(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>420.894</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3.567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>449.492</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Total Quality Assurance, Good Manufacturing practice, Positive work culture, Emergency Preparedness, Interpersonal Skills, Safety, Team Building  

b. Dependent Variable: Clitotal  
c. climate = 2

### Coefficients (a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>20.192</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>41.739</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Manufacturing Practice</td>
<td>-.792</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>-.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Work Culture</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>-.942</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>-1.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter Personal Skills</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Quality Assurance</td>
<td>-.368</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>-1.697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Clitotal  
b. climate = 2

### Climate = 3

### Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.646(a)</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>2.09183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Time Management, Team Building, Interpersonal Skills, Good manufacturing practice, Emergency Preparedness, safety, Total quality assurance  
b. climate = 3
The linear multiple regression analysis is performed on the dependent variable total score on climate and the independent variables different training program undergone by the associates. The analysis is refined by analyzing with respect to 3 clusters of climate of the organization. In first cluster in which associates feel the climate is not satisfactory, the regression significant fits with F-value 7.026 and the different training program explains 33.8% of the total variation in climate and simultaneous negative values of Beta.
indicates significance of all the 8 training programs in building the climate of organization with respect to the associates who are not satisfied by the climate.

In the case of second cluster, the regression does not fit properly [f-value 1.145] that is it is found that the associates who are moderately satisfied by the climate of the organization feels training do not predict the climate where as third cluster with the associates of good satisfaction feel that the training programs on team building, interpersonal skills, quality assurance, time management predicts good climatic condition in the organization with the variation of 41.7% [R-square - .417] of the total variance of the climate .

It is concluded that the associates who are not satisfied have more concentration on production side training, behavioural training and psychological training associated with advanced technologies, the second cluster associates are unambitious about the climate as well as their personal development. Where as the third cluster of associates want the refinement on certain training program to build a perfect climate.

Table 47 : DURATION OF THE TRAINING AND DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF TRAINING PROGRAM (ASSOCIATES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>903.172(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>294.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>903.172(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>294.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>15.360</td>
<td>903.172(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>294.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>15.360</td>
<td>903.172(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>294.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>6.044(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>294.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>6.044(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>294.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>6.044(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>294.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>6.044(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>294.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Exact statistic
b Design: Intercept+m
# Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.147(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.147</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.392(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.392</td>
<td>6.475</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.520(c)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.520</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>208.860(d)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208.860</td>
<td>19.730</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clitotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>352.126(e)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>352.126</td>
<td>12.878</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>12019.400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12019.400</td>
<td>1086.030</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td>9301.479</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9301.479</td>
<td>1195.174</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qtotal</td>
<td>83867.938</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83867.938</td>
<td>2156.058</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td>6564.122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6564.122</td>
<td>620.077</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clitotal</td>
<td>13004.939</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13004.939</td>
<td>475.631</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>4.147</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.147</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td>50.392</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.392</td>
<td>6.475</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qtotal</td>
<td>24.520</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.520</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td>208.860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208.860</td>
<td>19.730</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clitotal</td>
<td>352.126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>352.126</td>
<td>12.878</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>3298.050</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>11.067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td>2319.195</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>7.783</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qtotal</td>
<td>11591.826</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>38.899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td>3154.620</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>10.586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clitotal</td>
<td>8148.061</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>27.342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>149781.000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td>103864.000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qtotal</td>
<td>1036654.000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td>60330.000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clitotal</td>
<td>125006.000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Extotal</td>
<td>3302.197</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efftotal</td>
<td>2369.587</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qtotal</td>
<td>11616.347</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areatotal</td>
<td>3363.480</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clitotal</td>
<td>8500.187</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a R Squared = .001 (Adjusted R Squared = -.002)
- b R Squared = .021 (Adjusted R Squared = .018)
- c R Squared = .002 (Adjusted R Squared = -.001)
- d R Squared = .062 (Adjusted R Squared = .059)
- e R Squared = .041 (Adjusted R Squared = .038)
The Generalised linear model is used to find the impact of duration on the above mentioned five dependent variable and it is found that effective training supportive training program in the department, areas to be improved in the training programs, and organizational climate are predicted with the respective F-values 6.475, 19.730 and 12.878. So it is concluded as the duration of the training program increases the associates like to refine the training program to be more effective to build conducive organizational climate for the growth of the organization.

**TABLE 48 : ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CLUSTERS OF CLIMATE AND ORGANIZATIONAL OBJECTIVES AND PERSONAL VARIABLES OF ASSOCIATES.**

**Currently Posted * Climate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posted In</th>
<th>Climate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts / Finance</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Office</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 4.11 Current Position and Climate (Associates)

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>39.408(a)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>39.319</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 2 cells (7.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.57.

Age* Climate

Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Climate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 35 Years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 40 Years</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40 Years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 4.12 Age and Climate (Associates)

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>21.859(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>22.465</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.63.
Total Experience * Climate

Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Experience</th>
<th>Climate 1</th>
<th>Climate 2</th>
<th>Climate 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 Years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 Years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 15 Years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 15 Years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 4.13 Experience and Climate (Associates)**

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>20.312(a)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>22.468</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>1.378</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.07.
Monthly Remuneration * Climate

Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Remuneration</th>
<th>Climate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 10000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000 – 15000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15000 – 20000</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20000 above</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.14 Monthly Remuneration and Climate (Associates)

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>20.310</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>17.608</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear</td>
<td>1.492</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.23.
Currently Posted * Objectives

**Crosstab**

**Count**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts / Finance</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Office</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>216</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.15 Current Position (Associates)
Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>20.252(a)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>19.467</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>3.244</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 2 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.92.

Age * Objectives

Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 35 Years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 40 Years</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40 Years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.16 Age and Objectives (Associates)
Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.141(a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Assoc.</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.24.

**Total Experience * Objectives**

**Crosstab**

**Count**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Experience</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 Years</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 Years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 15 Years</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 15 Years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 4.17 Total Experience and Objectives (Associates)**
Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>13.361(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>13.156</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.32.

Monthly Remuneration* Objectives

Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 10000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000 – 15000</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15000 – 20000</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20000 above</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.18 Monthly Remuneration and Objectives (Associates)
Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>4.375(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>4.415</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>2.221</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.52.

The non-parametric chi-square is performed on the above mentioned two variables to exhibit the association. It is found that the post of associates [chi-square- 39.408] age [chi-square -21.859],

Total experience [chi-square-20.312] Monthly remuneration [chi-square -20.300] have good association with the two clusters of climate and in the case of cluster of organizational objectives, it has one association with position [chi-square -20.252] , total experience [chi-square -13.361] of associates and do not have association with age [chi-square -1.141] and monthly remuneration chi-square 4.375 of the associates. So it is concluded that climate of the organization depends upon all the personal variables of associates and the achievement of organizational objectives through training depends on the post, experience of the associates because these two factors increase the responsibilities of the associates and helpful to realize the objectives of the organization.

Impact of personal variables on the cluster of associates in organizational climate

The linear multiple regression analysis on the dependent variable climate of the organization with respect to the cluster of associates and the independent personal variable of the associates and the analysis revealed that with respect to cluster 1 the personal variable salary of the associates is predicted with one
Beta value .349 and the R-square value of the regression .115. In the case of the second cluster regression, no personal variable is predicted and regression is considered as unsuitable with F-value .887 and in the regression with respect to the third cluster with regression co-efficient .150, only one personal variable experience is predicted with the negative Beta value -.388.

So it is concluded that the personal variables salary and total experience of the associates play a vital role in building a constructive organizational climate for the satisfaction of the associates.
CHAPTER - V

MOTIVATIONAL PRACTICES

INTRODUCTION

Motivation is a perennial organizational problem. The context in which this problem arises, however, changes with economic conditions and social values. The organizational context of employee motivation changed dramatically during the 1990s with increasing job insecurity, rapid developments in new technology affecting job skills, with the pressures of constant change and unpredictability and with work intensification that followed the introduction of organizational approaches such as downsizing.

Motivation in the traditional sense would imply the existence of a drive in an individual for fulfilling certain objectives. It constitutes an integral part of a scientific endeavour to interpret human behaviour. The changing environmental conditions make the motivation issues and problems even more complex and pragmatic. In short, motivation could be on account of an urge within or on account of a stimulus coming from the environment. The urge within, will be determined by the process of socialization that an individual has gone through.

In realizing the importance of human resources in recent years, management efforts have been directed towards harnessing the human resources. Motivational concepts play a major role in most serious efforts to analyze and explain the individual’s behavior at work. Motivation is the
unifying concept for human behaviour and cuts across principles of industrial psychology. Motivation to work is a human state where the competence to work and the will to work fuse together.

**MEANING**

Technically the term motivation can be traced to the latin word `movere’ which means ‘to move’. To understand the concept of motivation three terms need to be defined – motive, motivating and motivation and their relationship. Motive is an inner state that energizes, activates or moves and that directs behaviour towards goals.¹ Motivating is a term which implies that one person in the organizational context induces another to engage in action [work behaviour] by ensuring that a channel to satisfy the motive becomes available and accessible to the individual.

The word motivation is understood in different ways such as aims, desire, intuition, impulse, end, purpose etc., Motivation is a psychological phenomenon. It refers to those forces operating within an individual which compel him to act or not to act in a certain way.

When the term “motivation” is used in the context of work motivation, the definition of motivation is similar to that given by vroom [2011] that is voluntary involvement in work. In that sense, work motivation has come to mean work satisfaction, commitment to work, involvement in work. ²

---

MOTIVATION IN PEPSICO

It is generally found that a group of employees require understanding and appreciation of their role in the organization so as to motivate them to coordinate towards higher productivity of the organization. HRD efforts can address to this need. Human energies are properly utilized when certain stimuli is provided to a dormant urge or potential which may otherwise remain undeveloped, unutilized. The conditions are to be created to motivate an employee or group to utilize their energies on the job fully and properly then, he or the group can be said to have been motivated. In PepsiCo, the employees are prepared for accepting higher responsibilities whenever promoted and are prepared to put additional effort in terms of improving skills, knowledge and behavior. Preparation for future job requirements starts in the company much in advance. For technical staff, importance is given to experience and qualification for promotion. About the target incentives the management has signed LTS [long term settlement] with workers in which variable pay has been introduced. The pay is fixed according to KPI {Key performance indices} numbers. The other motivational techniques include promotions based on single merit where double increment is given or double merit system where triple increment is provided. Apart from the above, celebrations on special achievements too are arranged by having picnics or gifts. The corporate image is the highest priority followed in PepsiCo, corporate etiquette explains how the employees move well within the organization. Yearly once all the employees are provided certain gifts especially gift for appreciation of work which may include cell phones, watches, LG compo drive etc., Appreciation given to the associates if they work in teams. Transfers and promotions are purely based on
merit and the associates are appraised every half year. Regarding appraisal the following categories are framed – Exceeding all, exceeding most, meeting all, meeting most and lower grade which is the last stage. Timeliness in work, client quality, leadership quality, how a particular employee is helpful to others are some of the aspects that are considered for reaching the stages in the appraisal system.¹

**Work environment**

**INTRODUCTION**

The efficiency of employees depends to a great extent on the environment in which they work. It consists of all the factors, which act and react on the body and mind of an employee. Under industrial psychology the physical, mental, and social conditions in which people work is the work environment. The primary aim is to create an environment, which ensures the greatest ease of work and removes all the causes of annoyance, anxiety and worry. If the work environment is congenial, fatigue, monotony and boredom are minimized and work performance can be maximized.

Elements of work environment:

Physical environment – It includes proper lighting, ventilation, Temperature, noise level and the like.

Mental environment – It consists of psychological factors, which influence the attitudes, behaviour and performance of a worker. Leadership

¹ Source: Company Records.
provided to workers is an important part of mental environment. A co-operative and sympathetic leader can inspire workers to put their best.

Social environment – It refers to the group to which a worker belongs. Workers develop a sense of belonging to their group. The norms and leaders of the group influence significantly the attitudes and behaviour of its individual workers.

Thus the management should understand and make constructive use of groups. ¹

WORK ENVIRONMENT AT PEPSICO

The employees in PepsiCo work for 300 days in a year comprising of 8 hours in a shift every day. The Human resource department constantly coaches workmen along with functional people on technical and personal knowledge improvements. The company values its employees. Gone are the days when the employees could be treated like machines, currently they are most indispensable asset for any organization and hence human treatment is the principle followed. ‘Flexitime’ is the option given to the employees with regard to time to depict their best talent that is intact with them. The office furniture, space utilization, factory premises provide a productive atmosphere which improves the quality of work life. The employee’s surroundings make more pleasant and conducive to working. Matching the environment to the employees is a major function of human resources. Sometimes, the employees

¹ Human Resource Management, C.B.Gupta Sultan Chand and Sons, V ed. Pg.7.3-7.5.
make it possible to work on Sundays too. The satisfactory level of the employees with respect to working in PepsiCo is 80%. Each employee takes pride in work, does job well, expresses views clearly and makes impact with presentations.

The middle level supervisors focuses on bottom line, controls costs, sets ambitious targets, exploits opportunities for self-development, motivates the team members, delegates tasks effectively, handles pressures and stress, stays calm and handles issues as far as possible within his decision making capability. The Union scenario is divided into two at the plant. There are many issues prevailing with the workers. The executives handle the issues objectively, irrespective of which union they belong to. Issues are dealt then and there and anything concerned with discipline is not comprised at all.

**ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

The organization culture is the important variable to decide the motivating factors and interpersonal relationships for the executives. The motivating factors, interpersonal relationships total scores are taken for dependent variables to carry out multiple general linear model analysis.
TABLE: 49 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MOTIVATION, INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP, ORGANIZATION CULTURE:

MULTIVARIATE TESTS(B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>23.187(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>97.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>23.187(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>97.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>23.187(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>97.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>23.187(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>97.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture.</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>10.157(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>97.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>10.157(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>97.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>10.157(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>97.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>10.157(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>97.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Exact statistic
b  Design: Intercept+Culture

TESTS OF BETWEEN-SUBJECTS EFFECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>207.249(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>207.249</td>
<td>9.440</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter personal</td>
<td>252.897(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>252.897</td>
<td>14.425</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>874.907</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>874.907</td>
<td>39.852</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter personal</td>
<td>235.970</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>235.970</td>
<td>13.460</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>207.249</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>207.249</td>
<td>9.440</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter personal</td>
<td>252.897</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>252.897</td>
<td>14.425</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>2151.501</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>21.954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter personal</td>
<td>1718.093</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>17.532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>174999.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter personal</td>
<td>89055.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>2358.750</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter personal</td>
<td>1970.990</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  R Squared = .088 (Adjusted R Squared = .079)  (2.2)
b  R Squared = .128 (Adjusted R Squared = .119)
From the above table it is found that the generalized linear model fits significantly \( F=10.157 \) at 5% level of significance. The independent variable organization culture has significant impact on both motivation \( F=9.44 \) and interpersonal relationships \( F=14.425 \). So the motivating factors and interpersonal relationships experienced by the executives are depending on the existing organizational culture.,

2. The elements of organization culture and their respective impact on motivation and interpersonal relationships:

The organization culture has important elements stated in the questionnaire: a) values in the organization; b) beliefs in the organization; c) practices in the organization.

It is ventured through multivariate analysis in order to know the corresponding effects of elements of organization culture on motivation and interpersonal relationships.

**TABLE 50 : THE ELEMENTS OF ORGANIZATION CULTURE AND THEIR RESPECTIVE IMPACT ON MOTIVATION AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS:**

Multivariate Tests (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>22.889(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture value</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>22.889(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture value</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>22.889(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture value</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>22.889(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture value</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>5.537(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture value</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>5.537(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture value</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>5.537(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture value</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>5.537(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture belief</td>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>2.670(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>2.670(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>2.670(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>2.670(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture practice</td>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>6.659(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>6.659(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>6.659(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>6.659(a)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Exact statistic  
b  Design: Intercept+Culture value+Culture belief+Culture practice.

### TESTS OF BETWEEN-SUBJECTS EFFECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>339.736(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113.245</td>
<td>5.385</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>352.164(b)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117.388</td>
<td>6.961</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter personal</td>
<td>953.574</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>953.574</td>
<td>45.341</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture value</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>98.380</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98.380</td>
<td>5.834</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter personal</td>
<td>28.504</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.504</td>
<td>1.355</td>
<td>.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Belief</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>185.362</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>185.362</td>
<td>10.992</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter personal</td>
<td>39.077</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.077</td>
<td>1.858</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Practice</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>39.749</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.749</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>279.617</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>279.617</td>
<td>13.295</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter personal</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>2019.014</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>21.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter personal</td>
<td>1618.826</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>16.863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>174999.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter personal</td>
<td>89055.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  R Squared = .144 (Adjusted R Squared = .117)  
b  R Squared = .179 (Adjusted R Squared = .153)
From the above table it is found that the element of culture belief is not properly explaining the Linear Model \([F=2.670]\) However, the other two elements value \([F=5.537]\) practice \([F=6.659]\) are explaining the dependent variable significantly. The value of the organization makes good impact \([F=10.992]\) on interpersonal relationships and practice creates impact on motivation \([F=13.295]\) significantly.

So it is concluded that executives feel that if the values are given to the potentials of the employees it increases smooth relationships among them to avoid conflict management. General practices like attention to new technology and appreciation motivates the employees in a good way.

**Impact of culture and its elements on the opinion of executives about the organization on the basis of work, people, pay, superior, promotion:**

The Generalized linear model for culture and opinion fits significantly \([F=7.716]\)

**TABLE 51 : GLM FOR CULTURE (EXECUTIVES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>4.711(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture.</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>4.711(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>4.711(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>4.711(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>7.716(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>7.716(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>7.716(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>7.716(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>7.716(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Exact statistic  
b  Design: Intercept+Culture
Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>30.991(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.991</td>
<td>2.360</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>250.877(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250.877</td>
<td>11.586</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>34.101(c)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.101</td>
<td>6.239</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>156.112(d)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156.112</td>
<td>21.050</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>26.518(e)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.518</td>
<td>6.853</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>181.706</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>181.706</td>
<td>13.836</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>14.470</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.470</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>43.920</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.920</td>
<td>8.036</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>5.446</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.446</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>8.955</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.955</td>
<td>2.314</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>30.991</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.991</td>
<td>2.360</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>250.877</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250.877</td>
<td>11.586</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>34.101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.101</td>
<td>6.239</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>156.112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156.112</td>
<td>21.050</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>26.518</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.518</td>
<td>6.853</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1287.009</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>2122.113</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>21.654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>535.609</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5.465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>726.798</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>7.416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>379.242</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>33718.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>36635.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>14423.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>20399.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>6304.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1318.000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>2372.990</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>569.710</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>882.910</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>405.760</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .024 (Adjusted R Squared = .014)  
b R Squared = .106 (Adjusted R Squared = .097)  
c R Squared = .060 (Adjusted R Squared = .050)  
d R Squared = .177 (Adjusted R Squared = .168)  
e R Squared = .065 (Adjusted R Squared = .056)
From the above table culture creates good impact on people \([F=11.586]\) Pay \([F=6.239]\) superior \([F=21.050]\) Promotion \([F=6.853]\) and concept work \([F=2.360]\). so almost the positive opinion about the above elements is depending very much upon culture of the organization. Now the same analysis \{GLM\} is carried out for the elements of the organization culture and the opinion to analyze further

**Multivariate Tests(b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>4.411(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>4.411(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>4.411(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>4.411(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture value</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>15.561(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>15.561(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>15.561(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>15.561(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Belief</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>3.220(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>3.220(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>3.220(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>3.220(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Practice</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>13.447(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>13.447(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>13.447(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>13.447(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Exact statistic
b  Design: Intercept+Orculvatotal+Orculbetota+Orculprtotal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>125.270(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41.757</td>
<td>3.361</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>837.475(b)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>279.158</td>
<td>17.453</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>203.215(c)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67.738</td>
<td>17.743</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>201.864(d)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67.288</td>
<td>9.485</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>56.643(e)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.881</td>
<td>5.192</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>148.915</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>148.915</td>
<td>11.986</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>182.367</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>182.367</td>
<td>11.402</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>24.444</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.444</td>
<td>3.446</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>6.734</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.734</td>
<td>1.852</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture value</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>24.046</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.046</td>
<td>1.935</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>13.487</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.487</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>132.251</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>132.251</td>
<td>34.642</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>3.817</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.817</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>39.595</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.595</td>
<td>10.888</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Belief</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>92.375</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92.375</td>
<td>7.435</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>111.738</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111.738</td>
<td>6.986</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>23.316</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.316</td>
<td>6.107</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>9.962</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.962</td>
<td>2.739</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Practice</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>4.780</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.780</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>835.794</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>835.794</td>
<td>52.254</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>42.808</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.808</td>
<td>11.213</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>161.965</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>161.965</td>
<td>22.830</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>10.750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.750</td>
<td>2.956</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1192.730</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12.424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>1535.515</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>15.995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>366.495</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>681.046</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7.094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>349.117</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>33718.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>36635.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Type III Sum of Squares</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>14423.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>20399.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>6304.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1318.000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>2372.990</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>569.710</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>882.910</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>405.760</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  R Squared = .095 (Adjusted R Squared = .067)
b  R Squared = .353 (Adjusted R Squared = .333)
c  R Squared = .357 (Adjusted R Squared = .337)
d  R Squared = .229 (Adjusted R Squared = .205)
e  R Squared = .140 (Adjusted R Squared = .113)

The elements of the organizational culture explains the good variation on the five opinions of the executives with f values 15.561, 3.22,13.447 respectively. From the table of tests of between subjects effects, it is ascertained that values in the culture predicts pay and promotion [F=10.888] beliefs of the culture explains work nature [F=7.435] People [F= 6.986] Pay [F=6.107] whereas general practice in the organization culture creates good impact on people [F=52.254] Pay [F=11.213] superior [F=22.83] but it is not affecting opinions on work and promotion. So it is concluded that organization gives more values to salary, and promotion of executives. Organization has the belief on work, people and salary simultaneously. Similarly, practices in organization are only in favour of people working in the organization, pay and managing the superiors especially in the top management.
Impact of motivational factors and interpersonal relationships of the organization on the opinion of executives:

TABLE 52 IMPACT OF MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS OF THE ORGANIZATION ON THE OPINION OF EXECUTIVES:

Multivariate Tests(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>6.383(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>93.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>6.383(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>93.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>6.383(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>93.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>6.383(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>93.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>4.509(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>93.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>4.509(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>93.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>4.509(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>93.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>4.509(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>93.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>14.251(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>93.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>14.251(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>93.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>14.251(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>93.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>14.251(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>93.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Exact statistic  
b  Design: Intercept+Motivation+Inter personal

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>167.738(a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83.869</td>
<td>7.073</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>201.291(b)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.645</td>
<td>4.495</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>183.688(c)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91.844</td>
<td>23.079</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>129.912(d)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64.956</td>
<td>8.367</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>45.942(e)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.971</td>
<td>6.193</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>45.638</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.638</td>
<td>3.849</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>26.538</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.538</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>84.828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84.828</td>
<td>21.316</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Type III Sum of Squares</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>8.898</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.898</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>3.064</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.064</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>108.120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108.120</td>
<td>9.118</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>15.524</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.524</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>48.742</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.742</td>
<td>12.248</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>77.133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77.133</td>
<td>9.936</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>6.358</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.358</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>23.062</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.062</td>
<td>1.945</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>148.034</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>148.034</td>
<td>6.612</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>169.436</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>169.436</td>
<td>42.576</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>22.797</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.797</td>
<td>2.937</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>29.555</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.555</td>
<td>7.968</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1150.262</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>11.858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>2171.699</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>22.389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>386.022</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>752.998</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>7.763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>359.818</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>33718.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>36635.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>14423.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>20399.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>6304.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1318.000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>2372.990</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>569.710</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>882.910</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>405.760</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  R Squared = .127 (Adjusted R Squared = .109)  
b  R Squared = .085 (Adjusted R Squared = .066)  
c  R Squared = .322 (Adjusted R Squared = .308)  
d  R Squared = .147 (Adjusted R Squared = .130)  
e  R Squared = .113 (Adjusted R Squared = .095)

The GLM for the above mentioned variable significantly fits that the independent variables motivation [F=4.509] and interpersonal [F=14.251] are significantly explained on the opinion of the executives. From the table of subjects effects motivation creates good impact on the opinion of executives in work [F=9.118] Pay [F=12.248] Superior [F=9.936]. This implies that executives felt that the existing motivating factors in the organization induce
them to accept the nature of work, under the direction of superior with good remuneration. So the executives get food satisfaction over the motivation factors. The variable interpersonal relationship predicts People $F=6.612$, Pay $[F=42.576]$ Promotion $\{F=7.968\}$. so it is found that interpersonal relationship in the organization made the executives to express a positive nature about the people, promotion policy and proportionate emoluments in the organization.

**Cluster Analysis for Motivational Factors of Executives**

The total scores on the motivational factors of executives is classified into 3 clusters by means of K-means cluster analysis.

**TABLE 53 : CLUSTER ANALYSIS FOR MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS OF EXECUTIVES**

Final Cluster Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moptotal</td>
<td>79.88</td>
<td>55.12</td>
<td>68.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Cases in each Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.000</td>
<td>17.000</td>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>100.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 5.1 Cluster Analysis for Motivational Factors (Executives)

From the table above it is found that the executives are classified into 3 groups under the cluster centers. The first cluster consist of 33 out of 100 executives that they are highly motivated with 79.88 and in the second cluster 17 out of them with cluster center 55.12 are of the opinion that they are poorly motivated and in the third cluster 50 of them with cluster center 68.40 believed that they are moderately motivated to discharge their duties.

Tests of Equality of Group Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df 1</th>
<th>df 2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful work Environment</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>3.645</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Compensation</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>3.646</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>12.99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting Work</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>27.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging Job</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Canonical Discriminant Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.038(a)</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.305(a)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- First 2 canonical discriminant functions were used in the analysis.

Wilks’ Lambda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Function(s)</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 through 2</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>227.056</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>24.524</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classified clusters are subjected to discriminant analysis for the reliability analysis. The test of equality of group means revealed classification of cluster can be reduced at 5% level of significance. The canonical correlation for the discriminant functions 0.943 and 0.484 are highly significant with chi-square value 227.056 and 24.524 respectively. So at 5% level of significance
the cluster classification of executives is reliable and suitable for further analysis based on the clusters obtained.

Association between personal variables and cluster of motivation: The association between personal variables of executives age, education, experience and Income and cluster of executive on motivation is found by non-parametric Chi-square tests.

**TABLE 54: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN PERSONAL VARIABLES OF EXECUTIVES AND CLUSTER OF MOTIVATION**

Age * motivation Crosstabulation

Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Motivation clusters</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 – 35 Yrs.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 40 Yrs.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40 Yrs.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 5.2 Association between personal variable and cluster of Motivation (Executives)**
Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.594(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>9.738</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear</td>
<td>1.430</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.76.

From the above table it is found that at 5% level of significance there is no association between age and cluster of motivational factors of executives [chi-square -8.594]. So for motivation age cannot be a factor and executives can be motivated at any age for the production purpose.

Education and cluster of motivation of executives:

Education * motivation Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation clusters</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edu Management</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>11.542(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>11.848</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear</td>
<td>6.667</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.93.
From the above table it is revealed that there is an association between education and cluster of motivation of executives. The executives with different educational background differ in imbibing the motivational factors. Executives in management take the factors of motivation regarding their department, similarly technical and software executive take their corresponding motivational factors of productivity.

### Experience and cluster of motivation of executives

**experience * motivation**

**Cross tabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation clusters</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newe Below 5 Years</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 Yrs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>3.352(a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>3.550</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>3.190</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases 100

---

*a 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.37.

In this due to certain cells with expected count less than 5 some of the cells are collapsed to get corrected chi-square values. So experience is classified into less than 5 years, 5-15 years and above 15 years, similarly the clusters are re-classified into less motivated and more motivated. In this collapse the chi-square value 0.187 is not statistically significant. So it is ascertained that whatever be the years of experience the executives have to be motivated for productivity.
Income and cluster of motivation of executives

Income * Motivation Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colinc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=15000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>7.958(a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>8.042</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.45.

From the above table the chi-square 7.959 reveal that as the income of executives differ their motivation level also differs so the motivating factors are workable on the executives with good emoluments.

TABLE 55 : THE IMPACT OF MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS, INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS OF EXECUTIVES ON ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE:

Climate = 1

Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.520(a)</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>1.84125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Interpersonal, Motivation
b climate = 1
### ANOVA(b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>54.135</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.067</td>
<td>7.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>145.778</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199.913</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Interpersonal, Motivation  
b Dependent Variable: Climate  
c climate = 1

### Coefficients(a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>22.590</td>
<td>2.648</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivatio</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ip</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>3.983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Climate  
b climate = 1

c Climate = 2

### Model Summary(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.490(a)</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>1.91089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Interpersonal, Motivation  
b climate = 2

c Climate = 2

### ANOVA(b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>26.477</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.238</td>
<td>3.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>83.985</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110.462</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Interpersonal, Motivation  
b Dependent Variable: Climate  
c climate = 2
### Coefficients (a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>11.148</td>
<td>3.885</td>
<td>2.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter personal relationship</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Climate  
b climate = 2

### Climate = 3

#### Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.734(a)</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>1.81853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Interpersonal, Motivation  
b climate = 3

gt

#### ANOVA (b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48.287</td>
<td>14.601</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>179.250</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Interpersonal, Motivation  
b Dependent Variable: Climate  
c climate = 3

gt

#### Coefficients (a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>17.712</td>
<td>4.386</td>
<td>4.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter personal relationship</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Climate  
b climate = 3
The organizational climate of executives are classified into 3 clusters which was already introduced in the previous chapter. The Linear multiple regression is performed cluster wise. The first cluster which consist of executives with the view that climate need to be improved build the climate. In this regression motivation and interpersonal explain 27.1 % variation of the climate in first cluster. [R-Square .271] and significant F=value 7.984 reveals that regression properly fits. In cluster 2 the executives feel they require more motivation [F=2.625] to build the climate. They believe interpersonal relationships do not predict the climate. the two variables explain 24% variation of the climate [R-square 0.240] Similarly in the third cluster the independent variables explain 53.9% [R-square = ..539]in this cluster also executive feel the motivational factors [t-5.4] are very important to build the good climate in the organization.

**TABLE 56 : IMPACT OF OPINION OF EXECUTIVES ON CLIMATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate = 1</th>
<th>Model Summary(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.321(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Prototal, Paytotal, Woptotal, Suptotal, Petotal
b climate = 1

**ANOVA (b,c)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>20.641</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.128</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>179.272</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199.913</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Prototal, Paytotal, Woptotal, Suptotal, Petotal
b Dependent Variable: Clitotal
c climate = 1
Coefficients(a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>25.235</td>
<td>2.894</td>
<td>8.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Dependent Variable: Clitotal
b  climate = 1

Climate = 2

Model Summary(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.681(a)</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>1.72043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), Protot, Suptot, Paytot, Petot, Woprotot
b  climate = 2

ANOVA (b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.253</td>
<td>3.464</td>
<td>.020(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), Protot, Suptot, Paytot, Petot, Woprotot
b  Dependent Variable: Clitotal
c  climate = 2
Coefficients (a, b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>17.085</td>
<td>4.265</td>
<td>.4006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>-.381</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>-1.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>-.231</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>-.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Dependent Variable: Clitotal
b  climate = 2

Climate = 3

Model Summary (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.707(a)</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>2.01989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b  climate = 3

ANOVA (b, c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>89.491</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.898</td>
<td>4.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>89.759</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>179.250</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), Prototal, Suptotal, Woptotal, Paytotal, Petotal
b  Dependent Variable: Clitotal
c  climate = 3
The Linear multiple regression on the dependent variable 3 cluster of climate and the independent variable opinion of executives on work, people, pay, superior and promotion helped to ascertain that in cluster one the opinion of the variable \( F=0.9921 \) is not in favour of good climate, because the executives demand the improvement of environment of organization. The cluster two executives feel that the opinion is not that much favourable to build the climate \( F=3.464 \) whereas in the third cluster the executives are in favour of nature of work \( F=4.387 \) to build the good climate in an organization. The variables explain 49.9% of the variation in climate.

**TABLE 57 : CLUSTER ANALYSIS FOR WORK ENVIRONMENT**

**THE EXECUTIVES ARE CLASSIFIED INTO 3 CLUSTERS ON THE BASIS OF WORK ENVIRONMENT.**

Final Cluster Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>30.94</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>15.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 5.3 Cluster Analysis for Work Environment (Executives)

The first cluster with frequency 50 executives feel that the environment is encouraging, [30.94] second cluster [22.08] consists of 36 executives. they feel that work environment is acceptable and third cluster with center 15.71 and frequency 14 feel that the work environment is to be improved.

Impact of organization culture and its elements on work environment

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.462(a)</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>5.65090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three elements of the organization values, beliefs and practices are very good predictors of environment. This was found by Linear Multiple regression that the variables explain 21.4% variation of whole work environment and the F=value 8.706 is highly significant. Among these variables of organization culture value \([t=3.661]\) and belief \([t=2.349]\) are significantly explaining the work environment. So it is concluded that the executives feel the value given to them by the organization and the belief the organization possess on them build very good conducive work environment.

The relationship between existing work environment in the organization and opinion of executives about the work: the proximity of these two variables are checked by the pearsons method of correlation.
TABLE 58 : RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORK ENVIRONMENT & OPINION OF EXECUTIVES

Proximity Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation between Vectors of Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a similarity matrix

From the above table it is ascertained that the executives feel the existing work environment situation is not suitable for the executives \( r = -0.084 \). So, they expect more refined work environment to improve their involvement in the work.

TABLE 59 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORK ENVIRONMENT AND THE CLIMATE OF THE ORGANIZATION

Proximity Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation between Vectors of Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a similarity matrix

The proximity matrix clearly reveals that the existing work environment in the organization is moderately effective in building the productive climate \( r = 0.267 \)
TABLE 60: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN PERSONAL FACTORS AND CLUSTERS OF THE EXECUTIVES ON WORK ENVIRONMENT

Age * WE Crosstabulation

Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 – 35 Yrs.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 40 Yrs.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40 Yrs.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 5.4 Age and Work Environment (Executives)

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>2.025(a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>2.035</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Assoc</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.00.
The above table finds that there is no association between age and cluster of environment [chi-square 2.025] The executives cannot be classified on the basis of age to express their work environment. Hence the third cluster is collapsed into 2 clusters namely below average, and above average etc., in order to avoid the cells with expected value less than 5.

**Education and work environment**

Education * WE Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>We 1.00</th>
<th>We 2.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In computing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Technical</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Software Quality</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 5.5 Education and Work Environment (Executives)
### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>2.401(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>2.420</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear</td>
<td>1.770</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.50.

The above table revealed that there is no association between education and work environment [chi-square 2.401] so the education of the executives is not going to affect the work environment in the organization.

**Experience and work environment:**
Experience * WE Cross tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>We 1.00</th>
<th>We 2.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 Yrs.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 Yrs.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 15 Yrs.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 15 Yrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 5.6 Experience and Work Environment (Executives)
Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>16.734(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>17.882</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.50.

It is found from the non-parametric chi-square test that there is a significant association [chi-square – 16.731] between experience of the executives and work environment in the organization that is the executives differ in their experience in accepting the work environment.

**Income and work environment**

**income * WE Cross tabulation**

**Count**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>income &lt;=15000</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income &gt;15000</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 5.7 Income and Work Environment (Executives)
**Chi-Square Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>6.895(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction(a)</td>
<td>5.875</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>6.984</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td>6.826</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Computed only for a 2x2 table  
b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.50.

From the above table it is found that the income [chi-square = 6.895] has significant association with the work environment. So executives differ in their income to decide the suitable work environment in the organization.

**TABLE : 61 THE IMPACT OF HELPING THE SUBORDINATES IN BUILDING THE CLIMATE**

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.684(a)</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>4.62323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA(b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1692.424</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>188.047</td>
<td>8.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1923.686</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>21.374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3616.110</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the linear multiple regression table it is found that the helping to subordinates variables Human relations, HR \([t=3.8]\) Decision making DM \([t=4.587]\) work performance WP \([t=3.703]\) Performance standards PS \([t=5.132]\) Job related skills JS \([t=5.193]\) effective communication EC \([t=6.125]\) change in work CW \([t=5.195]\) Stress management \([t=6.993]\) delegate effectively DE\([t=.130]\) are very significant for inter personal relationships and building the productive climate. These variables explain 46.8% of the variation of climate.

**TABLE : 62 CLUSTER ANALYSIS FOR MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS OF ASSOCIATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Cluster Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mottotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 5.8 Cluster Analysis for Motivational Factors (Associates)

The associates of the organization are classified into 3 clusters on the basis of motivation. The first cluster consists of associates who are moderately motivated with frequency 156 [cluster center 35.49] second cluster consists of 108 associates [cluster center 43.05] who are highly motivated and finally the third cluster consists of 36 associates [cluster center 21.78] who are less motivated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>156.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>108.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid: 300.000

Missing: .000
### Summary of Canonical Discriminate Functions Eigenvalues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.434(a)</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.176(a)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a First 2 canonical discriminate functions were used in the analysis.

### Wilks' Lambda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Function(s)</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 through 2</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>537.913</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>47.047</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tests of Equality of Group Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>103.697</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>9.332</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>39.266</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>65.485</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable Working</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>109.462</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting Work</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>143.013</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Company Policy</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>106.733</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>71.780</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect and Recognition</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>96.755</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic Supervisor</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>59.640</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Accomplishment</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>84.360</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This classified clusters of associates are subjected to reliability using discriminate analysis. In that the two discriminate functions are obtained with highly significant canonical correlation co-efficient 0.903 and 0.387. [chi-square value = 537.913, 47.047]. The tests of equality of group means reveals that all the 11 independent variables are highly significant.

**TABLE 63: IMPACT OF ELEMENTS OF CULTURE ON THE 3 CLUSTERS OF ASSOCIATES BASED ON MOTIVATION:**

**Motivation cluster 1**

**Model Summary(b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.724(a)</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>2.15111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), value, belief, leadership, change
b Motivation cluster1

**ANOVA (b,c)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>770.255</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>192.564</td>
<td>41.615</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>698.719</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4.627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1468.974</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), value, belief, leadership, change
b Dependent Variable: Motivation
c Motivation cluster1
**Coefficients(a,b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>24.871</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>25.394</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>belief</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>1.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>5.548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Motivation  
b Motivation cluster 1

**Motivation cluster 2**

**Model Summary (b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.635(a)</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>2.30202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), value, belief, leadership, change  
b Motivation cluster2

**ANOVA (b,c)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>368.939</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92.235</td>
<td>17.405</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>545.829</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5.299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>914.769</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), value, belief, leadership, change  
b Dependent Variable: Motivation  
c Motivation cluster2
Coefficients(a,b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>39.129</td>
<td>2.798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>value</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>belief</td>
<td>-.322</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>-.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>changes</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Dependent Variable: Motivation  

b  Motivation cluster 2

Motivation cluster 3

Model Summary(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.806(a)</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>2.35749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), value, belief, leadership, change  

b  Motivation cluster3

ANOVA(b,c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79.983</td>
<td>14.391</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), value, belief, leadership, change  

b  Dependent Variable: Motivation  

c  Motivation cluster3
The cluster wise linear multiple regression reveals that in the moderately motivated cluster the elements of culture explains 52.4% \([ R\text{-}square =0.524]\) \([F=41.615]\) variation in motivation and element changes in culture has good impact \([ t=5.548]\) on moderately motivated associates. So it is concluded that technological changes and management policy would motivate the moderately motivated associates In the second cluster the elements of culture explains 40.3% of the total variation in motivation \([R\text{-}square =0.403]\) \([F=17.405]\) and the element value of the organization has good impact on highly motivated clusters of associates. For the culmination of motivation they require value based organizational culture. So it is found that the motivation is depending on values in the organizational culture. In the third cluster the elements of organization culture explains 65% variation in motivation \([R\text{-}square .650, F=14.391]\) In this cluster the less motivated associates feel that the organizational value \([ t=3.330]\) would help them to motivate.
TABLE 64: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND CLUSTERS OF MOTIVATION

Age * Motivation cluster

Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Motivation Cluster</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 35 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 40 years</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGE & MOTIVATION

Graph 5.9 Age and Cluster of Motivation (Associates)
Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>20.401(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>20.662</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear</td>
<td>4.476</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.96.

From the above table it is found that there is a deep association between clusters of associates on motivation and age [chi-square = 20.401] so it is concluded that the nature of cluster differ with respect to age of associates.

2. Total experience and clusters of motivation

Total experience* Motivation cluster

Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation Cluster</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 Yrs.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Yrs.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 Yrs.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 15 Yrs.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table it is found that there is a significant association between number of years of experience and different clusters of motivation [chi-square =33.134] so it is concluded that the classification of associates on the basis of motivation vary according to their work experience.
3. Income and clusters of motivation

Income * Motivation clusters
Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Motivation Cluster 1</th>
<th>Motivation Cluster 2</th>
<th>Motivation Cluster 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 10,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 to 20,000</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 &amp; Above</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 5.11 Income and Motivation (Associates)
Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>21.582(a)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>24.554</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>1.634</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Valid Cases</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.08.

From the above tables it is ascertained that there is a good association between income and the three clusters of motivation of associated [chi-square-21.582]. So it is concluded that age plays a vital role for motivational factors of associates.

**TABLE 65 : IMPACT OF ELEMENTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE ON THE DIFFERENT ATTITUDES OF ASSOCIATES**

**Multivariate Tests (b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>26.449(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>26.449(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>26.449(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>26.449(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vvalue</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>1.975(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>1.975(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>1.975(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>1.975(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>5.842(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>5.842(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>5.842(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>5.842(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>2.598(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Hypothesis df</td>
<td>Error df</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>2.598(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>2.598(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>2.598(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>3.939(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>3.939(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>291.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Exact statistic
b  Design: Intercept+value+Belief+Leadership+Changes

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>166.186(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41.546</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>343.363(b)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85.841</td>
<td>3.298</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>156.455(c)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39.114</td>
<td>1.554</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>434.033(d)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>108.508</td>
<td>4.264</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>49.071(e)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.268</td>
<td>1.709</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>2492.218</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2492.218</td>
<td>62.777</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>2349.738</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2349.738</td>
<td>90.277</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>1885.146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1885.146</td>
<td>74.874</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>2612.703</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2612.703</td>
<td>102.673</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>459.859</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>459.859</td>
<td>64.067</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>7.648</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.648</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>26.889</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.889</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>19.917</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.917</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>9.649</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.649</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>19.370</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.370</td>
<td>2.699</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>14.780</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.780</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>148.820</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>148.820</td>
<td>5.718</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>35.792</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.792</td>
<td>1.422</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>50.739</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.739</td>
<td>1.994</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>4.718</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.718</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>25.881</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.881</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>35.849</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.849</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>15.196</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.196</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>104.739</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104.739</td>
<td>2.638</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>62.490</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62.490</td>
<td>2.401</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>28.390</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.390</td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above tables of GLM it is found that the independent variables of culture—beliefs of culture \( [F=5.718] \) has an impact on the people around the associates. The top management and their belief on the hard work of associates forces them to tell positive notions about people around them. Similarly technological developments and top managements policy help them to maintain smooth relationship with superiors. Other variables do not have any impact on the variables of attitudes.

### Table: ANOVA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>175.849</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>175.849</td>
<td>6.910</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>15.541</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.541</td>
<td>2.165</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>11711.334</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>39.699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>7678.274</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>26.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>7427.341</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>25.177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>7506.847</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>25.447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>2117.449</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>7.178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>62266.000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>42219.000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>41059.000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>41142.000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>11374.000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>11877.520</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>8021.637</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>7583.797</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>7940.880</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>2166.520</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  R Squared = .014 (Adjusted R Squared = .001)
b  R Squared = .043 (Adjusted R Squared = .030)
c  R Squared = .021 (Adjusted R Squared = .007)
d  R Squared = .055 (Adjusted R Squared = .042)
e  R Squared = .023 (Adjusted R Squared = .009)
TABLE 66: IMPACT OF MOTIVATION OF ASSOCIATES ON THEIR ATTITUDE

Multivariate Tests (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>20.331(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>294.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>20.331(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>294.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>20.331(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>294.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>20.331(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>294.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>2.489(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>294.000</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>2.489(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>294.000</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>2.489(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>294.000</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>2.489(a)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>294.000</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>264.681(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>264.681</td>
<td>6.792</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>258.986(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>258.986</td>
<td>9.942</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>189.556(c)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>189.556</td>
<td>7.639</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>172.822(d)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>172.822</td>
<td>6.630</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>19.083(e)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.083</td>
<td>2.648</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>3506.820</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3506.820</td>
<td>89.989</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>2644.537</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2644.537</td>
<td>101.521</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>2378.053</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2378.053</td>
<td>95.839</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>2305.013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2305.013</td>
<td>88.425</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>518.764</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>518.764</td>
<td>71.989</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>264.681</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>264.681</td>
<td>6.792</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>258.986</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>258.986</td>
<td>9.942</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>189.556</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>189.556</td>
<td>7.639</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>172.822</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>172.822</td>
<td>6.630</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion.</td>
<td>19.083</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.083</td>
<td>2.648</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>11612.839</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>38.969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above tables of generalized linear model it is found that the motivational factors of associates make them to affect their attitude towards work \([ F= 6.792] \), People \([ F= 9.942] \), Pay \([ F=7.639] \) and superior \([ F= 6.630 ]\). These aspects are very much affected by the motivational factors. Promotion is independent of motivation \([ F= 2.648] \) so on the whole it is concluded that the suitable motivational factors changes the attitude of associates on different aspects.
TABLE 67: IMPACT OF ELEMENTS OF CULTURE ON THE TOTAL MOTIVATION

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.641(a)</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>5.56036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), value, belief, leadership, change

ANOVA(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>6345.097</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1586.274</td>
<td>51.306</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>9120.700</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>30.918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15465.797</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), value, belief, leadership, change
b Dependent Variable: Motivation

Coefficients(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>13.171</td>
<td>1.780</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>1.804</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>7.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>belief</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>2.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>1.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>2.401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Motivation
The tables of linear multiple regression reveals that the elements of culture explains 41% variation in motivation \( \{ \text{R-square 0.410, } F= 51.306 \} \) the elements of culture value \( \{ t=7.558 \} \) Belief \( \{ t = 2.225 \} \) changes \( \{ t = 2.401 \} \) are important to induce motivation among associates. The leadership culture is not creating impact on the motivational aspects of associates.

**TABLE 68 : CLUSTER ANALYSIS FOR WORK ENVIRONMENT**

Final Cluster Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>19.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Cases in each Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>74.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>222.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>300.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 5.12 Cluster Analysis of Work Environment (Associates)**
The work environment of associates is classified into suitable 3 clusters. The number of clusters are identified by trial and error method and suitability is checked along with reliability by discriminant analysis. The first cluster of associates [cluster center 28.5] who are of the view that the work environment is acceptable with frequency 74, second cluster associates [cluster center 45, frequency =4] are of the view that work environment is favourable, third cluster associates [cluster center 19.09, frequency =222] feel that the work environment need to be improved.

**Summary of Canonical Discriminant Functions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.627(a)</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.102(a)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a First 2 canonical discriminant functions were used in the analysis.

**Wilks' Lambda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Function(s)</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 through 2</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>171.455</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>28.625</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tests of Equality of Group Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conducive Environment</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>23.727</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting ahead based on one’s performance</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>12.510</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal needs correlated</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>3.116</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open and trusting relationship</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>7.836</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The classified clusters are checked for reliability and to use them in further analysis. The discriminant analysis clearly reveals that cluster classification is significant [canonical correlations $r = .621$, $r =.305$, chi square 1 =171.455, chi-square 2 =28.625] so it is concluded that the classification of associates on the basis of work environment is justified and relied for analysis.

**TABLE 69 : ASSOCIATION BETWEEN DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND WORK ENVIRONMENT CLUSTERS OF ASSOCIATES**

[I] age and work environment  
Age * WE

Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WE</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 – 35 Yrs.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 40 Yrs.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table it is found that there is an association between age and the clusters of environment, [chi-square =11.844] here the second cluster with frequency less than 4 is collapsed with cluster 1. So it is concluded that age plays vital role to the feeling of conducive work environment.
## Total experience and work environment

### Experience * WE

#### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>WE 1.00</th>
<th>WE 3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 Yrs.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 Yrs.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 15 Yrs.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 15 Yrs.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graph 5.14 Total Experience and Work Environment (Associates)
Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>5.504(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>5.595</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>1.579</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Valid Cases</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.44.

From the above table it is found that there is no significant association between experience and work environment of associates (chi-square = 5.504)
So it is concluded that the years of experience of associates do not decide the work environment of associates.

Iii] Income and work environment

Income * WE
Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 10,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 –20,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-&amp; above</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above tables it is found that there is no association between age and work environment of associates [chi-square = .649]. So it is concluded that income is not at all affecting the associates to express about their work environment.
TABLE 70: IMPACT OF WORK ENVIRONMENT ON THE OPINION OF ASSOCIATES ABOUT DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF WORK IN THE ORGANIZATION:

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.678(a)</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>4.20232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), WE

ANOVA(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4466.719</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4466.719</td>
<td>252.936</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>5262.517</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>17.659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9729.237</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), WE
b Dependent Variable: Work opinion

Coefficients (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>48.972</td>
<td>1.728</td>
<td>-.940</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.940</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.678</td>
<td>15.904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: WE
The linear regression tables help to ascertain that the work environment explains 45.9% [R square =.459, F=252.936] variation in the opinion stated by the associates. The work environment has good impact [F = - 15.904] in framing the opinion of various work aspects of the organization.

**TABLE 71 : IMPACT OF ELEMENTS OF ORGANIZATION CULTURE ON THE WORK ENVIRONMENT OF ASSOCIATES**

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.612(a)</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>3.27424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), value, belief, leadership, change

**ANOVA (b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1890.564</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>472.641</td>
<td>44.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3162.583</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>10.721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5053.147</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), value,belief,leadership,change

b Dependent Variable: Work Environment

**Coefficients (a)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>15.531</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belief</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), value, belief, leadership, change
From the above table it is found that the different elements of organization culture explains 37.4% of the total variation in work environment. [R-square = .374][F=44.087] All the elements are equally significant in explaining the work environment that is value [t=3.568] belief [t=3.524] leadership [t=2.316] and changes [t=2.346] so it is concluded that the work environment of the organization is depending upon the culture adopted by the organization.

**TABLE 72 : CONTRIBUTION OF MOTIVATION, ATTITUDE WORK ENVIRONMENT IN BUILDING THE CLIMATE OF ORGANIZATION**

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.462(a)</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>4.78420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), Promotion, WE, Motivation, People, Superior, Pay, Work

**ANOVA (b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1816.722</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>259.532</td>
<td>11.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6683.465</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>22.889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8500.187</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), Promotion, WE, Motivation, People, Superior, Pay, Work
b  Dependent Variable: Climate

Coefficients (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>7.855</td>
<td>2.166</td>
<td>3.626</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>5.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>4.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>-.343</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>-.406</td>
<td>-2.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>-.506</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>-.478</td>
<td>-2.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>3.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>1.525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above tables of multiple regression it is found that motivation, elements of attitude, work environment explain 21.4% [R-square =0.214, F= 11.339] of total variation in organizational climate. It is concluded that to build a healthy climate in the organization, work environment [t=5.320] motivation [t=4.543] work [t= -2.056] pay [t= -2.485] superior [t= 3.679] are playing a vital role.

************
CHAPTER - VI

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

CONCLUSION & SUGGESTIONS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

TRAINING

Linear multiple regression analysis is used to find that the variable different elements of training like controlling labour turnover, balancing work flow, preventive maintenance, self reliance for problem solving, unnecessary involvement in training activities, extending constructive team work, methods of maintaining smooth inter-personal relationships and qualities of the training program like innovative technological program, perfection in quality, in production, risk-bearing, achieving the goals with adventurous spirits and the training supportive activities in the departments are highly explained to meet the objectives of training program [ R-square = 0.593]. So it is found that the training program are highly effective when they possess different constructive elements, excellent quality and their execution at the departmental levels.

The existing organization culture in any organization plays a profound role in determining the elements of the training program, quality of training program, training supportive activities. The organization culture is classified into 3 categories in our study – 1] values in organization [2] Beliefs in organization and [3] Practices in organization.
It is found that the value of the organization culture, beliefs in organization is not predicting any of the above mentioned dependent variables. Where as the general practices in the organization explains quality of the training program, training supportive programs in the departments that is, when the organization aims at lot of attention to updating technology, continuous potential appraisal of the top management on the executives, profound consolidation of decisions from the top management are important factors to decide the elements, quality of the training program.

The cluster-wise multiple regression analysis reveal that the II cluster of climate in which the executives feel that the climate is acceptable after training, III cluster consist of executives who feel that the climate is very good after training. So it is inferred that the training is a very important element in an organization to build a conducive, constructive climate.

Almost all the executives feel that the training programs are significantly achieving the objectives of the organization goals. Some of the executives feel that the training program moderately achieves [63%] , 34% of the executives feel that the training program are highly useful to predict the achievement of the organizational goals. Only 3% of executives feel that the training program are not at all significant.

It is found that the executives who feel that the training are not directly involved in developmental activities of organization, demand that the general climate changes must be taking place in the organization. There is a general view among the executives that subordinate training would not have any impact on their own performance. But the executives who feel that training is
highly successful express that the completion of the task in an organization can be achieved only by the co-operation of the subordinates who underwent the training program \[t\text{-value} - 2.722\].

It is found that there is an association between overall satisfaction, skill level of employee, and the three clusters of executives on the basis of their views about the training to achieve the organizational goals. So, it is inferred, unless and until the training programs possess important elements like quality, the overall satisfaction of the executives would not be reached.

It is inferred that the behavior of employees after attending the program is not significantly building the climate of the organization. So, the executives generally feel that the overall climate changes are not depending only on training. Therefore, the climate of the organization is depending on other elements like motivation, inter-personal relationships and the organization culture.

It is found that the duration of the training program is possessing good impact on the objectives of the organization and effectiveness of the training supportive program in the departments. As the duration of the training program increases, the executives feel it helps them to achieve the organizational objectives and also to conduct effective supportive training programs in their respective departments.

It is ascertained that the organizational culture has very good impact on the aspects of training. The values, beliefs of organization has main concentration on producing the products with good quality where as the general
practice in the organization culture has deep correlation with training programs undergone by the executives – team building, and total quality assurance. So, the executives feel when the top management continuously supports and thinks about the training program, then only they are able to achieve productivity with good quality.

Regarding Organizational objectives and demographic variables, it is found that the demographic variable age explains the climate of the organization in the executives who feel the climate need to be improved. In the case of II cluster of executives in climate the total experience and monthly income play a vital role in building the climate that is, the executives feel that the experienced persons must be given importance and good placements in the organization with proportionate and attractive emoluments. In the case of cluster III of climate, education, current position, total experience, monthly pay are predicted by the climate. So, the executives of the III cluster feel that the placement must be selected according to their education, the rational promotional activities would play a vital role in building a constructive climate.

The executives are of the opinion that the training program alone will not achieve the organizational objectives. Besides that, their suitable placement and designation and their monthly pay package are the other external factors which would help the organization to achieve the organizational goals.

In the case of associates they strongly feel that the effective training supportive training program, quality of the training program, areas to be improved in the training program are very important to make the training program more effective to reach the organizational goals.
The associates are of the view that the value of the organization would decide effectiveness in supportive training programs and areas to be improved in the training programs. The associates feel that the belief of the organization is only in favour of finding the areas to be improved in the training program. The general practice of the organizational culture is aimed at producing good quality in the training program and to identify areas to be improved for the training program.

From the cluster analysis it is found that 39.66% of the total associates feel that climate need to be improved in PepsiCo, 42% of the associates feel that the climate is acceptable and 18.3% of the associates feel that the climate is very good. It is also found that in the I cluster of the climate, the associates feel that the new areas of the training program must be identified to introduce innovation in the training programs to the associates. Where as in the II cluster of climate, the associates feel that quality of the training program must be improved by identifying the new areas in the training program. The associates of the III cluster feel that the quality of the training program alone will build constructive climate in the organization.

The associates are classified into 2 heterogeneous groups in such a way that 72% of them feel that organization goals are achieved. The different training program conducted for associates help the organization to build a good climate suitable for individual efficiency, organizational efficiency and productivity. The associates of cluster climate I feels that different training programs like good manufacturing practice, positive work culture, safety,
emergency preparedness, team building, inter-personal skills, total quality assurance and time management have good impact on the climate.

The associates of climate II feel that the above mentioned training programs are not significantly creating the organizational climate because they believe some other elements in an organization can be contributed to build the climate. Whereas the associates of cluster climate III are of the opinion that certain training programs like emergency preparedness, team building, inter-personal skills and total quality assurance predict good climatic conditions in an organization.

It is found that the associates of the organization feel that the duration of the training program plays an important role to explain the quality of the training, extent of significance of training, effectiveness of training supportive programs in the departments, areas to be improved in the training program and climate of the organization. As the duration increases, it is found that rich elements are present in the training program. The quality of the program is excellent, the organization is able to identify the areas to be improved in the training programs due to longer interactions with the associates and prediction of good climate.

It is found that there is an association between the good climate of the organization and the placement of associates in the departments. This shows that in certain departments the work load and the responsibilities vary and irrationally imposed on the associates.
The Personal variables, age, total experience, monthly remuneration are having good impact on the climate of the organization. So, the personal variables of the associates play a vital role in building a good climate in the organization.

It is revealed that the current posting of associates, total experience are playing a significant role in associates to achieve the organizational objectives through training that is it is profoundly inferred that training alone cannot achieve the organizational objectives. Besides that, some of the personal variables are also contributing their part to perfect the associates’ performance. The personal variables age and monthly remuneration do not play any role in the performance of associates to achieve the organizational goals.

**Motivation**

The culture of the organization would definitely create an impact on motivation and inter-personal relationships among the executives and their subordinates. It is found that the value of organizational culture is in favour of predicting inter-personal relationships. So, the value of the organization has given more weightage to inter-personal relationships rather then motivation.

The belief of the organization do not have any impact on motivation and inter-personal relationships where as the general practice in the organizational culture has good impact on motivation. So, on the whole it is inferred that the organizational culture predicts motivation as well as inter-personal relationships. Similarly, the values of culture predicts pay of the executives and promotion. Similarly, there is a belief in the organizational culture which
predicts work, relationships of the people and pay to the employees. The general practice in the culture predicts the relationship with people, pay and the relationship with superior. So, on the whole it implies that the organizational culture would decide the attitude of the employees.

The motivation and inter-personal relationship among employees make them to develop a positive attitude towards their work, relationship among the employees, pay, superior relationships and promotional policies of the organization. The motivational aspects among the executives in PepsiCo make them to express the positive attitude towards sincere work, smooth relationships with superior and promotional policies of the organization, where as the inter-personal relationships make the executives to maintain a rational relationship among the superiors and subordinates and promotional policies of the organization.

The executives are classified into 3 clusters with high level of motivation [33%] moderate level of motivation [50%] and the low level of motivation [17%] It is also found that the personal variables age, experience do not have association with the clusters of motivation where as education and the income have very good association with the clusters of motivation. So, the executives with very good education and income are fragile enough for the motivational methods.

The impact of motivation and inter-personal relationships is significantly higher on the climate of the organization. The inter-personal relationships possess good impact on the climate of executives in the cluster climate 1. The executives who feel that the organization gives high level of
motivation, feels that inter-personal relationships among the executives and subordinates is a fundamental building block for good climate. With respect to cluster II of the climate of executives, motivation plays a vital role in building the climate. So, it is inferred that when the executives are not satisfied, the climatic conditions are yet to be motivated in the organization.

In the climate 3 scenario also the motivational aspects play a vital role in building the climate of the organization. So, on the whole it is concluded that in PepsiCo that the motivational aspects are given weightage rather than the inter-personal relationships to build a constructive and conducive climate for development.

It is found that the attitude of the employees also build a good climate. With respect to the executives of the cluster climate 1 these attitudes work, people, pay, superior relationships, promotional policies do not have impact in building the climate. Similarly, in the cluster climate 2 of the executives, these attitudes do not build the climate whereas with respect to the III cluster climate, the work attitude of the executives play a very important role to build a constructive climate.

The cluster analysis for work environment of executives classified in such a way that 50% of them asserted the work environment is pleasant. 36% of them stated that the work environment is fair. Finally 14% o the executives feel that the work environment is not acceptable.

It is found that the work environment is also affected by the elements of organizational culture. It is inferred that the value of the organization and belief
of the organization in the organizational culture have good impact on the work environment of the executives in the organization.

The existing work environment and the opinion of the executives about their work is not at all correlated. This shows that work environment is not deciding the nature of work. Where as work environment and climate are positively correlated. This implies that work environment plays a very important role in building a constructive climate. The personal variables- age, education do not have any role to play with work environment. Whereas the experience of the executives possess deep association with work environment. This shows that as the executives are more experienced, they want their work environment to be serene and tranquil. The income of the executives indirectly affects the work environment. It shows that when the executives are paid properly with proper pay it makes them to assert a positive view about the work environment.

As the inter-personal relationships play an important role in building the climate as a part of it, it is found that when the executives help their subordinates on understanding human relations, learning decision making, performance appraisal, goal setting, skill development, effective communication, adjustments to change in work, smoothly handling stress and pressure of the job, developing methods to delegate effectively and conflict management, it builds a good constructive climate for the organization.

As far as the motivational aspects are concerned, the associates are classified into 3 clusters – the first cluster with 52% of associates who expresses that the culture of the organization moderately motivates them. II
cluster consist of 36% of the total associates who feel that they are highly motivated and finally the III cluster consist of 12% of associates who accepts that they are not motivated properly.

In the motivation cluster I of associates it is found that the changes in the organization are the main factors affecting their motivation. In the motivation cluster II of associates, they feel that the value of organizational culture must be changed to increase their motivational aspects. In the motivation cluster III of associates feel that value of the organizational culture is an important factor to be followed for the motivational aspects.

It is revealed that the demographic variable- age, experience, income have deep association with the motivation of associates, that is, the associates in the organization feel that these demographic variables are considered by them as one of the motivational factors.

It is found that the different elements of organizational culture have good impact on different attitudes of associates like nature of work, relationship among the people., pay, superior relationships, promotional policies. It is ascertained that belief of the organizational culture is in favour of the attitude of the associates towards inter-personal relationships. The associates feel that changes in the organization affects the relationships with the superior.

It is found that when the associates are motivated properly, their attitude on the nature of work, inter-personal relationships among the employees, pay
and superior relationships, are drifting towards goodness. The motivation does not have any role to play with promotion.

The associates feel that the values in the organization, beliefs prevailing in the organization and finally the changes in the organization are very much affecting their motivational aspects.

The associates are classified into 3 clusters 24.67% feel that their work environment is moderately acceptable and around 2% of them feel that work environment is appreciable and 74% feel that the work environment has to be improved.

It is also found that the demographic variables age has very deep association with work environment. The aged associates demand for constructive, serene work environment where as the demographic variables experience and income are not considered for the deciding factor of work environment.

The associates feel that the work environment alone would make them to say their good opinion about the nature of the work. The elements of organizational culture like value of the organization belief, leadership, changes in the organization are having simultaneous impact in creating conducive work environment.

It is found that the work environment, motivation, nature of work, pay, superior relationships are found to be important factors to build a constructive, productive climate for associates.
CONCLUSION

Based on the study the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The values and beliefs of organization are not increasing the quality of training program where as the general practices like updating technology helps in improving the quality of training program.

2. Qualitative training programs can build up favourable climate to achieve the organizational goals.

3. Physical, psychological and behavioural changes play a significant role in improving the success of the organization.

4. Longer duration of training programs bring more effectiveness in the quality of training.

5. Organizational culture influences the quality of the training programs.

6. The demographic elements of Employees determine the organizational climate.

7. Education, pay structure, smooth superior – subordinate relationships, favourable working conditions, effective HR policies influence the motivation level of employees.

8. The organizational culture and their elements are considered as indispensable tools to determine the nature of work environment.

9. The organizational culture is a moderately inducing factor to develop favourable attitude among the employees towards the work, team building and commitment.

10. Creativity in the work improves the Employee morale.
10. An effective communication system brings in successful conflict management.

SUGGESTIONS

1. The organization should set up a team to execute potential appraisal, performance appraisal, and the need for training program for both executives and associates.

2. The quality of training must be improved in such a way to meet the organizational objectives directly. The training programs must be monitored by an executive or group of top level executives to give proper output of the training program and the purpose it has achieved with respect to the organizational goals.

3. Training programs must not be mechanical but it should last for considerable time so that the executives and associates can acquire skills suitable for the next job in the organization. Training must be made an important factor to make a total organizational culture change.

4. Training must be an educative one in such a way that all the executives and associates must be satisfied and they should also realize that training increases individual efficiency, organizational efficiency and productivity.

5. The organizational culture possessing the elements values, beliefs and general practices must be transparent enough to imbibe the innovative changes and technological advancements in the training programs for the executives and associates.
6. The present organizational culture can be improved to encourage the Executives and Associates to maintain smooth and cordial relationships among them.

7. The management has to improve the quality of supervision, communication system, pay package with a view to encourage self motivation among the employees.

8. The organization can formulate the policies for the competitive and also transparent man power schemes for pay package and career growth, to attract and retain the efficient employees.

9. Working environment and organizational climate are to be made effective to maximize the productivity and improve the organizational growth and prestige.