Chapter 2

Review of Literature

2.1 Cultural Diversity:

Diversity is not new phenomenon, as organizations are becoming more and more diverse and they value potential manpower. With the change in demographics of Indian companies in recent years diversity has become an increasingly important issue for organizations. The term “diversity” was not very popular until mid 1980s; going through various management literature it was found that diversity get recognition in 1987 and peaked in 1990s (Edelman, Fuller, and Mara-Drita, 2001).

“Diversity” refers to numerous classes of individual differences like population, culture, gender, spirituality, language, disability, sexuality and age (Hopkins, 1997); it also includes education level, skills, expertise, management style, tenure, marital status, family background, geographical differences, interests, career aspirations (Diamante, Reid & Giglio, 1995). In simple words diversity refers to the many different ways in which people in organizations differ (Day, 1995). According to Williams & O’Reilly (1998), any attribute that another person may use to detect individual differences termed as diversity. Diversity in workplace also refers to the co-existence of employees from a variety of socio-cultural backgrounds; it includes cultural factors such as race, gender, age, color, physical ability, ethnicity, etc. The definition of diversity is very broader this may include age, national origin, religion, values sexual orientation, education, language, beliefs, physical appearances, disability, and economic status (Wentling and Palma-Rivas, 2000).
Cultural diversity at workplace is a set of complex, controversial, and political phenomena (Janssens & Steyaert, 2003). Cultural diversity conceptualized numerous by researchers and sometimes it is called as workplace diversity (Nkomo, 1995). In narrow sense researchers argue as it is restricted to specific cultural categories such as race and gender (Cross et al. 1994). Some opined that it can not be understand in narrow sense as it is based on many characteristics like age, gender, language, religion, physical attributes, sexual orientation, etc (Nkomo, 1995). Nkomo (1995) concluded in his study that ‘everyone is different’ and if this is true, diversity is meaningless concept. On his contrary many scholars, who think that diversity is a broader concept, argue that diversity cover all the possible ways people can differ (Jackson et al., 1995). According to them, individuals do not only differ in race, gender, age and other demographic characteristics but also they differ in values, abilities, organizational function, tenure and personality. They confront that an individual has multiple identities and have manifold dimensional personality which cannot be isolated in any organizational setting.

McGath, Berdahl & Arrow (1995) conceptualized workplace diversity by developing a five cluster classification. These are as follows: demographic characteristics such as age, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, physical status, religion and education; task-related knowledge, skills and capacities; values, views and attitudes; personal, cognitive and attitudinal styles; Status in the organization such as one’s hierarchical position, professional domain, departmental affiliation and seniority. By studying more literature of Williams & O’Reilly (1998) revealed three frameworks to define possible effects of workplace diversity. The first one is social categorization, which according to Turner (1987) categorized people
according to salient attributes like gender, ethnicity or race, this result in stereotypes. Another one is similarity theory in which individual share similarity on salient and non salient attributes. The third one is information and decision making theory, which analyze the impact of distribution of communication and expertise on work teams (Wittenbaum & Stasser, 1996).

Individuals vary in different categories of diversity, researchers named this differentiation as visible and non visible categories (Milliken & Martins, 1996). Visible categories include, age, ethnicity, gender and race; the characteristics like educational background, sexual orientation, geographic location, income, marital status, parental status, and religious beliefs are termed as non visible in nature. The other differentiation of diversity in order to describe the functional difference, are surface-level and deep-level. Surface level means demographic characteristics, such as gender, age and race while deep-level explains the functional differences like work experience, life style, status, functional experience, etc (Phillips & Loyd, 2006). Individuals have multiple identities apart from race, age, ethnicity, and gender; they come up with their particular set of knowledge, personality and cognitive style to the work place. Thomas (1991) suggested that in order to understand the dynamics of heterogeneous workforce, the interactive effects of multi-dimensional diversity have to address. He also argued that diversity has positive impact if it is managed properly and it is oriented towards specific demographic groups of employees.

Many authors have reported effect of diversity on functional as well as the human aspects of organization. Diversity has both negative and positive impact on organization. Various studies have confirmed the negative consequences such as Eron (1995) states that diversity in
itself does not automatically lead to a competitive edge and more likely lead to tension, conflict, misunderstanding and frustration if not properly managed. In support of this Milliken and Martins (1996) found that the greater the diversity, greater will be the dissatisfaction and employee turnover. Furthermore, if diversity is not effectively managed the effects can be long lasting and can incur major cost implication; in terms of employee absenteeism, unresolved conflict, poor performance, harassments, discrimination and inefficient communication (Cox, 1997). On the other hand the positive aspects are also supported by many studies; if diversity managed well diversity can be a direct road to success for an organization.

Gordon (1995) identified that diversity can result in a competitive edge, and may definitely give a positive impact on financial performance. Besides, a diverse workforce results in a larger pool of knowledge, skills and abilities, and hence leads to creativity and innovation (Hayles & Russell, 1997). In spite of opposing diversity as a competitive tool; Eron (1995) also supported the argument that if properly managed, diversity can benefit the organization, as it will guarantee that the finest talent of the market can be attracted and retained. In addition to all these benefit employee satisfaction, morale and commitment can be enhanced through a diverse workforce, resulting in the elimination or reduction of complaint and penalties related to discrimination. Through the weapon of diversity any organization can target new markets as employees are well trained for intercultural cooperation. The employees are broadened their sensibility towards new culture by means of facilitating diversity initiatives and promote global functionality (Hayles & Russell, 1997). Managing diversity means enabling the diverse workforce to perform its full potential in an equitable work environment where no one group has an advantage or disadvantage (Torres and Bruxelles, 1992).
Some theorist found contradictory effects of diversity on group process and performance (Michaëla et al. 2003). According to them, ‘Social categorization theory’ and ‘Similarity-attraction theory’ predict negative effects in between group communication; it decreases level of motivation and commitment with an increase in labor turnover. Research findings suggest that several factors could be responsible for the conflicts in between team and groups. Some renowned researchers like Pelled et al. (1999) and Tsui et al. (1992) concluded that spotting an individual in an ‘out-group’ may disrupt group dynamics. Parallel to the view self categorization theory also shown that the member of an ‘out-group’ member can evoke dislike, distrust, and competition than ‘in-group’ member. (Hogg et al. 1993).

Anderson & Metcalfe (2003) had come up with the evidence for managing workplace diversity. They suggested that, while there are the positive sides of workplace diversity, but had adverse implications. They argued that there is a scarcity of solid research which investigates the impact of diversity upon businesses, which has raised questions about the existence of any association between workplace diversity and business performance. There is a pragmatic support saying that diversity can lead to both positive and negative effects (Jackson et al., 2003). It was found that, in comparison to homogeneous groups, members of diverse work-groups exhibit a less attachment and shows less commitment towards their organization (Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998). Tsui, Egan, & O’ Reilly (1992) added that employees often make conflict and take too much time in decision making. . It was found that in spite of having negative effect; the positive connection is more between workplace diversity and organizational performance.
Due to many findings by the scholars, it has been seen that the positive outcomes are more than the negative one in diversity related research (Mannix & Neale, 2005). The available research emphasized the benefits of diversity which concluded that diverse workplace include higher quality in decision making, high creativity and enhanced understanding of marketplace (Robison & Dechant, 1997). According to Robison & Dechant (1997) diverse workgroups demonstrates cognitive benefits that increase overall performance of an organization. Diverse groups are better decision taker and they are more realistic managers; diverse group has multiple perspective and broad knowledge background which give a higher quality solutions and are more creative (Kurtzberg, 2005; Yap, Chai, & Lemaire, 2005; Triandis, Hall, & Ewen, 1965). In support of the above a study by Watson, Kumar, and Michaelsen (1993) also refered that diverse work groups are demonstrate more benefits in an unpredictable and complex work environment. One more scholar Janis (1972) opined that improved decision making is the prevention of disagreement and chaos in a highly effective manner. Heterogeneous group can fall under these categories where the error of misunderstanding happens (Robinson & Dechant, 1997). Increased levels of diversity will theoretically keep groups from becoming too interconnected; this level of cohesion will help to discourage misunderstanding, while promoting a higher quality of problem solving. Heterogeneous group members are more expected to generate a multiplicity of choices. These groups are more likely to assess which is the best option, irrespective of the other perspectives.

In the viewpoint of marketing, diversity is often seeing as a strategy to gain access to new markets (Kochan et al 2003; Robinson & Dechant, 1997). All these researchers directly or indirectly supported the fact that a workforce which is having similar thought process to its
customer base can enhance the organization’s ability to market its product more effectively. The past experience helps these homogeneous groups to accomplish task more easily to cater market needs (Milliken & Martins, 1996). In order to cater more new markets, corporations will need to slightly bend the human resource to match the need of the target markets so that they can easily outperform their competitors.

In summing up, organization depends on talents, if workforce managed properly the organization get succeeded regardless of their differences (Greenhaus & Callanan, 1994). It is well suggested by Human (1996) whether diversity is beneficial or harmful, it is a reality that organization should capitalize this phenomenon to hold and manage diversity effectively, to create an environment that benefits all employees. The relationship between diversity and effectiveness is complex, it gradually affect performance, cohesion, satisfaction and motivation. In order to determine the effectiveness of organization, need strong managerial effectiveness as a support for organizations in long run (Mannix & Neale, 2005).

2.2 Employee Effectiveness

In the recent years organizational analysts and policy makers have become increasingly interested in the domain of employee effectiveness. According to Ingbretsen “employee is vital to organizational success and they should dedicate themselves for creating and supporting a work environment. Hence this kind of personal responsibility increases individual effectiveness in an organization. Likert (1961) emphasized that every employee must be flexible in his thoughts and working which resulting in high degree of effectiveness which helps in attaining organizational goals. As opined by Cox and Blake (1997) that
diversity in workforce creates innovation and effectiveness. Managers of MNCs are now focusing on extracting more and more talent by diverse workforce.

Smith (2003) in his article on National News suggested three major tips for increasing effectiveness of employee when a firm works in a diverse workforce. First is that an organization should understand the basic human needs of employee. When basic needs like a good salary, physical security and productivity, a sense of relatedness and responsibility, a challenging and affirmative task is achieved then an employee feel attached with the organization and contribute their preeminent efforts to achieve organizational goals. The second is to inculcate realistic positivity for achieving personal growth in future. This will motivate an employee to work more effectively when organizational goals are coupled with personal goals. Third and last is to understand balance between organization’s life and employee’s life. By promoting employee’s work life balance like encouraging them to pursue their hobbies, flexi times, enriching their family life and by taking care of their personal health, an organization can increase satisfaction of employees which consequently leads to higher productivity and effectiveness.

The employee utilises their skills and competencies to enhance the economic value of their organization while increasing employee effectiveness of the implemented policies (Analoui 2007). The effectiveness a employees delivers in a particular work setting is a result and consequences of a specific purpose which is derived by particular activities (Broide and Bennett, 1979). According to Kirchoff (1977) employee effectiveness is the act of fulfilling multiple expectations rather than optimizing one objective. Boyatzis (1982) underlined effectiveness as qualities, intrinsic abilities or personality strengths of an individual. Drucker
(1988) differentiated efficiency and effectiveness and define effectiveness as the foundation of success. On the contrary Willcocks (1992) suggested that the field of employee effectiveness has been a neglected as compared to other issues of management. The present review of the literature revealed that there is not one definition of employee effectiveness, which could be single handedly applied in every aspect of management.

2.2.1 Role of Employee in Increasing Effectiveness

With an increasing ‘cut throat’ competition and dynamic business environment around the globe organizations require a team of managers to run the day to day operations. Employees as managers play a significant role in the development, formulation, and execution of the organization’s long term as well as short term strategies that determine corporate success (Analoui (2007). Indeed, they are dynamic and the life giving elements in every business and without them the resources cannot be converted into high production (Drucker, 1967). In the words of Herbert (1976) a manager is a person who can actually produces effectiveness in an organization by managing it appropriately, producing the results or meeting the targets in every sphere of activities. The manager's job is linked with three major dimensions—technical, conceptual, and human. The productivity of any organization can be increased by the effective management of all the three dimensions and specially by managing the conceptual and human dimensions of management. Manager’s quality of work is dependent on how well he uses the strength of his subordinates. In other words, effective management is the result of synergy of effectiveness of individual managers in the organization (Sen and Saxena, 1999). Katz (1974) gives three dimensions for increasing productivity of an organization technical, conceptual and human. He said that all the three dimensions should be
attained for increasing effectiveness and specially by managing the conceptual and human
dimensions of management.

The concept introduced by Henri Fayol in the year 1949 described the functions of
management as planning, organizing, directing, coordinating and controlling the major
operations of an organization. Very sooner in the 1970s, this classical model was challenged
by Mintzberg (1975), who suggested managerial activities under a three dimensional
typology of interpersonal, informational and decision-making roles of a manager. According
to Mintzberg, there are three interpersonal roles (figurehead, leader and liaison), three
informational roles (monitor, disseminator and spokesperson) and four decision-making roles
(entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator and negotiator). He also suggested that
the relative importance of these functions varies according to the type of job and level at
which the employee is operating.

Carroll and Gillon (1987) assume Mintzberg typology a little unreasonable and envisage as
‘it lacks specificity’. They argue that it does not point out the relationship between manager
roles types and organizational effectiveness. Despite of their argument; Mintzberg’s typology
stands as an important contrast to the classical approached developed by the previous
management theorists. Carroll and Gillen also agree on some of the points that many of the
'classical' functions have as much validity in today's organizations as in the past and 'still
represent the most useful way of conceptualizing the manager's contribution in organizational
effectiveness. Some more recent theorist like Kotter (1982) and Stewart (1982) presented
new perspectives that managers spend a great amount of their time in interacting with other
people, both inside and outside an organization. They describe it as a ‘network building’ and
also argued that it is essential for a manager to gather information so that he can achieve the goals and set plans for future.

According to Drucker (1967), a manager is one who determines what has to be done and what should not to be done. In an intense competition managerial role is continually changing with organizational complexity, globalization and with the changing role of stakeholders (Bolman & Deal 1991). The managerial role has changed from merely supervision to middleman between workers and management. As the role of the manager changes it becomes more challenging to investigate the factors that impact efficiency and effectiveness of the manager (Mintzberg 1975, Analoui 2007). Stewart (1982) focused attention primarily on the form of managerial work, rather than on its actual content, and has been prominent in addressing the context in which managerial activities occur, rather than simply examining action per se. Her major contribution has been her emphasis on the demands, constraints and choices which managers face in deciding which activities to engage in and how to behave. Researchers like Kerr and Jermier (1978) said that effective managers are crucial for the success of organizations. He also said that the activities engaged by the managers determined the impact of managerial effectiveness within the organization.

Katz (1974) associated manager’s job with three major dimensions—technical, conceptual, and human. So this can be concluded that a manager’s efficiency in any organization can be amplified by the effective union of all the above three dimensions. Analoui (2007) proposed eight parameters of managerial effectiveness (i) Managerial perception (ii) need for
managerial skill (iii) Organizational criteria (iv) Motivation (v) Degree of “demands” and “constraints” (vi) Presence of “choices” and “opportunities” (vii) Nature of intra- and inter-organizational relationships; (vii) Dominant managerial philosophy. It was further explored that personal, organizational and environmental contextual factors influenced these parameters significantly. In the view of same Jain (1999) has recognized three dimensions of managerial effectiveness namely functional, interpersonal, and personal effectiveness. While in other study Mott (1971) also developed an instrument to measure managerial effectiveness and identified productivity, adaptability, flexibility as the dimension of managerial effectiveness.

2.2.2 Employee Effectiveness and Organizational Effectiveness

Employee effectiveness is an important research area. A comprehensive review of literature reveals that there are three important perspectives of employee effectiveness they are Conventional Perspective, Organizational level proficiency based perspective and individual level competency based perspective (Bartol and Martin, 1991). Conventional approach explains the ability of a manager to set and achieve goals and explains that organizational effectiveness is dependent on the employee effectiveness. The organizational level proficiency based theory that internal and external factors have influence on long term future orientation of the organizations. Organization’s mission, vision, and strategic plan formulation plays vital role in achieving future goals. This approach further reveals that the organization accomplish any task tactically when it incorporates the internal resources i.e. man, material, money, machinery, know-how and the external surroundings. The individual competency approach focuses upon the individuals rather than the association of external actors and puts stress on the enhancement of convenient management skills and tactics.
There are many researchers who laid the foundation of employee effectiveness by conducting extensive behavioral observations. One of the major experiments by Luthans et al. (1988) also has a remarkable significance. He had recorded the performance of managers under various activities taken on seventy-eight employee in a diverse organizational setting. Subsequent analysis generated by dividing employee’s work into four major clusters: communication, traditional management, networking and human resource management (Luthans, 1988). On the set cluster Luthans and his colleagues are able to distinguish between effective employee and successful employee. Effectiveness was defined as a mixture of quality and quantity of performance within the unit or section which the employee had responsibility for. Success, on the other hand, was linked with quick promotion of an individual within his or her organization. Effective employee performed activities which were distinctly different from those which 'successful' managers engaged in. Whereas the former spent high proportions of their time in communication and human resource management (HRM), successful employee spent relatively more time in networking activities (socializing, politicking and interacting with outsiders). Given the distinct sets of behaviors engaged in by individuals who were effective and those who achieved rapid promotion, it is not entirely surprising that only 10 per cent of employee were judged to be both effective and successful.

According to Campbell (1970) employee effectiveness should reflect in organizational effectiveness as well. Organizations require a team of members who can run day to day business operations smoothly (Boyatzis 1982). In support of the same Analoui (2007) opined that employee plays a significant role in the development, formulation, and execution of the organizations short term and long term goal. Aggregation of employees’ performance represents the organizational performance which places stress on the efficient use of resources and accomplishment of desirable outcomes. With increased dependency of business
on information technology, managers are required to sort out new ways to facilitate organizational production and sustainable self growth. What differentiates surviving organizations from others (Sinclair-Hunt & Simms, 2005) is the performance and effectiveness of its executive. Indeed, it is always a debatable topic is how to assess executive employee effectiveness, which provides a pathway for develop resources competently. Consequently, management may be viewed as a special kind of leadership in which the achievement of the organizational goal is vital and managers strive to operate in a situation with optimum performance outcomes. The performance of an employee and how effectively he/she would operate a situation is related to many variables from an individual to an organizational dimension (Bao 2009, Hamlin and Serventi 2008, Page, et al. 2003).

2.2.3 Employee Effectiveness in Indian Organizations

The issue of employee effectiveness has a supreme importance especially in a developing country like India. India being one of the rapidly growing economy and is largely depends upon its human capital. If incompetent employee would be at the controller of the organizational affairs, the pace of development would slow down. Hence, there is an overriding need to identify predictors of employee effectiveness. There is an increasing attention is being directed in Indian organizations towards improving employee effectiveness. There are a number of studies which have been conducted by researchers and scholars in India and abroad to find out the culture as a co-relate of managerial effectiveness. But so far no comprehensive study of cultural impact on employee effectiveness has been conducted, in Indian context.
Budhwar & Sparrow (2002) in their study revealed that there is an influence of national culture on managerial styles and functions of an organization or in other words employee effectiveness. The study indicated the workplace spirituality is a key driver of employee effectiveness in Indian context. Leadership style is also one of the factors determining the employee effectiveness. For testing the relationship between employee effectiveness and leadership style Mathur and Yadav (1987) examined 100 Indain middle level employee. After research examination findings conclude that employee effectiveness was significantly related to leadership styles.

Maintaining the same concept Kool and Saxsena (1989) study also highlighted leadership styles and its effectiveness among Indian executives. They explored prevalent managerial styles and their effectiveness among Indian executives in private and public sector organization by surveying 220 executives in top, middle and lower level management. Four relationships: High task/low relationship, high task/high relationship, high relationship/low risk, low task/low relationship. Results indicate that 87 per cent of managers adopted style 2 as their primary or secondary leadership style followed by style 3. Top and middle level managers preferred style 2 more than middle level managers. 74 per cent of private sector managers were found to be effective.

Luthans, Welsh and Taylor (1988) gave a different outlook by considering a quality oriented human resource manager than the effective leader. They opined that quality oriented leaders have a lot of interaction with both insiders and outsiders and he also exhibit the quality of motivating considerable staff. In a very recent study carried by Muniapan and Satpathy (2010) revealed the importance of ‘Valmiki Ramayan’ in developing employee effectiveness. Considering the same Indian epic Laad and Sharma (1993) in their investigation used values
from Indian philosophy to explain employee effectiveness. The Indian psycho-philosophy, took the concept from *Bhagwad Gita* which tells about the concept of effective work like yoga concept, Guna from the sankhya philosophy, the doctrine of Karma, and teachings from the Upanishads. In their review they identifies that both individual effectiveness and organizational effectiveness begin with learning to inculcate appropriate values and principles for attaining wisdom.

Indian employees held important value expectancies for financial gains and better working conditions. Peter and waterman (1982) argued that companies with strong cultures with good working conditions are highly successful in India. Siehl and Martin (1990) elaborated this view and also suggested that culture may serve as a filter for the factors that influence the effectiveness of the organization. Srivastava (2000) added to the knowledge that there is positive correlation between organizational culture, organizational performance, individual effectiveness and success. Organizations having strong culture performed better compared to organizations with weak cultures. The results suggested that culture of the organization had its effect on employee and organizational productivity.

### 2.3 Cross Cultural Diversity: Indian Scenario

India is among the largest markets of the world in terms of market size along with China which together account for 37% of the world population (World Population Prospects, 2014). After a total overhaul of the policies related to the entrance of Multi National Corporations (MNCs) in India, large number of Global brands have successfully cross the threshold of
Indian markets, but many few are able to understand the success mantra for the mysterious, complex and a diversified market where the tastes and preferences of customers change frequently. Having the huge potential, India is one of the most promising and progressively growing economies in the world. Indian market is so complex because of the large number of cultures, religions, diverse levels of income of the people. Besides, a wide change in regions with the conditions of rural and urban division creates another challenge in front of MNC’s. Given the huge diversity of people and challenges related to distribution, the Global firms need to adapt to the local market work environment in order to attract the employees to join the organization.

Braasch’s (1999) work on cross cultural issues revealed that the most appropriate way to work with India workforce is working as superiors. Being a superior is the best way to understand their working style and make employee more comfortable in sharing their problems. He further explain his concept that the best way to achieve effectiveness through the model of dddp (deliberate, demanding, differentiated Paternalism). This model explains that the MNC’s have to adapt an approach of deliberate effort of adaptation in Indian context with a demanding leadership paternalism which involve strong authoritative elements, fatherly empathy and true leadership with a differentiated strategy which is individualized for each employee.

2.3.1 Indian National Culture: A Brief Note

Indian national culture has to a synonym of the word of “caution”. The cultural and regional diversities in India, it is very hard to talk about “one” national culture; many researchers
attempt to provide the major characteristics of India’s national culture. Considering the fact that India has two major ethnic groups; the first one Indo-Aryans, 72% (North) and Dravidians, 25% (South) rest being Mongoloid and others), is home to four major religions (80% of the population is Hindu, 12% Muslim, 2.3% Christian, and 2% Sikhs) it should be considered as a pluralistic society (Indian Index Mundi, 2014)

If we talk about only language, though the national language of India is Hindi but Indians are mostly situated in North India only speaks Hindi. Though Hindi is the national tongue and is spoken by 30% of the population. English is the most important language for national, political, and business communications (Joshi, S. 2001). It is believed that languages of North Indian states belong to Indo Aryan race and those from South India belong to Dravidian Race. Hindi was introduced as a national language to bridge the widening gap between North India and South India. If we divide India between North and South it can be identified that the first thing we notice is the linguistic diversity. In the physical appearances Dravidians who mostly reside in South India are smaller in average height and have dark skin as compared to the people in North India (Euromonitor, 2006). The way of dressing is also different the ways sari is wrap by the females of North India and South India. Similarly, there is quite a difference in males also North Indian males wear dhotis while the males in southern India simply wear the dhotis like skirts (Manoj, 2001). However, this distinction is restricted to rural or lower class as the middle class Indians have acquired more of the western way of clothing which is homogenous across India.
2.3.2 Employee Effectiveness in an Indian Cross Culture Work Settings

In India, a good superior is expected to behave like a good father towards subordinates: paternalism is the norm in India (Braasch, 1999). It is assumed that a good manager has to respond to his employees needs by building a relationship of trust and goodwill and to get the work done by improving efficiency in any work settings. In the Indian context, an initial focus on will be given on people-orientation which is generated by building good relationship with the organization. According to Sinha (2004), Indians have a very high personal need with his colleagues, subordinates and boss. He opined that an Indian employee only performs well if he feel secure, trusted and by having a sense of belongingness to the organization despite the existence of extreme values in Indian society.

Keeping the cultural sensitivity in the mind Hofstede’s four cultural dimensions provide broad explanation for the Indian work culture. On a scale between 0 and 100, Hofstede compiled his results for each of the dimensions for the countries surveyed. The position of India on each of the four dimensions reveals interesting information: On power distance, India scored 77 points. This justify the facts that most of the Indian employees are perceived as power holders and leaves no doubt that hierarchical differences are important in Indian society and in organizations as well. On uncertainty avoidance, India’s score is 40, implying that employee in India sustain a relatively relaxed atmosphere than other nation. Indians are not comfortable in associated with the unknown risk. India’s score on individualism is 48. This suggests that there are both collectivists and individualistic characteristics in Indian employee. India scores 56 on the masculinity dimension. This means that in India the employees report a great need for achievement, heroism, assertiveness, and material success.
In conclusion, because of the heterogeneous character of the Indian management culture, the employee dealing in a cross cultural work setting has to follow a strategy of differentiation, depending upon in which part of India he is working, what is the background of his employees etc. It can be suggested that the core part of Indian national culture still demands a paternalistic style and the flexible surface part is ready to accept the converging western management style.