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2.0 Background

Very few studies have been conducted in the Indian context, as is the case in a developing country or the third world when compared to United States, Europe or Japan, both regarding corporate culture and organizational performance in general and that of information technology companies in particular, despite India being a force to recon with in the IT software and services sector.

2.1 Corporate Culture - A Conceptual Treatment

2.1.1 Conceptual Framework

One of the earliest information on study of culture in the modern times is by Herskowits (1955)\(^1\), who defined it as “Culture is the man made part of the environment. It reflects the way of life of people, their traditions, heritage, design of living, etc. Culture is the very air they breath and the spirit which permeates their life. It is the totality of belief, norms, and values which is related to the patterned regularity in people’s behaviour.”

Webster’s New College Dictionary (1982)\(^2\) defined culture as “the integrated pattern of human behaviour that includes thought, speech, action, and artifacts and depends on man’s capacity for learning and transmitting knowledge to succeeding generations”.

Pareek, (1997, p. 441)\(^3\), defined culture as ‘cumulative preferences of some states of life over others (values), response predispositions towards several significant issues and phenomena (attitudes), organized ways of filling time in relation to certain affairs (rituals), and ways of promoting desired behaviours and preventing undesirable ones (sanctions).’
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2.1.2 Corporate Culture: Development Phases

Anthony, (1994 : 28-30), while discussing development of cultures in communities which are distinct from their neighbours and easily recognized in ethnic, national and regional entities, argued that "institutions may also possess the characteristics of communities with common cultures, and are layered within broader communities, thereby forming sub-cultures". The author also quoted Turner (1971) who had earlier described the features of 'industrial sub-cultures', identifiable within the wider culture of Western Europe or the United Kingdom, such as 'occupational communities' like steel-making or coal-mining, professional groups like military institutions (recognized by differences like uniforms, traditions and language).

Anthony further cited examples of business organizations like ICI, Marks & Spencer, and Ford Motors having their own 'distinct sub-cultures' or 'corporate cultures', and maintained that "such cultures in these organisations were not the result of deliberate effort or intention on the part of their founders who established them and operated; but the culture followed and grew out of company's history, establishing a pattern of 'the way we do things here', a distinct culture by itself, which required a necessary conformity on the part of new recruits, and thus distinct corporate cultures were formed which continued."

Smircich (1985), having realized that distinctive organizational cultures grow and are established by similarities of required outlook and behaviour over time, observed that "organisations do not possess cultures, they are cultures, the cultural characteristics and the organizations are embedded in each other rather than existing as parallel but separate entities", and further explained that 'cultural meanings are usually carried and displayed in symbolic form and can best be recognized in rituals, traditions and rites of passage.'

Schein (1985 : 6), incorporating the unconscious and unrevealed aspects of cultures, has given the most familiar definition of organizational culture so far as: "a pattern of basic assumptions invented, discovered or developed by a
given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid, and to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems." Schein further added that "these basic assumptions, beliefs, values and meanings are 'shared unconsciously, in a taken for granted fashion' that makes them difficult to discern, even for those that hold them."

Schein (1983 : 13-28)^1^, earlier in his work 'The Role of the Founder in Creating Organisational Culture', observed that 'the leader who holds decision-making power in the organization may exert influence in the formation of corporate culture. And, the value and belief of the founder of the organization may decide its goals, functions, and philosophy of management.'

Meek (1992)^9^, while discussing organizational cultures, argued that 'the various theories fall into one of two groups' (1992 : 202-5)^8^. In one, culture is seen as something an organization possesses, 'Human relations theorists regard culture as something an organization has and which can be manipulated to serve the ends of management' (1992 : 199)^8^; in the other, culture is embedded in the organisation's history and structural relationships, 'culture is something an organization is' (Smircich, 1985 : 347)^6^. The former represents the managerial view of culture, the latter the anthropological.

Louis (1985)^9^, while describing how culture develops in organizations, stated as "Culture may develop around the top of an organization. There may be a 'for-public-consumption' culture at the top, one deliberately designed by ruling elite to be passed down through the organization. Secondly, an emergent yet more public culture may also emanate from the top of the organization. It is the second variant that is usually referred to as the 'corporate culture'."

Gupta (1993)^10^, while discussing the concept of 'work culture' and its development, observed that the "culture has great impact on various aspects of work and organization. The cultural phenomenon when related to work related activities gives concept of work culture." The author further explained this
concept saying “work culture means work related activities and the meaning attached to these activities in the framework of norms and values regarding work. These activities, norms and values are generally contextualised in an organization. An organization has its boundaries, goals and objectives, technology, managerial practices, material and human resources as well as constraints. Its employees have skills, knowledge, needs and expectations. These two sets of factors-organisational and organismic-interact, and over a time establish roles, norms and values pertaining to work. It is this totality of the various levels of interacting factors around the focal concern for work which is labeled as ‘work culture’ or ‘corporate culture’ (p. 2).”

2.1.3 Corporate Culture

Turner (1990)^1^, first described corporate culture as “The culture of an organization defines appropriate behaviour, bonds and motivates individuals and asserts solutions where there is ambiguity. It governs the way a company processes information, its internal relations and its values. It functions at all levels from subconscious to visible” (p. 11). The author further elaborated it as “Culture comes from within people and put together by them to reward the capabilities that they have in common. Culture gives continuity, while timely incorporating required changes in its growth and consolidation process, and identity to the group. It balances contrasting contributions, and operates as a self-steering system which learns from feedback. It works as a pattern of information and greatly facilitate the exchange of understanding. The values within culture are more or less harmonious” (p. 21).

One practical definition of corporate culture came from Andre Laurent of Insead (1990)^1^ : “An organization’s culture reflects assumptions about clients, employees, mission, products, activities and assumptions that have worked well in the past and get translated into norms of behaviour, expectations about what is legitimate, desirable ways of thinking and acting. These are the locus of its capacity for evolution and change” (p. 21).
Umezawa (1990)\textsuperscript{13}, defined corporate culture as the ‘firm’s specific thinking and behavioural pattern.’ In other words, companies may have distinctive pattern of thinking or beliefs, the former is directly observable among the members of the organization while the latter is in their minds.

“Marrin Bower” (1982)\textsuperscript{14}, for years Managing Director of Mc. Kinsey & Company and author of “the will to Manage”, offered a more informal definition - he described the informal cultural elements of a business as “the way we do things around here”.

Corporate culture was defined by Walton (1979)\textsuperscript{15} as “the combination of attitudes, relationships, developed capabilities, habits and other behavioural patterns that characterizes the dynamics of the organisation”.

Gupta, (1993)\textsuperscript{10}, gave a comprehensive definition of organizational culture as “Culture is specific to one organization, there may be many sub-cultures in an organization, cultures develops through interaction of employees, individuals and group traits and organizational climate, the top management has a role in the development of particular corporate culture and it is a combination of attitudes, relationships, habits and beliefs shared by employees of the organization” (p.2).

Gupta (1993)\textsuperscript{10}, further clarified that “work culture’ has been used interchangeably with ‘corporate culture’ or ‘organisational culture’. As the work culture reflects the shared values, beliefs and attitudes of the employees toward work, the employees as a whole can be termed as an ‘organisation’ and the culture reflected by these employees becomes ‘organisational culture’. The corporate philosophy and management philosophy have strong impact on organizational philosophies—a major component which determines work culture. Corporate culture, therefore, can be used interchangeably with work culture” (p. 1).

2.1.4 Corporate Culture: Some More Observations

Various philosophers, social scientists and management experts have defined the term “corporate culture” as follows:
Peters and Walterman (1992)^16, defined corporate culture as "The shared values of an organisation's members."

Kilmann (1982)^17, defined corporate culture as "The collective will of members: what the corporation really wants and what really counts in order to get ahead in the corporation."

Schein (1983 : 4)^18, defined corporate culture as "The sum total of collective and shared learnings of a group."

Schwartz and Davis (1981)^19, gave definition of corporate culture as "A pattern of beliefs and expectations shared by the organization's members that produces norms that powerfully shape the behaviour of individuals and groups in the organisation."

Tunstall (1983)^20, defined corporate culture as "A general constellation of beliefs, mores, customs, value systems, behavioural norms and ways of doing business that are unique to each corporation."

Sethia and Von Glinow (1985, as referred)^21 defined corporate culture as "The shared and relatively enduring pattern of basic values, beliefs and assumptions in an organization."

Sinha, J. B. P. (1990)^22, described 'corporate culture' as "the resultant effect of interaction of organizational and organismic factors which is reflected in established roles, norms and values pertaining to work."

2.1.5 Discussions and Analysis : Corporate Culture

A number of scholars, social scientists and organisational psychologists gave various definitions and concepts of 'corporate culture' during the previous decades. Some of them are cited above. Their study largely explained the cultures of the traditional companies (old economy companies – physical material based and lesser knowledge content) which dominated the business scenario then. Organisational culture changes with changing time, technologies, social norms and business environment, and also incorporates new elements in it.
The present research study is focused on corporate cultures of Indian information technology (IT) companies, and IT itself is a recent phenomenon worldwide. These Indian IT companies operate globally and also possess global culture of knowledge based IT companies. The corporate culture in such new breed companies differs from the cultures of traditional companies on several counts. A separate literature survey on 'corporate cultures in knowledge based and IT companies' is presented in this chapter (under heading 2.3) which will bring out relevant facts on this topic. However, many of the basic cultural characteristics discussed above (under heading 2.1, and sub headings 2.1.1 – 2.1.4) are still relevant for the present study. A brief account of the same and inferences drawn are presented in succeeding paragraphs:

'Culture' was seen as the way of life of people and the totality of belief, norms, and values related to people's behaviour (Herskowits, 1955). It embodies cumulative preferences in the form of values, attitudes towards several significant issues, and also prevents undesirable ones (Pareek, 1997). Its development took place as various 'occupational communities' kept forming their own 'industrial sub-cultures' (Turner, 1971). It forms sub-cultures as communities do and cultures in the organisations were not the result of deliberate effort or intention, but it followed and grew out of company's history, establishing a pattern of 'the way we do things here' (Anthony, 1994).

The term "corporate culture" has been used to denote the value system or basic beliefs shared by members of an organisation which can be manifested in the norms of conduct, behavioural patterns, clothing and wearing, arrangements of work site, products of work, rituals, and ceremonies, etc. (Schein, 1985; Smircich, 1985). It also reflects 'the collective will of members' – as to what the corporation really wants and what really counts in order to get ahead in the corporation (Kilmann, 1982). The corporate culture of a given enterprise is gradually formed by its members during the processes of social interaction in dealing with their external and / or internal challenges. Nevertheless, the leader who holds decision making power in the organisation may have exerted influence
in the formation of corporate culture (Schein, 1983\textsuperscript{18}; 1985\textsuperscript{7}). The values and beliefs of the founder of the organisation may decide goals, functions, and philosophy of management (Schein, 1983)\textsuperscript{18}.

Further, culture has been seen as something an organization possesses (Meek, 1992)\textsuperscript{8}, and culture is something an organization is (Smircich, 1985)\textsuperscript{6}. Corporate culture emerges from the top of the organization (Louis, 1985\textsuperscript{9}; Gupta, 1993\textsuperscript{10}); and it represents norms and values pertaining to work (Gupta, 1993\textsuperscript{10}); and it is also 'the way we do things around here' (Marrin Bower, 1982)\textsuperscript{14}. It is firm's specific thinking and behavioural pattern (Umezawa, 1990\textsuperscript{13}; Gupta, 1993\textsuperscript{10}); and it defines appropriate behaviour, bonds and motivates individuals and asserts solutions where there is ambiguity (Turner, 1990)\textsuperscript{11}. Corporate culture is the combination of attitudes, relationships, developed capabilities, habits and other behavioural patterns which characterizes the dynamics of the organization (Walton, 1979)\textsuperscript{15}.

Furthermore, corporate culture was seen by various other social scientists and management experts as: shared values of an organisation's members (Peters and Walterman, 1992)\textsuperscript{16}; sum total of collective and shared learnings of a group (Schein, 1983)\textsuperscript{18}; a pattern of beliefs and expectations shared by the organization's members, and behaviour of individuals and groups (Schwartz and Davis, 1981)\textsuperscript{19}; a general constellation of beliefs, mores, customs, value systems, behavioural norms and ways of doing business that are unique to each corporation (Tunstall, 1983)\textsuperscript{20}; the shared and relatively enduring pattern of basic values, beliefs and assumptions in an organization (Sethia and Von Glinow, 1985)\textsuperscript{21}; and, as the resultant effect of interaction of organizational and organismic factors which is reflected in established roles, norms and values pertaining to work (Sinha, 1990)\textsuperscript{22}.

Yet, in a comprehensive, progressive and practical view on corporate culture, it was opined that an organization's culture reflects assumptions about clients, employees, mission, products, activities and assumptions that have worked well in the past and get translated into norms of behaviour, expectations
about what is legitimate, desirable ways of thinking and acting; and also indicated about its evolution and change (Andre Laurent of Insead, 1990)^12.

And, another comprehensive understanding of ‘corporate culture’ brought out various characteristics together as - culture is specific to one organization, there may be many sub-cultures in an organization, cultures develops through interaction of employees, individuals and group traits and organizational climate, the top management has a role in the development of particular corporate culture and it is a combination of attitudes, relationships, habits and beliefs shared by employees of the organization'. Also, the corporate philosophy and management philosophy have strong impact on organizational philosophies, and ‘corporate culture’ can be used interchangeably with ‘work culture’ or ‘organisational culture’ (Gupta, 1993)^10.

In short, a number of philosophers and management experts touched upon various facets of corporate culture, developed concepts and defined it. Majority of them put values, beliefs, attitudes, norms and people’s behaviours in the center and described corporate culture in various ways. Some of them talked about development of culture and sub-cultures. Some scholars also termed it as 'a way of life', some pointed out that culture is firm’s specific, and few treated it as collective will of the members. Some of them also treated clothing and wearing, work arrangements, day to day rituals, traditions and ceremonies as cultural characteristics. Some management thinkers opined that culture grew out of company's history, few others observed that members of the organisation formed it gradually, and a few also pointed out that culture emerged from top of the organisation. Some observed that corporate leader vested with decision making power exerted influence in the formation of corporate culture. Also, the values and beliefs of the founder of the organisation may decide goals, functions, and philosophy of management.

Further, Andre Laurent of Insead (1990)^12 gave a comprehensive and practical understanding of corporate culture which presents a progressive approach and was also found be quite relevant for corporate cultures in the
modern day's IT companies. And, Gupta (1993) also presented a comprehensive picture of corporate culture which embodies and explains most of the cultural characteristics brought out by many thinkers in the previous decades.

2.1.6 Inferences: An Approach towards Corporate Culture in IT Companies

Various definitions and concepts of corporate culture given by different scholars and a further discussion and analysis of the same presented as above give a broader and clear picture of culture in organisations. They also enable us to draw some inferences related to 'corporate culture in IT companies (industry)'. Knowledge based IT companies may have developed their own 'IT sub-culture' (industry specific sub-culture: Turner, 1971; Anthony, 1994; Gupta, 1993). And, these companies may also have developed respective company or IT industry specific cultural characteristics (discussed separately in this chapter later - under heading 2.3 on 'corporate culture in knowledge based and IT companies', and under heading 2.4 on 'the emerging corporate cultures').

However, on the basis of above definitions and concepts, some of the basic cultural characteristics which were brought out by management thinkers in previous decades, may still be relevant to corporate cultures in modern day's IT companies (industry). Thus, an approach towards corporate culture in IT companies is inferred as given below:

- The corporate culture in IT companies may be reflected in their own 'way of life', value system or basic beliefs, norms of conduct, shared values, attitudes, desired behaviours, bonds and firm's specific thinking (Herskowits, 1955; Walton, 1979; Schwartz and Davis, 1981; Tunstall, 1983; Sethia and Von Glinow, 1985; Schein, 1985; Smircich, 1985; Turner, 1990; Umezawa, 1990; Peters and Waltermann, 1992; Gupta, 1993; Pareek, 1997); and, clothing and wearing, arrangements of work site, products of work, rituals, and ceremonies (Schein, 1985; Smircich, 1985; Pareek, 1997).
• The culture in these companies may also reflect ‘the collective will of members’ – as to what the company really wants and what really counts in order to get ahead in the company or the company to become globally competitive (Kilmann, 1982). 

• In majority of the cases, the leader who holds decision making power in the organisation may have exerted influence in the formation of corporate culture of these companies (Schein, 1983; 1985). And, the top management may have played a vital role in the development of this particular (IT) culture in the organisation (Louis, 1985; Gupta, 1993).

• In some other cases, the corporate culture in these enterprises may have gradually formed by its members during the processes of social interaction in dealing with their external and / or internal challenges and / or technological challenges (Schein, 1985). Yet, in other few cases, the culture in these organisations may not be the result of deliberate effort or intention, but it may have followed and grown out of company’s history (Anthony, 1994).

• The values and beliefs of the founder of the organisation may decide goals, functions, and philosophy of management in these companies (Schein, 1983; Gupta, 1993).

• And, the respective organization’s culture in these IT companies may reflect assumptions about clients, employees, mission, products, activities and assumptions that have worked well in the past and get translated into norms of behaviour, expectations about what is legitimate, desirable ways of thinking and acting. Also, their cultures will keep evolving and keep incorporating changes in the fast changing information technologies (IT) scenario and business environment worldwide (Andre Laurent of Insead, 1990).
Above inferences and an approach towards corporate culture in IT companies is not yet completed and gives only the partial picture of it. It requires further review of relevant literature related to culture's elements, culture in IT and knowledge based companies, emerging corporate cultures etc. This picture will be clear after further survey of literature, which is presented in this chapter under appropriate headings and sub-headings (2.1.7 - The Elements of Corporate Culture, 2.1.8 - Determinants of Corporate Culture, 2.1.9 Types of Corporate Culture, 2.3 - Corporate Culture in Knowledge Based Companies and IT Industry, and 2.4 - The Emerging Corporate Cultures).

2.1.7 The Elements of Corporate Culture

Deal and Kennedy (1982), in their comprehensive research on corporate cultures of leading eighty American corporations, found that "there are various elements of 'corporate culture' which determine the kind of a company it will be by categorising it as a "strong culture company" or a "weak culture company"." These elements influence the culture and performance of the organizations as well as inspire the members or employees and develop loyalty and commitment in them. The authors identified these elements as - 'Business environment, values, heroes / the business leaders, the rites and rituals, and the cultural network' (p. 13-15).

2.1.7.1 Business Environment

Deal et. al. (1982), while discussing business environment, observed that 'each company faces a different reality in the market place depending on its products, competitors, customers, economic scenario, technologies, ecological, political, government influences,...' and so on. The authors further added that 'in order to achieve an edge over others and to succeed in its marketplace, each company must carry out certain kinds of activities very well, viz. manufacturing, selling, R&D and inventions, providing services...' and the likes. And 'the environment in which a company operates determines what it must do to be a success.' The authors further pointed out that the 'business environment is the
single greatest influence in shaping a corporate culture.' Thus, 'companies that
depend for success on their ability to sell an undifferentiated product tend to
develop one type of culture - a work hard/play hard culture; and other companies
that spend a great deal of money on risk prone research and development
whose outcome is not known, may tend to develop a different culture - a 'bet your
company culture', ...' and so on (p. 13-14).

2.1.7.2 Values and Beliefs: The Bed Rock of Culture

Deal et. al. (1982)\textsuperscript{23}, while discussing values, observed that 'these are the
basic concepts and beliefs of an organisation and as such they form the 'heart' of
the 'corporate culture'.\textquoteright Also, "Values' define "success" in concrete terms for
employees' - by suggesting them (the employees) as "if you do this, you too will
be a success" - and thereby establish standards of achievement within the
organization. And the authors further observed that "strong culture' companies
had a rich and complex system of values that were shared by the employees.
Managers in these companies talked about these beliefs openly and without
embarrassment, and they did not tolerate deviance from the company standards"
(p. 14). They also pointed out that "values are the bedrock of corporate culture"
(p. 21); and that these are the "soul of corporate culture" (p. 37).

Further, the authors, while discussing "core values" or the "shared values"
in the context of corporate cultures and values, observed that "corporate
philosophy and vision shape conduct as well as future of the company.
Particular values clearly make sense for specific organisations operating in a
specific economic environment. Successful companies place a great deal of
emphasis on values. Organisations gain great strength from their "core values" or
the "shared values" - with emphasis on the "Shared".\textquoteright The authors further
explained that 'if employees know what their company stand for, then they are
much more likely to make decisions that will support those standards.' The
authors also maintained that "shared values' define the fundamental character of
an organization, the attitude that distinguishes it from others, they create a sense
of identity for those in the organization, making employees feel special'; and that
'values are a reality in the minds of most people throughout the company, not just the senior executives.' They also cited some of the such 'corporate characters' as: "Make great ads" (Leo Burnet Advertising Agency), "Universal Service" (American Telephone & Telegraph - AT & T), "Better things for better living through chemistry" (Du Pont), and so on (p. 21-25).

Pareek (1997: 432), while discussing organizational culture, observed that 'values and beliefs are the core of an organizational culture and ethics refers to normative aspects to what is socially desirable'. Oxford Advance Learner's Dictionary (1981) described value as 'quality of being useful or desirable, ...goodness, ..worth' (p. 950). And, Atkinson (1997), while discussing cultural change and strategies for companies' success, enumerated typical company values as – 'values on growth and success, values on safety, values on job content, values about corporate and community responsibility, values on communication, values about ethical standards of behaviour, values on people development, and values on quality' and also emphasized that 'companies should possess, nourish and develop such values for their long-term success and continuity.'

Deal and Kennedy (1999), in their next research based work some two decades later, while discussing values and beliefs, reconfirmed that "beliefs and values form the bedrock of a company's cultural identity. Beliefs are shared convictions, widely accepted notions – which are very important. Values are what we stand for as a group, what we are all about, what we rally around when things get rough." And, the authors also cited an example as - Johnson & Johnson – in a positive response to the Tylenol crisis (when it ordered massive and expensive product recall which contained poison) was a direct result of its laid down 'philosophy': "We believe that our first responsibility is to the doctors, nurses, hospitals, mothers, and all others who use our products" (p. 4-5).

Deal et. al., (1999) also observed that – "in today's corporations life the link between values, beliefs, and profitability leads to creation of vision or
mission vision or mission statements. Although the intentions are almost meritorious, the results often fall short of expectations" (p. 5); and they further added that “they (vision, mission..) are not even well understood by the middle or lower rung of management and operational executives”; and “the words and deeds of today's corporations do not match up”; and the authors lamented that “many laudable value commitments have fallen victim to an emphasis on short-term results and shareholder return, except some notable exceptions” (p. 5).

2.1.7.3 The Heroes and the Business Leaders

In their previous research based work, Deal et. al. (1982)^23, discussed in details about the 'heroes and the business leaders' in the corporations, and observed that “these people personify the culture's value and as such provide tangible role models for employees to follow.” And, further added that ‘some heroes are born - the “visionary” institution builders of their time in various countries of the world - and some are “made” by memorable moment that occur in day to day corporate life’. They also pointed out that ‘smart companies take a direct hand in choosing people to play these heroic roles, knowing fully well that others will try to emulate their behaviour. “Strong Culture” companies have many heroes. At General Electric, for instance, the heroes include Thomas Edison, the inventor; Charles Steinmetz, the complete engineer; Gerald Swope and later Jack Welch, the CEO entrepreneurs. These achievers and leaders are known to virtually every employee with more than a few months or even a few weeks tenure in the company. And they show every employee "here's what you have to do to succeed around here" (p. 14).’

Deal et. al. (1982)^23 further observed that “something like charisma is attributed to corporate leaders when they are called heroes”. And calling ‘Heroes as the corporate right stuff’, they observed that ‘The hero is the great motivator, the magician, the person everyone will count on when things get tough’ and ‘Managers run institutions; heroes create them’ (p. 37). The authors further explained that ‘heroes are symbolic figures whose deeds are out of the ordinary, but not too far out. They show - often dramatically – that the ideal of success lies
within human capacity', (p. 37); and on heroes' concerns for beliefs and values, the authors observed that 'heroes are concerned with the set of beliefs and values they hold and in making sure these beliefs and values are inculcated in the people around them' (p. 56); and further on priority for company and its goals, they maintained that 'powerful leaders traditionally consider the company first. And like Watson, they “put the business in their heart” (57).'

Furthermore, on corporate leaders and heroes, Bryman (1986 : 185) observed that “Leadership is essentially to do with the creation of values which inspire, provide meaning for, and instill a sense of purpose to the members of an organization. The leader is the person who actively moulds the organisation’s image for both internal and external consumption and who suffuses it with a sense of direction” (p. 185). And, Schein (1985 : 2), one of the most authoritative writers on the subject, believed that ‘leaders and culture are as interdependent as to be two sides of the same coin’ and further opined that “the only thing of real importance that leaders do is to create and manage culture and that the unique talent of leaders is their ability to work with culture” (p. 2).

And going further, on leaders being charismatic, Wortman (1996) argued that ‘leaders should be charismatic, flexible and inspiring’ — especially with regard to those they manage. And, Anthony (1994), while discussing traits of corporate leaders, observed that ‘leaders, particularly the inspirational kind, are often described as charismatic which is personal attribute residing in the leader’ (p. 38); ‘and not something like virtue, supernatural, superhuman or exceptional powers as earlier suggested by Weber’ (p. 201, note 2).

Bennis and Namus (1996), on leader's role, suggested “the empowerment - the ability to generate enthusiasm, vision and communicate this to people” — is critical in any leadership role; and, on traits of such leaders, the authors observed that “leaders are visionary in outlook, risk-lovers and independent.” And, on this count Burns (1996, as quoted) observed that “leaders are independent, visionary and inspirational, driven by long-term goals, visions and objectives and they provide a mission for others, and they expect the
same high standards from their people, and they are the real change-makers; and the leaders have a clear view of what they want to achieve and are less concerned with detail than getting what they want”; and they are interested in "ends rather than means". Elsewhere, Pareek (1997)\(^3\), argued that “visioning is the key transformational leadership function” (p. 423-424); and "the main concern of transformational leadership is to get performance from people beyond expectations - by inspiring them, stimulating them and paying attention to them as individuals” (p. 417).

Smith and Peterson (1988)\(^33\), in their study on ‘Leadership, Organisation and Culture’, the authors observed that ‘it is the leadership which is the rudder of the organization which guides its direction and sail through safely in difficult times’; and that the ‘leadership is the key to create a positive corporate culture as well as achieving good organizational performance.’

And, Deal et. al. (1982)\(^23\), on the success of leadership, observed that “The ultimate success of a chief executive officer depends to a large degree on an accurate reading of the corporate culture and the ability to hone it and shape it to fit the shifting needs of the marketplace” (p. 18).

Turner (1990)\(^11\), while describing culture and leadership, argued that - ‘a most vital connection exists between corporate culture and leadership’; and explained that ‘the successful leaders exert their most direct influence upon their companies by using the corporate culture’; and the ‘leaders help shape the culture, and the culture helps shape its members’ (p. 17).

2.1.7.3.1 Heroic Figures

Deal and Kennedy (1999)\(^26\), in their next research work some two decades later, while throwing lights on the corporate leaders and heroes, observed that “cultural tales highlights the exploits of special people”; and in doing so, “stories elevate individual employees, managers, or bosses to special symbolic designation in the culture as heroes or heroines. These gallant characters embody cultural values. In their day-to-day comings and goings, they serve as
role models or living logos, signaling through their words and deeds the ideals to which a company aspires." The authors also cited the examples of few well known corporate heroes, such as, Herb Kelleher, CEO of Southwest Airlines, as "the High Priest of Ha-Ha" for the company’s Halloween party. And that ‘Kelleher’s behaviour reinforces his oft-repeated words that “fun is not a four letter word, as fear is”. Also, ‘He (Kelleher) tells employees publicly that he loves them, reinforcing the company’s reputation as “the airline that love built”. His caring and compassion is heart felt and well received by employees’ (p. 8). The authors further, while discussing other cultural icons, observed that ‘in fact, all the heroic icons do not cluster at company’s apex. They are scattered every where – across functions, divisions, centers, and stations. Recognizing their contributions offers another opportunity to solidify and reinforce cultural values’ (p. 8).

2.1.7.4 The Rites and Rituals

Deal and Kennedy (1982)\(^\text{23}\), while discussing rites and rituals in corporate lives (in their previous book), observed that “these are the systematic and programmed routines of day-to-day life in the companies. In their mundane manifestations - which are called rituals - they show employees the kind of behaviour that is expected of them. In their extravaganzas - which are called ceremonies - they provide visible and potent examples of what the company stands for. Strong culture companies go to the trouble of spelling out, often in copious detail, the routine behavioural rituals they expect their employees to follow” (p. 14-15). The authors further added that “strong culture companies create the rites and rituals of behaviour in their corporate life – the rites and rituals that exercise the most pervasive influence on”, and further quoted Bower (1982, as quoted) saying it as “the way we do things around here” (p. 60).

Deal and Kennedy (1999)\(^\text{26}\), in their next research based work “The New Corporate Cultures” some two decades later, while discussing ritual and ceremony in the context of culture, further pointed out that ‘values and beliefs remain intangible and often difficult to pin down’; and further maintained that ‘anthropologists, while studying primitive cultures, look at repetitious activity –
which they call ritual – for clues about the group’s beliefs and values. They study ceremonial occasions to find out what a group deems worthy of celebrating.' The authors further clarified that 'in our modern world, routine activities (ritual) and special celebrations (ceremony) also tell us a lot about how people in groups think and what they value' (p. 5-6). And, while talking on ceremony, the authors observed that ‘“ceremonies offer periodic opportunities to celebrate who we are, recognize key events” and help mark the passage of time. Most companies – good one at least – convene periodic recognition ceremonies to honor employees and gather people together at seasonal festivities such as the company picnic or holiday party. Like rituals, these events have a symbolic subtext. They provide opportunities for connections, memories, and learning that the regular workday cannot always provide’ (p. 6).

2.1.7.5 The Cultural Network: Communications

Deal and Kennedy (1982)$^{23}$, while discussing communications within organizations, observed that ‘it is the primary but informal means of communication within an organization that exists in the form of ‘cultural network’. It is also the “carrier” of the corporate values and heroic mythology. Storytellers, spies, priests, cabals, whisperers, gossips and secretarial sources form a hidden hierarchy of power within the company. Working the network effectively is the only way to get things done or to understand what’s really going on’ (p. 15). The authors further added that ‘This network is actually the primary means of communication within the organization; it ties together all parts of the company without respect to positions or titles’ (p. 85).

Deal and Kennedy (1999)$^{28}$, (after some two decades) in their next research based book “The New Corporate Cultures”, reexamined it and reconfirmed ‘the existence of cultural network in the organization’. The authors also observed that – “in corporation nothing remains a secret for long due to the existence of this informal network, a communication hub that almost outperforms the official channel or the formal chain of command. Although people have an official job, they often are assigned or take on other duties that won’t ever appear
These informal players include storytellers, priests and priestesses, gossips, whisperers, and spies. People with shared interests may form cabals to advance their shared agenda or plot a common purpose. They further maintained that "the real business of a business gets done by the cultural network. In robust cultures, this informal group players can reinforce the basic beliefs of the organization, enhance the symbolic value of heroic exploits by passing on stories of their deeds and accomplishments, set a new climate for change, and provide a tight structure of influence for the CEO. In toxic cultures, the network becomes a formidable barrier to change" (p. 9).

Deal et. al. (1999), while concluding it and envisaging the changing time and conflicting interests, observed that — "in times past the characters of the informal network had the best interests of the company at heart. But in today's corporate environment dedicated to shareholder value and short-term results, efforts of the cultural network turn sour and toxic. Priestly figures oppose departure from the traditional values. As a result, they are often terminated. With them goes the corporate memory. Tales told by storyteller champion resisters and saboteurs. Gossips leak inside information to outsiders. Spies become whistle-blowers, selling secret information to the highest bidder. Cabals turn on senior executives. In short, an informal group of cultural players that once contributed to cultural cohesion now becomes a key force in cultural decline" (p. 11).

Turner (1990), while discussing importance of communication, first described culture as a pattern — "A culture is no particular thing or object, but a pattern which appears both through time and across the organization" (p. 15). The author further pointed out the 'importance of communication in developing shared experience in the context of culture' as "Many cultures facilitate communication, the sharing of experience and information. They can make their members strongly supportive of each other. Corporations may develop patterns of wishful thinking and mutual reassurance" (p. 15); ...and the 'reason for
working' as "To win the affection of peers and fellow workers can be the ultimate and most powerful reason for working" (p. 16).

2.1.7.6 **Discussions : Elements of Corporate Culture**

A number of researchers found various elements of corporate culture which are largely responsible for shaping culture in organizations. Deal and Kennedy (1982\(^{23}\), 1999\(^{26}\)) were the pioneer in this field. They carried out two consecutive research studies, first in 1982 and the second in 1999 after a gap of almost two decades. They research included in depth study of corporate cultures and performance of large number of leading American corporations. As a result of the studies, certain elements of corporate culture were identified and their impact on culture were evaluated by them.

Subsequently, other scholars and management thinkers also touched upon the subject and gave their views on some aspects of culture's elements. Some of them were Smith and Peterson (1988\(^{33}\)), Turner (1990\(^{11}\)), Bennis and Namus (1996\(^{31}\)), Burns (1996, as quoted)\(^{32}\), Pareek (1997\(^{3}\)), Atkinson (1997\(^{25}\)), Bryman (1986\(^{27}\)), Schein (1985\(^{7}\)) and Wortman (1996\(^{28}\)) whose observations on different aspects have been cited above. A brief discussion on the subject, various observations of the scholars and their analysis will enable us to draw conclusions and inferences for the current research study. It is given below:

Deal et. al. (1982\(^{23}\)), found various elements of corporate culture which determine a "strong culture company" or a "weak culture company". These elements influence the culture and performance of the organizations and also inspire the members or employees in a positive way. The elements of corporate culture brought out by them were as given below:

First, **Business Environment** – it is the environment in which a company operates. Each company faces a different reality in the market place depending on its products, competitors, customers, economic scenario, technologies, ecological, political, government influences, local legislations, buyer country's legislations and so on. Business environment determines what the company
must do to succeed. Each company must carry out certain kinds of activities very well. It will provide the company a cutting edge and bring success. And, business environment is the single greatest influence in shaping a corporate culture.

Thus, the importance of business environment in shaping corporate culture as well as succeeding in the market place or the global market place is well understood. The present research study is focused on study of corporate culture of Indian IT companies. These Indian IT companies are in the business of fast changing high technology areas and are operating globally. Hence, business environment is inferred to be the single most important factor influencing their corporate culture and their worldwide operations and success.

Second, **Values and Beliefs** – which are the bed rock of corporate culture. These are the basic concepts and beliefs of an organisation that form the ‘heart’ of the ‘corporate culture’. Values are the soul of corporate culture. ‘Values' define “success” in concrete terms. Deal et. al. (1982) also found that 'strong culture' companies had a rich and complex system of values that were shared by the employees. Organisations gain great strength from their “core values” or the “shared values”. Values influence corporate philosophy and vision, which in turn shape the conduct as well as future of the company.

In this context, Pareek (1997), also opined that ‘values and beliefs are the core of an organizational culture and ethics lead to acts and practices what is socially desirable’. Atkinson (1997), talked about various aspects of values and ethical practices and emphasized that companies should possess, nourish and develop such values for their long-term success and continuity.

And, Deal and Kennedy (1999), in their second study some two decades later, reconfirmed that ‘beliefs and values form the bedrock of a company’s cultural identity’. And ‘beliefs are the shared convictions, widely accepted notions – which are very important. Values are what we stand for as a group, what we are all about’. In order to prove it, the authors also cited example of Johnson & Johnson – company’s positive response to the Tylenol crisis which was a direct
result of its laid down philosophy. Thus, Deal et al., (1999)\textsuperscript{26} concluded that - in today's corporations' life the link between values, beliefs, and profitability leads to creation of vision or mission statements which guide the corporations in their acts and practices.

Thus, various observations on values and beliefs, core values or shared values, ethical values etc. given by different scholars and their impacts on corporate culture support each other's views and reconfirm their importance in corporate life. These basic characteristics of corporate culture appear to be equally applicable in the present study of 'corporate culture of Indian IT companies'.

Third, \textit{The Business Leaders or Corporate Heroes} - Deal et al. (1982)\textsuperscript{23} observed that these people personify the culture's value and provide tangible role models. They are the ‘visionary’ institution builders of their time. “Strong Culture” companies have many heroes. Also, some corporate leaders are charismatic. They are called heroes and are corporate right stuff. Business heroes are also great motivator. These heroes create institutions and managers run them. Powerful leaders consider the 'company first' and they 'put the business in their heart'.

Further, corporate leader creates values which inspire the members, and actively moulds the organisation's image (Bryman, 1986)\textsuperscript{27}. Leaders create, manage and work with culture (Schein, 1985)\textsuperscript{7}. Leaders should be charismatic, flexible and inspiring (Wortman, 1996)\textsuperscript{28}. Empowerment - the ability to generate enthusiasm, vision and communicate this to people is critical in any leadership role, and leaders are visionary in outlook, risk-lovers and independent (Bennis and Namus, 1996)\textsuperscript{31}.

Leaders are independent, visionary and inspirational, driven by long-term goals, visions and objectives and they provide a mission for others, and they expect the same high standards from their people, and they are the real change-makers; and the leaders have a clear view of what they want to achieve and are
less concerned with detail than getting what they want, and they are interested in "ends rather than means" (Burns 1996, as quoted). And, Visioning is the key transformational leadership function, and the main concern of transformational leadership is to get performance from people beyond expectations - by inspiring them, stimulating them and paying attention to them as individuals (Pareek, 1997).

Leadership is the rudder of the organization which guides its direction and sail through safely in difficult times, and it creates a positive corporate culture to achieve good organizational performance (Smith and Peterson, 1988).

A most vital connection exists between corporate culture and leadership - successful leaders exert their most direct influence upon their companies by using the corporate culture, and the leaders help shape the culture, and the culture helps shape its members (Turner, 1990).

Deal and Kennedy (1999), in their second research study also pointed out about the existence of 'heroic figures' in the organizations - as heroes or heroines. These gallant characters embody cultural values, and they also serve as role models or living logos, signaling through their words and deeds the ideals to which a company aspires.

And finally, the ultimate success of a chief executive officer depends to a large degree on an accurate reading of the corporate culture and the ability to hone it and shape it to fit the shifting needs of the marketplace (Deal et al., 1982).

Thus, the above observations on business leaders or corporate heroes, their traits and roles in the organizations given by various scholars have been presented systematically and in concise forms. These are self-explanatory and give a broader and clear picture of the same. Business leader's or hero's key role in building the institution, inspiring and guiding the members of the organizations and shaping organisational culture for the company to succeed need not be over emphasized as they are essential. In short, leadership acts as
the rudder of the organization which takes the company to the desired
destination safely. It is one of the most important elements of corporate culture.
Hence, it is inferred that this element is equally applicable in the present study of
'corporate culture of Indian IT companies'.

Fourth, **The Rites and Rituals** - these are the systematic and
programmed routines of day-to-day life in the companies. They also reflect the
behaviour of people in the organisations and what is expected of them. Strong
culture companies spell out the routine behavioural rituals. The extravaganzas or
ceremonies in companies provide visible and potent examples of what the
company stands for. In the modern world, routine activities (ritual) and special
celebrations (ceremony) also tell us about how people in groups think and what
they value. They also give us clues about the group’s beliefs and values. Thus,
they play important roles in shaping corporate culture, and strengthening and
carrying forward group’s or corporate’s

beliefs and values. Also, in the present study of ‘corporate culture of IT
companies’, the company (or industry) specific rites, rituals and ceremonies are
quite evident.

Fifth, **The Cultural Network or Informal Communications** - it is the
primary but informal means of communication within an organization. It also
carries forward the corporate values and heroic mythology. It exists in the
organizations in various forms - the Storytellers, spies, priests, cabals,
whisperers, gossips and secretarial sources. They also form a hidden hierarchy
of power within the company. And, they play their important roles as informal
channel of communication and contribute towards cultural cohesion in an
organisation. But in today’s corporate environment dominated by shareholder
value and short-term results, this cultural network has weakened. However, it is
going to continue in the companies in some forms or the other. Of course, it may
also include modern communication aids like mobile phones, e-mails, SMS,
Internet etc. as effective tools of informal communications among the employees
in the modern day’s corporations.
In fine, the various elements of corporate culture discussed and analyzed as above influence and contribute in shaping up corporate cultures. Most of them appear to be relevant in the case of ‘corporate cultures of Indian IT Industry’ also which is the topic of the current research study.

2.1.8 Determinants of Corporate Culture

Gupta (1993: 4-5)\(^{10}\), while discussing the various dimensions which determine the nature of corporate culture or in which the organisational culture is manifested had brought out some important determinants like:

2.1.8.1 **Leadership of top management** – ‘which plays a vital role in the development of corporate culture, its professional approach to management, consensus for the policies, awareness of changing environment, planning practices and decision making system, boundary management i.e. generating support and resources from outside, visioning and translating them into reality etc.’

2.1.8.2 **Trust among employees** – ‘a good organisational culture is always based upon the level of trust among employees.’

2.1.8.3 **Communication system** - work culture of an organization can be judged through the analysis of its communication process, and the communication can be open, encouraging, inter-unit, top-down, down-top or horizontal.'

2.1.8.4 **Management of differences and conflicts** – ‘conflicts being the part of organizational process and inevitable, and the quality of organisational culture are determined by how conflicts are being managed.’

2.1.8.5 **Response to change** – ‘change is inevitable, changes may occur in industrial environment, political set-ups, economic conditions, technology and management styles, and organizations may vary in their policies to cope up with the change, and an organization which is in high technology (like information technology – which is related to the topic of this research study), high competition environment, and an organization producing short life cycle products (again,
information technology being a fast changing one, falls under this category) is bound to have inclination towards change.'

2.1.8.6 Employees job satisfaction – 'a major determinant of positive organisational culture, and employees with positive attitude derive greater satisfaction out of their jobs, and thus creating a positive work culture as well as positive relationship with each other.'

2.1.8.7 Team work and cooperation – 'being one of the characteristics of conducive organizational culture and very important as well.'

2.1.8.8 Union management relationship – 'being the important link between management and workers – a good employee and management relation is a basic requirement for a positive and strong corporate culture.'

2.1.8.9 Sense of belonging – 'the identification of employees with the organization being a healthy sign of corporate culture, it generates positive attitude towards work and the employees work hard and give their best.' And,

2.1.8.10 Activation of individuals in group – 'the personality factors of employees having bearing on the corporate culture of the organization, employees involvement in social activities, informal groups, and level of interpersonal relations determine the corporate culture, and this factor is partially affected by organizations attitude towards informal groups.'

2.1.8.11 Discussions : Determinants of Corporate Culture

Gupta (1993) brought out various determinants of corporate culture. They are the key factors in organisational life, which determine what kind of corporate culture would develop in a company. The major determinants of corporate culture were identified and explained above (under sub-headings 2.1.8.1 – 2.1.8.10). These are - leadership of top management, trust among employees, communication system, management of differences and conflicts, response to change, employees job satisfaction, team work and cooperation,
union management relationship, sense of belonging, and activation of individuals in group. These are self-explanatory and important in corporate life.

Moreover, their explanations have been given above, which also signify their relevance in shaping corporate culture. The importance of some of these determinants, such as leadership, communication, response to change etc. in shaping corporate culture were already discussed in details under elements of corporate culture (under heading 2.1.7 and sub-headings). Other factors like - trust among employees, managing differences, employees job satisfaction, employees – management harmonious relationships, sense of belongings, social activities, informal groups and level of interpersonal relations etc. would also go a long way in determining the corporate culture of an organization. Thus, these basic determinants of corporate culture should be equally applicable in determining corporate culture of information technology (IT) companies in India.

2.1.9 Types of Corporate Culture

Management thinkers have classified corporate culture into various types and discussed about them. Some of them relevant to this study are cited below:

2.1.9.1 The Vitalized Type Culture

Prof. Toyohiro Kono's (1993, as referred)\(^\text{34}\) classified 'corporate culture' into five types. The very first of the five types, the vitalized type one, was explained by him as "All members put emphasis on innovation, have a sense of one family or one community, and share common values. The goal of organization is clearly understood and the members understand the meaning of jobs clearly. Information is actively collected from external sources, and is customer-oriented. The organization has good communication both vertically and horizontally. Ideas for improvement are presented voluntarily, and members perform duties in anticipation of the expectations of others. Opposing ideas towards seniors and colleagues are presented. Members take risks also, members feel that there is little social distance between them and their seniors. They do not hesitate to call their
seniors by name. The vitalized culture tends to reproduce new strategies, to implement their will and have high productivity.”

In above, the author has emphasized that ‘vitalized type of corporate culture being the most favourable, companies ought to possess a vitalized type of culture.’ Further, Prof. Kono also discussed the four types of factors that formulate corporate culture as: First, the corporate philosophy – ‘it describes the desired value of the corporations and the desired way of thinking and it thus affects the pattern of behaviour.’ Second, the product-market strategy – ‘it determines the job position which affect the behaviour pattern through experience.’ Third, the organizational structure and personnel management system – ‘in which the organizational structure defines the communication pattern and responsibilities of each member and the personnel management system stipulates the reward and punishment system.’ And, the fourth one, the attitude of top management – ‘which affects the other three.’ Thus, these four factors influence the corporate culture of an organization.

2.1.9.2 Market Place Factors Led Cultures

Deal and Kennedy (1999)\textsuperscript{26}, while discussing the types of cultures existing in various corporations, pointed out two market place factors that influence cultural patterns and practices. They were, first, ‘the degree of risk associated with a company’s key activities’, and second, ‘the speed at which companies – and their employees – get feedback on whether decisions or strategies are successful.’ And, the authors, also found that the market realities are dichotomized into high / low risk, and quick / slow feedback. Then he further categorized four generic cultural types as:

2.1.9.2.1 The Tough-guy, Macho Culture: First, ‘the tough-guy, macho culture’ is a world of individualists who regularly take high risks and get fast feedback – viz. investment banking, advertising, television, movies, sports, entire entertainment industry; their financial stakes are very high; chance plays a major part in tough-guy cultures’ (p. 12).
2.1.9.2.2 The Work Hard / Play Hard Culture: The second, 'the work hard / play hard culture' is the world of sales, where fun and action are rule in which individual employees take few risks but receive quick feedback on whether they were successful or not - viz. most of the sales driven companies fall into this work hard / play hard category which include computer companies, office equipment suppliers, most high-tech start-ups, and a whole raft of support industries like automobile retailing, telemarketing, stock-broking etc; success come with persistence and frenetic level of activity; the heroes of this culture are super salespeople' (p. 13).

2.1.9.2.3 The Bet-your-company Culture: Third, 'the bet-your-company culture' is one where big-stakes decisions are taken and years pass before employees know whether the decision was right - viz. capital-goods companies, mining and smelting companies, large-system businesses, oil companies, and service businesses; in these the corporate bettors may risk the future of the entire company; and in one or two bad decisions the entire enterprise may sink; in such environment, well deliberated collective decision would always be a better choice; it is best symbolized by the slogans of some of the major players in this sector of the economy: “Progress is our most important product” (GE); “Better living through chemistry” (Du Pont); “Alcoa can’t wait for ....... for tomorrow” (p. 13-14).’

2.1.9.2.4 The Process Culture: And, fourth, 'the process culture' is a world of little or no feedback, where employees find it hard to measure what they do; instead they concentrate on how it's done; and this is low risk, slow-feedback corner of the world - viz. banks, insurance companies, financial-service organizations, most retailers, utilities, and heavily regulated industries like pharmaceutical companies etc.; and the employees in this work culture get virtually no feedback, and they have no idea how effective they are until someone blames them for something; and this lack of feedback forces employees to focus on how they do something, not what they do; and the values in this culture center on technical perfection – figuring out the risks and solutions
and getting the process and details right. “Underwriting Excellence,” the Chubb Insurance slogan, is a good example and is “Strive for Technical Perfection.” (Price Waterhouse & Company)' (p. 14).

2.1.9.3 Discussions: Types of Corporate Culture

Prof. Kono (1993) classified corporate culture into five types. The first of the five types - the vitalized type culture – which includes innovation, a sense of one family or one community, shared values, organizational goal, clarity in job responsibilities, importance of information, welcoming new ideas for improvement, customer-orientation, risk taking, good communications, openness, democratic norms, informal environment, good employees-management relationships, new strategies for high productivity, little social distance between juniors and their seniors etc.

The vitalized type culture was found to be most favourable and progressive. It also possesses the characteristics in line with the present research study problem – i.e. corporate culture in information technology (IT) companies in India. Hence, the characteristics of culture identified by Prof. Kono may be considered for studying the culture of these IT companies.

Moreover, four types of factors that formulate corporate culture were also discussed. These are - the corporate philosophy, product-market strategy, organizational structure and personnel management system, and the attitude of top management. Some of them have already been discussed earlier (under headings 2.1.7 and 2.1.8 and sub-headings). Their importance in shaping culture were already established. These factors may be equally applicable in the present research study problem i.e. corporate culture of Indian IT companies.

Deal and Kennedy (1999) talked about four types of corporate cultures – which were based on market place factors like - high / low risk, quick / slow feedback. On this basis, they were further categorized into four types - first, the tough-guy, macho culture (individuals taking high risks and getting fast feedback); second, the work hard / play hard culture (sales oriented, where fun
and action being the rule); third, the bet-your-company culture (big-stakes decisions taken, research oriented, may risk the future of the entire company); and, fourth, the process culture (little or no feedback, values in this culture center on technical perfection).

It has already been established that market place factors or business environment play crucial role in shaping culture of the companies operating in certain environment. In the present case, study of corporate culture of Indian IT companies, which are operating globally, market place factors must be playing important roles in shaping their corporate cultures. One or a combination of a few of these factors must be influencing the corporate cultures of these IT companies.

2.2 Corporate Culture and Organisational Performance

2.2.1 Conceptual Framework: Strong Culture Companies

Deal and Kennedy (1982)\textsuperscript{23}, having done corporate culture and organizational performance analysis of eighty leading American corporations, found the existence of ‘strong culture companies’, and gathered evidence which proved that the ‘impact of their values and beliefs on company performance was indeed real’ (p. 7). The authors further observe that ‘companies that have cultivated their individual identities by shaping values, making heroes, spelling out rites and rituals, and acknowledging the cultural network have an edge.’ And, that ‘these corporations have values and beliefs to pass along - not just the products or services. They have stories to tell - not just profits to make. They have heroes whom managers and workers can emulate - not just faceless bureaucrats.’ The authors further argued that ‘they (corporations) are human institutions that provide practical meaning to people, both on and off the job’; and that ‘people are a company’s greatest resource, and the way to manage them is not directly by computer reports, but by the subtle cues of culture’ (p. 15); and that ‘a “strong culture” is a powerful lever for guiding behaviour; it helps employees do their jobs a little better, especially in two ways’ (p. 15):
First, “A strong culture is a system of informal rules that spells out how people are to behave most of the time”; and, the authors explained that ‘by knowing what exactly is expected of them, employees will waste little time in deciding how to act in a given situation. In a weak culture, on the other hand, employees waste a good deal of time just trying to figure out what they should do and how they should do it. The impact of a strong culture on productivity is amazing. In the extreme a fair estimate could be that a company can gain as much one to two hours of productive work per employee per day ‘(p. 15).

And, Second, “A strong culture enables people to feel better about what they do, so they are more likely to work harder”; and, the authors explained that ‘when a sales representative can say “I am with IBM” rather than “I peddle typewriters for a living”, he will probably wear in response, “Oh, IBM is a great company, isn’t it?”, and he quickly figures out that he belongs to an outstanding company with a strong identity. For most people, that means a great deal. The next time they have the choice of working an extra hour or sloughing off, they will probably work whole heartedly. Overall, this has an Impact on productivity too’ (p. 16).

2.2.2 Impact of Culture on People’s Life and Performance

Deal et. al. (1982)\(^2\), while discussing the impact of culture on the people’s life and work performance – a human resource related performance as a component of organizational performance, further observed that “people at all stages of their careers need to understand culture and how it works because it will likely have a powerful effect on their work lives. The authors further add that people just starting their careers may think a job is just a job, but when they choose a company, they often choose a way of life. The culture shapes their responses in a strong, but subtle way. Culture can make them fast or slow workers, tough or friendly mangers, team players or individuals. By the time they have worked for several years, they may be so well conditioned by the culture they may not even recognize it. But when they change jobs, they may be in for a big surprise and would really realize the impact of the company culture on their
life and behavioural pattern. The authors cite example of a General Electric executive - groomed in a thoughtful, serious, respect for peer group, considerable deference for authority, but slow-moving culture of GE, will be found quite unfit if he switches over to Xerox, which is having a totally different culture than GE. Success and even survival at Xerox is closely tied to an ability to maintain a near frenetic pace, the ability to work and play hard, Xerox-style" (p. 16).

2.2.3 Culture and Organisational Performance

2.2.3.1 Performance of Knowledge Based Companies

Turner (1990)\textsuperscript{1}, While describing corporate culture, pointed out 'the importance of corporate culture of knowledge based companies for achieving high performance' and observed that "In the world of increasingly 'flat' companies and sophisticated "knowledge-based" products, control and understanding of an organization's corporate culture are a key responsibility of corporate leaders, as well as a vital tool for management if it is to encourage high performance and maintain shareholders value" (p. 11). The author further argued that "All cultures are in responses to corporate dilemma. The role of the corporate leader is to manage conflicting needs in a synergistic way, creating an environment in which opposing forces can be reconciled to create rapid and strong growth" (p. 11).

2.2.3.2 Culture Brings Success and is Alterable

The above author (Turner) further associated 'success and competitive advantage to culture' and observed that, "In corporations, culture is used to explain why nothing seem to work, or why competitors are so much successful. Culture is thought to bestow unique competitive advantages and/or dire limitations. .......The rule applies equally to the uniqueness of all distinctive cultures or corporate cultures". Turner further argued that "Corporate culture is describable, measurable if necessary and, within limits, alterable" (p. 11); and further explained that 'suitable methods and tools can be designed to alter,
modify, fine tune and to bring required changes to strengthen corporate cultures to become more effective, and it will also give basic foundation materials to build new corporates with strong and effective cultural foundations for being successful in the fiercely competitive environment.’

2.2.3.3 People’s Performance as Organisational Performance

Deal and Kennedy (1999), observed that “companies that focus on their people and create a social environment – or culture – in which employees can thrive achieve superior, long-term business success. The role culture plays in performance seems obvious since all businesses are people businesses.” The authors further added that, “when people are vested in their work, they work harder, show up on time, stay late when needed and take pride in the company’s products or services. They are loyal, committed, and interested in the collective welfare as well as their individual careers. They speak up when things need to be changed rather than letting some bad thing to happen. Not only their hands but their heads and hearts are engaged in the enterprise’s mission.” And, the authors maintained that “the biggest single influence on a company’s culture is the broader social and economic environment in which the company does business. A corporate culture embodies what it takes to succeed in a particular socioeconomic context – i.e. if hard selling is required for success, a culture will encourage people to sell and sell hard; if manufacturing precision is the requisite for success, a company will see that people employ strict standards to guide their work – as in the case of various Japanese corporations” (p. 21).

The authors further pointed out that after their first research work and initial version of “Corporate Cultures” (1982), a large chorus of executives and academics such as Edgar Schein, Stan Davis, Ralph Kilmann, and Tom Perers among others had further carried out further research work and writings under the same overall concept and strengthened authors’ views and reconfirmed the results (p. 21-22)
Furthermore, the authors in this context cited the views and live experience of a few chief executive officers of leading American corporations to strengthen their (authors') analogy and results as: Starbucks CEO, Howard Schultz (1997), puts the term ‘culture’ this way: “If people relates to the company they work for, they will pour their hearts into making it better .............. I pour my heart into every cup of coffee and so do my partners at Starbucks”; Continental Airlines CEO, Gordon Bethune (1998), says it little differently: “Whatever problems you run into in running a business, they are all people problems ....... Businesses are run by people. So at the root of whatever problems you have in your business you’ll find people ....... A lot of managers and executives miss the forest for the trees by forgetting to look at their people”; Herb Kelleher and Colleen Barrett (1996), Southwest Airlines CEO and Chief Operating Officer, respectively, credit culture for shaping their enterprise: “Culture is one of the most precious things a company has, so you must work harder on it than anything else”; and Kevin and Jackie Freiberg (1996), whose chronicle of Southwest Airlines, Nuts!, received a lot of attention, write, “The idea of corporate culture is too important to the effective functioning of today’s corporations to be dismissed as a fleeting craze. Culture is the glue that holds an organization together” (p. 22).

Deal et. al. (1999), while looking closely at the highly respected companies, asserted that they are bound to have ‘distinctive culture’, and quoted Fortune magazine which reached this conclusion in its survey of businesses with stellar reputations: “The one thing that set the top-ranking companies in the survey apart is their robust cultures”; and the authors further concluded that ‘people do matter in business, and culture plays dominant role in holding people together and giving their efforts focus and meaning and thereby achieving superior organizational performance and greater success of the companies’ (p. 22-23).
2.2.3.4 Corporate Culture and Financial Performance

Deal and Kennedy (1999)\[^{26}\] having established the importance of culture to superior corporate performance, moved on to examine strong cultures regarding their financial performance. Here, the authors pointed out that based on their earlier research work in 1992, they had cited a number of American companies as exemplars of the then emerging management philosophy – i.e. ‘corporate culture’ – which included Caterpillar, General Electric (GE), Du Pont, Chubb Insurance, 3M, Jefferson-Smurfit, Digital Equipment, IBM, Dana Corporation, Procter & Gamble, Hewlett-Packard, Johnson & Johnson, Tandem Computer, and Continental Bank among others. Most of these companies did fare well during their travel of two decades period; except for a few exceptions like IBM faced financial losses; Tandem and Digital also did not do well and were acquired by an upstart like Compaq; Hewlett-Packard got merged with Compaq; and some more such cases came to light during the consolidation phase of U.S. industries.

Moving on, the authors also added that further researches show that had one put his money in the year 1982 in above mentioned culturally admired companies and purchased one share of each company (some of them were not even listed on the stock market that time), his initial stake would have increased by a hefty 987% through the year 1998 i.e. in 16 years time. In the contrast, had one invested his money in the Standard & Poor’s (the famous rating organization) average, the most broadly based index of stock market performance, his stake would have increased by only 538% - around half what one could have gained by betting one the culturally sound and exemplary companies on this account; the authors, while concluding, asserted that “this simple arithmetic alone is enough to substantiate that a company’s culture turns out to be a major determinant of its future economic success” (p. 23-24).
2.2.3.5 Strong Culture and Long-Term Performance

Deal and Kennedy (1999)\textsuperscript{26}, while reviewing research findings of various studies carried out by other researchers in this area, observed that 'Various other researchers, with their more recent work and sufficient depth of study, have further added verification and strengthened the belief', and quoted them as:

John Kotter and James Heskett (1992)\textsuperscript{39}, the two respected professors at Harvard Business School, in their book 'Corporate Culture and Performance', based on a series of four empirical studies between 1987 and 1992 and exploring over 200 companies in considerable depth, had come out with their conclusions as: First, 'corporate cultures have a significant impact on a firm's long-term economic performance'; second, 'corporate cultures will probably be an even more important factor in determining the success of next decade (i.e. through the year 2002)'; third, 'corporate cultures that inhibit strong long-term financial performance are not rare; they develop easily, even in the firms that are full of reasonable and intelligent people'; and fourth, 'although tough to change, corporate cultures can be made more performance enhancing'. And the authors further maintained that "based on solid academic research, these conclusions confirm the correlations between corporate culture and long-term performance"(p. 24).

Also, other researchers - Kotter and Heskett (1992)\textsuperscript{39} looked at financial performance over a ten year period. They analyzed 207 companies – the largest nine or ten firms in twenty-two different U.S. industries. Using a survey questionnaire, the authors were able to construct an index measuring the relative cultural strength of 202 of these companies. Then they evaluated the companies’ 1977-1988 financial performance using three different measures: first, average yearly increase in net income; second; average yearly return on investment, and third, average yearly increase in stock price. Then, the research data and their further analysis established that during the study conducted between 1977 and 1988. The outcome was as: first, culturally strong companies averaged 571% higher gains in operating earnings than those more culturally deprived over the
eleven years period; second, companies with highly rated cultures averaged 417% higher returns on investment than their less culturally robust counterparts; and third, companies with strong cultures saw their stock prices increase 363% more than their culturally challenged peers over the time span of the study (P. 24-25).

Deal et. al. (1999) further added that their own analysis of Kotter and Heskett's data confirmed that 'strong-culture companies massively outperformed weak ones between 1977 and 1988'; and the authors further asserted that their "1982 assertion (i.e. based on the outcomes of their first study), emphasizing cultural robustness, were vindicated with these positive results" (P. 24-25).

2.2.3.6 The Financial Success of Visionary Companies

Furthermore, Deal et. al. (1999) had cited the outcomes of the second major study of the link between 'culture and performance' (although using slightly different language) which was published in 1994. The researchers James Collins and Jerry Porras in their work, "Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies" (1994), examined the history and financial track records of thirty-six companies dating back to the 1920s.

Some of the visionary companies selected for study were - Minnesosta Mining and Manufacturing (MMM), American Express, Boeing, Citicorp, Ford, General Electric (GE), Hewlett-Packard, IBM, Johnson & Johnson, Marriott, Merck, Motorola, Nordstrom, Philips Morris, Procter & Gamble, Sony, Wal-Mart, and Disney among others. And their comparison companies in the respective categories were - Norton, Wells Fargo, McDonnell Douglas, Chase, General Motors (GM), Westinghouse, Texas Instruments, Burroughs, Bristol-Myers, Howard Johnson, Pfizer, Zenith, Melville, R. J. Reynolds, Colgate, Kenwood, Ames, and Columbia respectively (p. 25-26).

Further, Collins and Porras measured the performance of above selected visionary companies from the beginning of 1926 through the end of 1990 – a much longer time frame than that of Kotter and Heskett. Their conclusions,
however, were similar: One dollar invested in each of the visionary companies in 1926 would have been worth $6,356 by the end of 1990. In contrast, the same dollar invested in each of the comparison companies in 1926 would have yielded only $955. An investment in the general stock market average over the same period would have been worth only $415. Hence, Collins and Porras’s research established that “vision pays and their notion of vision certainly relates to culture” (p. 26).

In their research report, the authors Collins and Porras (1994) had listed ten characteristics of these companies that appeared to explain their superior performance. Their first and perhaps most important finding is that building strong culture companies, rather than exploiting novel ideas or making great fortunes, was the driving rationale behind the fabled business leaders of the yesteryear. Some testimony from some legendary figures were cited as: “I have concentrated all along on building the finest retailing company that we possibly could. Creating a huge personal fortune was never particularly a goal of mine.” (Sam Walton, as quoted in Built to Last), and “Our engineering staff [has] remained fairly stable. This was by design rather than by accident. Engineers are creative people, so before we hired an engineer we made sure he would be operating in a stable and secure climate. We also made sure that each of our engineers had a long range opportunity with the company and suitable projects on which to work”. (Bill Hewlett, as quoted in Built to Last). And other comparisons – such as – GE and Westinghouse, Citicorp and Chase, Wal-Mart and Ames, Motorola and zenith, Disney and Columbia Pictures – offered very similar leadership profiles. “Founders’ long-term visions rather than short-term efforts to exploit specific market place opportunities create great companies. Sustaining visions are also the driving force in strong culture companies” (p. 26).

The authors further added: “Another point of similarity between visionary and culturally robust or cohesive companies is found when a close look is given at the relative importance of shared set of core values compared to a narrow
set of immediate objectives such as profit maximization. The history and evolution of number of firms bear this out – for examples, HP versus Texas Instruments, Johnson & Johnson versus Bristol Myers, Motorola versus Zenith, Boeing versus McDonnell Douglas (since absorbed by Boeing), and Philip Morris versus R. J. Reynolds among others, core values appear central in both visionary companies and those termed as culturally robust companies” (p. 26).

Deal et. al. (1999) further observed that “visionary companies are not content with minor achievements. They set huge goals and formidable tasks for themselves. People who are drawn to work in such companies relish challenge. Their willingness to take on and meet daunting challenges is one of the keys to long-term performance superiority. For example, GE under Jack Welch insisted on being number one or two in every one of its markets.” Similarly, Frank Vanderlip set Citicorp on a path to global dominance in 1915 when he said, “I am perfectly confident that it is open to us to become the most powerful, the most serviceable, the most far-reaching world financial institution that has ever been” (as quoted in Built to Last) - (p. 27).

Collins and Porras (1994) also concluded that “the truly great visionary companies have strong, insular, almost exclusionary cultures (in the sense – exclusive, powerful and insulated from outside effects – as in the case of army culture). Working with them is like being in the Marines or the Commando Force: If you don’t shape up quickly, You’ll be out on your ear.” They also cited examples of – Nordstorm, IBM, Disney, and P&G – the culturally sound companies (p. 27-28).

And, amidst various research work done by different scholars and researchers at different times – such as – Collins and Porras, Deal and Kennedy, among others – the consistency in views and main point of convergence in message being – ‘the importance of culture in top performance of companies’. Collins and Porras further stated : “The essence of a visionary company comes in the translation of its core
ideology into the very fabric of the organization, .... Into *everything* that the company does” p. 28).

2.2.3.7 Organisational Performance: Some More Views and Results

Lee and Lawrence (1992)\(^\text{41}\) carried out an in depth study of ‘Corporate Culture and Performance’ of large number of leading American corporations, and analysed the corporates’ cultures and also studied their effects on the performance of the corporations. The authors further established that – “positive and strong corporate culture, leadership, professionalism, conducive work environment and appropriate technology and work tools in and organization result into higher corporate performance and provide it agility and competitiveness, where as companies lacking in it or not incorporating timely changes in their culture and work atmosphere end up showing poor performance, and even tend toward extinction.”

Gay and Salaman (1990)\(^\text{42}\), in their study titled ‘Enterprise Culture and the Search for Excellence’, a paper presented at the Employment Research Unit, Cardiff Business School Annual Conference, looked into the culture of organizations in the search of excellence. The authors finally established that “a positive and strong culture of the organization is one of the strongest tools and the most important one, to achieve excellent performance in the organisation.”

Atkinson (1997)\(^\text{25}\), while discussing ‘organizational performance and strong cultures’, reconfirmed ‘correlation’ between the two on the basis of his own study and various other studies on the topic. The author also cited the previous study in this context done by Deal and Kennedy (1982)\(^\text{23}\) in which these two researchers studied the performance of eighty companies and found that “the more successful companies were those which had strong cultures”, and the strong culture was categorized as –“Has a widely shared philosophy of management; emphasised the importance of people to the success of the organization; encouraged rituals and ceremonies to celebrate company events; had identified successful people and sung their praise; maintained a network to
communicate the culture; had informal rules of behaviour; had strong values; set high standards of performance; and, possessed a definitive 'corporate culture'.

Thompson (Jr.), (1994)⁴³, a well known management consultant, while discussing various aspects and dynamics of organizational cultures, such as, concept of culture, sources of cultural strength, the organizational culture, the machine culture, understanding changes, the dynamics of industry change, techniques for managing change etc., also established that "For good corporate performance, a positive culture is essential. And, a cultural change to make the organization's culture positive could be achieved through 'team building, employees empowerment and TQM'."

2.2.3.8 Rebuilding Culture for Organisational Performance

Barham and Rassam (1989)⁴⁴, in their work "Shaping the Corporate Future", the authors firmly believed that 'a strong and positive corporate culture is the most important thing which brings success and higher performance to an organization and thereby shapes its future.' And, as the title of the book signifies, the authors went through the cultural strengths of various leading companies of the world, formulated strategies for shaping their bright futures, having taken cues from the respective company's culture and its strengths. Some of the major companies cited in this context were : Accor (France), BMW AG (W. Germany), Electrolux Ab (Sweden), Jaguar Plc (United Kingdom), Norks Data As (Norway), Shell U.K. Ltd. (United Kingdom), and J.C.Burton Grnp Plc. (United Kingdom) among others.

Williams, Dabson and Walters (1989)⁴⁵, in their book 'Changing Culture : New Organisational Approaches', first emphasised the need of a positive organizational culture for success, organizational effectiveness and long-term performance. And further, they went through all aspects of corporate cultures, and identified the symptoms when an organizational culture needed changes for the organization to improve performance and survive. Finally, Williams et. al. suggested new organizational approaches in 'changing and rebuilding the
corporate cultures for better performance' and to keep pace with the fast changing time and business environment.

Wiener (1988)\textsuperscript{46}, in his work 'Form of Value System : A Focus on Organisational Effectiveness and Culture Change and Maintain', as the title signifies, described 'values as the core to an organization and to its culture, and values as the soul of an organization.' The author moved on to describing 'various forms and systems of values', such as, 'value for quality, value for customers, value for the people, value for a positive work environment, value for technological excellence, value for ethical and moral practices,...,' and so on. The author further maintained that 'these values can become the purpose of the organization, the culture and norms of the organization', and opined that 'these values and value systems having roped properly can be the basis of organizational effectiveness, a positive change in culture, and would ensure maintaining it and moving the organization in the right direction, and thereby achieving higher performance and fulfilling the organisational goals.'

Atkinson (1990/1997)\textsuperscript{25}, discussed 'a clear meaning, basics and understanding of corporate culture, and its importance in organizational life.' The author further moved on to finding 'ways and means for achieving success and higher corporate performance', and presented the success strategy as – 'shaping the corporate culture, bringing about – Total quality culture, implementation of cultural change, adopting the concept of 'right first time', taking preventive actions against undesirables, development, learning and training.' The author had also discussed about readiness for change, economics of cultural change, cultural and behavioural change, implementation of cultural changes and their review techniques; and recommended the above mentioned 'tips and inputs for corporate success in the long run.'

\textbf{2.2.3.9 Culture and Performance Studies : Indian Context}

Vaidyanathan (1993)\textsuperscript{47}, Director (Personnel), Gas Authority of India Ltd., carried out a detailed study in Indian context on 'work culture vs productivity' in
respect of the giant Indian public sector undertaking - The Gas Authority of India Limited (GAIL). He went through the history of the organisation, identified the major determinants of its culture - external and internal, and their effect on performance, productivity and perception of the employees. And then suggested a suitable strategy 'with the interface between work culture, technology and productivity strategies and planned organisational changes'. It was implemented in the organisation. As a result of that he was able to achieve the planned higher level of productivity and corporate performance 'with a proper mix of culture, Indian ethos and values, and technology' in the Indian context, and established that in spite of unfavourable labour laws and traditional low productivity in Indian public sector undertakings, a proper mix of 'culture and technology' worked well.

Balakrishanan (1993)\textsuperscript{48}, Additional Director (Personnel), SAIL, found a very low productivity level in respect of the Indian steel major, Steel Authority of India Limited (SAIL). It was the leading public sector undertaking in the steel sector in India, with a turnover of around Rs. 10,000 crores per year and employees strength of 2.25 lakh but with the lowest productivity level while comparing with U.K., USA, Japan and S. Korea. The author diagnosed the problems, and further suggested turn-around strategies, which included 'Improving work culture, good I.R., training and development, motivation scheme, modernisation, future vision and planning'. And, having implemented all these, the author found that there was considerable improvement in productivity level and established that it worked well in the Indian large corporation and that too in a public sector undertaking (generally known for low level of productivity).

Mungla (1993)\textsuperscript{49}, Director (Finance), NTPC, described the true story of this great organisation in the Indian public sector which took birth in the year 1975. In this mega corporation, just after 17 years of its operation, the approved investment level was to the tune of Rs. 22,785 crores in the year 1992 with operations of 13 Super Thermal Power Projects and 5 combined cycle Gas Power Projects with total approved capacity of 16,837 MW (Mega Watts). And, further, the author asserted that all these spectacular performance of the Indian
power giant NTPC was attributed to the 'good corporate culture, commitment to quality, promotion of participative culture, welfare and quality of work life'.

Khanna (1993), Deputy General Manager (Mfg.), Hero Honda Motors Limited, presented the real case study about the Motor Cycle giant - the Hero Group having collaboration with the Honda Group of Japan for the Production of 2-wheelers (Motor Cycles) in India. In this case, the author discussed 'about the major determinants which had shaped the positive work culture of this organisation, its internal activities contributing to the development of a good work culture, some welfare activities for development of region around the factory, effect of work-culture on workers attitude and satisfaction and a high level of performance attributed to the conducive positive work culture. And, the author also discussed 'strategies for planned organisational and culture changes' in order to achieve still a 'higher level of performance'.

Sinha (1990), in this specific study on 'work culture in Indian context' and an account of Indian business environment, went into depth 'as to why are employees in some organisations committed to work while their counterparts in other organisations alienated from?' The author found that the things that matter in such cases are - 'Culture, motivation, internal strength of organisations etc.' And, in the course of his study, Sinha also established that - 'work culture is the resultant effect of interaction of organizational and organismic factors which is reflected in established roles, norms and values pertaining to work; and a positive work culture results into higher organizational performance'.

2.2.3.10 Culture and Performance Studies: Asian Context

Morishima (1982), in his research study 'Why has Japan Succeeded?', the author pointed out the real clue regarding ground success to Japan. And, it was nothing but the adoption of 'Western Technology and the Japanese Ethos' - and the blend of these two yielded unimaginable results and grand Japanese success, making it the second largest economy of the world long back. The author further established that 'the traditional Japanese culture' was most
important in this case, which enabled it to absorb the Western technology, absorbed it, improved upon it, re-exported it to the West, still retaining and maintaining the core of its traditional culture.

Cartwright (1999)\textsuperscript{53}, while discussing relevance of traditional Asian cultures and economic development, observed that ‘Japan’s economic achievement is due in large measure to the way the country’s traditional culture was able to absorb and improve upon American technology and management methods. From being a relatively backward nation, almost unknown to the people in the West, Japan has become the second largest economy in the world in the space of two to three generations.’ The author further maintained that ‘The new hybrid work culture has given those countries and companies which have adopted it a significant competitive advantage.’ Cartwright also advised the Western companies as ‘If we are to compete in global market, it is essential for western managers to understand the importance of organizational culture and how it affects the morale, motivation, attitudes and competitive performance of their workforce.’ The author, further moving on to other Asian countries including India and praising their cultural strengths, observed that ‘As the East has absorbed western science and technology to create the new culture, so the West is, of necessity, coming round to an acceptance and greater understanding of the importance of traditional values in the development of a powerful work ethic.’ Cartwright further added ‘However, the economies of the East Asian ‘Tiger’ countries and those of China and India develop in the future, we should remember that Japan was the first of the new national ‘cultural economies’ (p. 6).’

2.2.4 Discussions and Analysis: Corporate Culture and Organisational Performance

A detailed literature survey was carried out in order to ascertain the extent of impacts of corporate culture on organisational performance. Views of various researchers and several research findings regarding the same were studied, analyzed and recorded. Culture’s bearings on the various facets of organisational performance were systematically presented above (under heading 2.2 and sub-
headings 2.2.1 – 2.2.3.10). However, a quick look at them and a further analysis of the above records will enable us to draw conclusions and inferences. It may also be helpful in understanding the research problem of the current research study.

Deal and Kennedy (1982)\(^{23}\), on the basis of various evidences, proved that the impact of strong culture companies’ values and beliefs on company performance was enormous and their productivity was also amazing. ‘strong culture’ was found to be a powerful lever for guiding behaviour and actions of people in achieving the organisational goals. A strong culture also enables people to feel better about their jobs and make them to work harder.

Further, Deal and Kennedy (1999)\(^{26}\) in their second research study also found that culture can make people fast or slow workers, tough or friendly managers, team players or individuals. In a culturally sound company people work not only with their hands but their heads and hearts also. A culture – in which employees can thrive, achieve superior and long-term business success. And, it was established that highly respected and top ranking companies are bound to have ‘distinctive’ or ‘robust’ culture (Fortune magazine’s survey).

Turner (1990)\(^{11}\) talked about cultures in increasingly ‘flat’ companies and sophisticated ‘knowledge-based’ companies (including IT). He also found that an organization’s corporate culture is a vital tool for management to achieve high performance and maintain shareholders value, and it is the key responsibility of corporate leaders. Culture brings success and unique competitive advantages. It is alterable and can be fine-tuned to strengthen corporate cultures to become more effective.

Some more observations on importance of culture for good organisational performance were given as - ‘If people relates to the company they work for, they will pour their hearts into making it better’ (Howard Schultz, 1997)\(^{35}\). Gordon Bethune (1998)\(^{36}\) advocated for building culture by building people and solving their problems for business success. Herb Kelleher and Colleen Barrett (1996)\(^{37}\)
stressed on working harder to build up culture which is a precious thing in the organization and which will bring success and good performance. And, Jackie Freiberg (1996)\(^{38}\) opined that 'the idea of corporate culture is too important to the effective functioning of today's corporations'.

On culture and superior financial performance - Deal and Kennedy (1999)\(^{26}\) established the importance of culture to superior corporate performance. Further, these researchers also established that strong culture companies had much higher financial performance as compared to those companies lacking in cultural strengths. Deal et. al. proved it arithmetically by comparing their financial performances of several years.

On strong culture and long-term performance – John Kotter and James Heskett (1992)\(^{39}\) established that corporate cultures had a significant impact on a firm's long-term economic performance, and corporate cultures would be a more important factor in determining organisational success in the coming decades. Based on the 12 years' data generated by Kotter and Heskett (1992)\(^{39}\), the other researchers - Deal and Kennedy (1999)\(^{26}\) further confirmed that 'strong-culture companies massively outperformed weak ones'. Also, these researchers reconfirmed their earlier findings in 1982, and asserted that 'cultural robustness, were vindicated with these positive results'.

And, on financial success of visionary companies - Collins and Porras (1994)\(^{40}\), and Deal and Kennedy (1999)\(^{26}\) found that 'core values' were central in both 'visionary companies' and 'culturally robust companies', and these companies had amazingly high level of organisational performance.

Further, several other researchers - Lee and Lawrence (1992)\(^{41}\), Gay and Salaman (1990)\(^{42}\), Atkinson (1997)\(^{25}\), and Thompson (Jr.), (1994)\(^{43}\) had carried their separate study and research on corporate cultures and their impacts on organisational performance. All of them separately established that a strong correlation exists between corporate culture and organisational performance.
And, a number of researchers like - Barham and Rassam (1989); Williams, Dabson and Walters (1989); Wiener (1988); and Atkinson (1990/1997) advocated for rebuilding corporate culture and incorporating necessary changes in it to achieve higher organisational performance and success.

Also, in five real life stories - study of corporate culture and organisational performance in Indian context - Vaidyanathan (1993), Director (Personnel), Gas Authority of India Ltd. (GAIL); Balakrishanan (1993), Additional Director (Personnel), Steel Authority of India Limited (SAIL); Mungla (1993), Director (Finance), NTPC; Khanna (1993), Deputy General Manager (Manufacturing), Hero Honda Motors Limited; and Sinha (1990) carried out study of corporate culture and organisational performance in their respective organizations. They also implemented suitable strategies in their organizations to strengthen corporate culture and brought positive changes in their corporate cultures. By doing so, they were able to achieve much higher organisational performance in their companies.

And, in culture and performance studies in Asian context - Morishima (1982) established that Japan succeeded due to 'Western Technology and the Japanese Ethos' – it was traditional Japanese culture which brought amazing success to Japan. And, Cartwright (1999) also found that traditional Japanese and Asian countries' cultures were largely attributed in bringing tremendous prosperity and high level of economic development in Japan and other Asian countries.

In nutshell, there exists a 'high correlation between corporate culture and organisational performance'.

And, on the basis of above outcomes and various confirmations and reconfirmations, it may be inferred that in the present research study on 'corporate cultures of Indian IT companies and their total organisational
There is a likely high correlation between these two. However, it can only be confirmed after a field survey.

2.3 Corporate Culture in Knowledge Based Companies and IT Industry

2.3.0 Introduction

‘Information technology’ (IT) and other ‘knowledge based’ companies are relatively new phenomena, not only in India but in the world also. They are still in the process of evolution. These companies are mainly people based, who are highly skilled and different in temperament. Their ‘minds’ are the raw materials for such knowledge based companies. Their work environment is also different. The corporate culture in these companies is different than the traditional companies’ cultures. The corporate cultures in these companies are emerging ones. However, some views of researchers and scholars on the topic are cited below under different sub-headings:

2.3.1 “Flat” Organisations : IT and Knowledge Based Companies

Turner (1990), discussed ‘corporate culture’, and made special reference to corporate culture of ‘knowledge based’, ‘IT’ and ‘flat’ organisations. The author first described corporate culture (already cited at appropriate place) and then moved on to describing importance of corporate culture of knowledge based (including IT) companies for achieving high performance. The author further argued that ‘In the world of increasingly ‘flat’ companies and sophisticated “knowledge-based” products (including IT and software), control and understanding of an organization’s corporate culture are a key responsibility of corporate leaders, as well as a vital tool for management if it is to encourage high performance and maintain shareholders value’ (p. 11).

2.3.2 “Flat” Organizations and Leadership

Turner, further pointed out that ‘the traditional “hierarchy system” which integrated the corporation, in the way, the “brains” at the top of the organization
told "the hands" or manual workers at the bottom what to do, and how and when to do it.' And moving further, the author asserted that 'the sheer complexity of modern business operations has overwhelmed this system' (p. 17).

And, the author further, while discussing a knowledge based company or a company of the future, observed that 'the company of the future is often portrayed as “flat”, without vertical command chains. The boss, even if there is one, can no longer know what everyone should do. The entire organization is stuffed with knowledge. No single head can contain the information and skills which are necessary' (p. 17). And, the author cited the example of NASA as – ‘it reputedly takes 68 different kinds of engineers to make one lunar-landing module for NASA. We can well imagine “commanding” this coterie of esoteric experts. It is simply not possible.’ And, the author asserted that – ‘all a leader can really do is manage the culture of the place where the work is done, extol the vision of the completed whole and the performance standards needed to attain this, and manage the extremely subtle communications necessary for the working together of all parts of the module’ (p. 17).

Turner, further talked about leaders and followers in this new environment, and argued that ‘the whole notion of leaders and followers is increasingly out of date and may even be source of confusion. Followers “lead” in a variety of ways, using judgment, knowledge, skill and self-management. Leaders may have to spend large amounts of their time “following” what skilled subordinates are trying to tell them.’ The author further cautioned that ‘where traditional views of leadership linger and bosses are seen to possess inalienable forms of superiority in all relationships, independent of their actual knowledge, the whole national economy may suffer.’ And, Turner finally suggested that ‘the capacity to delegate responsibility to where the knowledge resides is crucial to organizational effectiveness’ (p. 18).
2.3.3 *The Ladder of Responsibilities and a Responsibility Hierarchy*

Turner, while discussing about the ladder of responsibilities in the context of the knowledge based companies or the companies of the future, argued that ‘it is false to believe that “authority is breaking down” because a boss can no longer tell most subordinates what to do’, and asserted that ‘it may break down because leaders fail to manage cultures and do not know how to shape this complex phenomena’. The author also observed that ‘this is a soluble problem and a skill that can be mastered’, and further advised that ‘a distinction must be made between behaviours called “hierarchical” – by which the person complaining means that he or she is being ordered around too much and is not being allowed enough discretion’ – and suggested the existence of a “responsibility hierarchy” (p. 18).

The author further asserted that ‘hierarchical behaviour is becoming less and less appropriate in an environment where employees are required to exercise their own judgment and are being paid to do so. But does not affect the existence of a responsibility hierarchy ..... Increasingly, the leader may want to seek the help of the subordinates in defining what good performance is’ (p. 18).

Turner, in the context of knowledge dominated new corporate environment, suggested that ‘the concept of levels of responsibility with culture at the top is most important’ (p. 18); and clarified it as - ‘If A tells B, C and D exactly how they should perform, this inevitably impinges upon their areas of judgment and expertise. But if A tells them what good performance is and then celebrates its attainment or criticizes its non-attainment, then all the responsibility for performing well remains with subordinates.’ And, the author maintained that ‘while A accepts responsibility for creating “a culture of high performance” in the company; culture, then, stands at the apex of the leader’s responsibility hierarchy’ (p. 18-19).

Turner, then, concluded it as – ‘the leaders take responsibility for the whole culture “game”, the complete arena in which all the businesses’
activities occur' (p. 19). And, the author further added that – ‘there will be leaders increasingly behaving like mentors, strategists and coaches to the learning and performances of their employees – encouraging creativity, for example, as did Anders Lindstrom at BHACO, not knowing himself what should be created. If the leaders shape the culture, the employees will shape the ideas and everyone will “lead” at his own level’ (p. 19).

2.3.4 Corporate Cultures in the Age of IT and Advanced Technologies

Deal and Kennedy (1982)\textsuperscript{23}, while discussing organizational cultures in IT and knowledge era companies – in the age of information technology (IT) and other advanced technologies and rapidly changing business environment, observed that ‘the breakdown of the large traditional, hierarchical organizations that have dominated in the past, and the dismantling of such organizations resulting into highly decentralized organizations in which the work of the corporations being done in small, autonomous units linked to the mega-corporation by new telecommunications and computer technologies, the process transforming the role of middle management, and most middle management rungs being replaced by mechanisms of social influence – by emphasis on culture. The business becoming a no boss business, and consequent emergence of atomized organizations, and to manage them – strong cultural ties and a new kind of symbolic management emerging on the business organization’ (p. 177).

Deal et. al., while discussing the new kind of workforce manning these organisations, observed that ‘the workforce has continued to gravitate more and more in the “Theory Y” (McGregor, 1950) direction’, and ‘the new knowledge workers / workers are – richer, better educated, white collar, more flexible and less job-dependent, and more familiarity with computer and information technologies, electronics, much more conversant with electronic gadgetry than workers have been before.’ Deal et. al. further observed that ‘The organization designers no longer relying upon middle management – with its natural tendency to shape communications to fit its views of the world – to link workers together –
with the increasing use of computer and information technologies on a major scale' (p. 179-180).

And, the authors, while discussing the changes in technology, observed that 'the "Third Wave" revolution of computer and information technologies, powerful personal computers (PCs), microcomputer applications, standardized and powerful chips, computer enabled new products and equipments, customized software, and increasingly becoming cheaper as well as more powerful and all pervasive use of computers have changed the work and the lives' (p. 181-182). And, while talking on the new type of organization, the authors observed 'the emergence of small, task-focused work units, each with economic and managerial control over its own destiny, interconnected with larger entities (mega corporations) with computer and communications links, and bonded into larger companies through cultural bonds; and they call such entity as atomized organization' (p. 182-183).

2.3.5 Team Culture: IT and Knowledge Based Companies

Sherriton and Stern (1996)\textsuperscript{54}, while discussing relevance of 'team culture in the context of corporate culture' in the present day IT and other knowledge era organizations, pointed out that 'In the past, employees came together informally to generate ideas or solve problem. These teams were not considered a formal part of the organizational structure and were seldom recognized in formal compensation or reward systems. But the organization would opt for teamwork when a contribution was required from various groups across an organization' (p.2).

And, the authors further observed that 'Faced with new challenges, organizations today are quickly moving toward new, formal structures where cross-functional teaming replaces the traditional hierarchical organization with a matrix structure. Short-term, long-term, and even permanent alliances among functions or across organizations are prevalent. Interdisciplinary and interdepartmental project teams are becoming the norm in how works get done
And to create **high-performing teams**, the authors maintained that ‘We must first acknowledge that teamwork doesn’t come naturally. While individuals and organizations are trained to pay lip service to the value of working together, this approach actually clashes with cultures that reward “looking out for number 1”.’ Hence, the authors, in this present work, pointed out that ‘organisations are embracing the concept of work teams and also clarify that without an underlying team culture, any team - based structure is doomed to collapse.’

Sherriton et. al. also addressed in depth the issue of changing organisational culture to support team effectiveness; presents a practical, proven model for achieving such transformation, and illustrate the process with various case-studies and examples (p. 46-51, 68-99).

### 2.3.6 Discussions: Culture in IT and Knowledge Era Companies

Information technology (IT) and knowledge based companies are relatively new entities in India and elsewhere in the world. So is the case with the culture of these companies. Their culture is still in the process of evolution. Nevertheless, these companies, which belong to fast changing technological fields, possess their unique corporate cultures. With changing time, rapidly changing technologies and business environment worldwide, they have been incorporating new changes in their culture to remain competitive in the market place. Some researchers and management thinkers studied the pattern of their cultures and gave their views which are presented above (under heading 2.3 and sub-headings 2.3.0 – 2.3.5). However, a brief discussion on the topic and further analysis of the same may help in drawing conclusions. It is given below:

Turner (1990)\(^\text{11}\) talked about cultures in the sophisticated ‘knowledge-based’ companies (including IT) companies. He found that these companies are increasingly becoming ‘flat’ and hierarchical behaviour is becoming less and less appropriate in their case. The ‘authority is breaking down’ in the organization
and a 'responsibility hierarchy' is taking place. The old concept of the 'brains' at the top and 'the hands' at the bottom of an organization is shattering. Turner also observed that the entire organization is stuffed with knowledge. No single head can contain all the information and skills that are necessary. The boss, even if there is one, can no longer know what everyone should do. All a leader can really do is manage the culture and not bossing around.

Further, the concept of levels of responsibility with culture at the top is most important. An organization's corporate culture is a vital tool for management to achieve high performance and maintain shareholders' value. And, appropriate culture in an organisation is the key responsibility of corporate leaders. Culture brings success and unique competitive advantages. It is alterable and can be fine-tuned to strengthen corporate cultures to become more effective (Turner, 1990). And, what Turner observed and assumed more than a decade back, such flat organisations, responsibility hierarchy, leadership role etc. have become the order of the day in today's IT and other knowledge based companies.

In this context, Deal and Kennedy (1982) had earlier talked about highly decentralized organizations in which the work of the corporations were supposed to be done in small, autonomous units linked to the mega-corporation by new telecommunications and computer technologies. The authors also predicted that such new type of organization would have small, task-focused work units, each with economic and managerial control over its own destiny. It would be interconnected with larger entities (mega corporations) with computer and communications links, and bonded into larger companies through cultural bonds. Thus, the authors gave the concept of atomized organization for these new breed companies.

Now, while comparing the above assumptions given earlier by Deal et. al. more than two decades back in 1982 with the on ground situation, it is found that today such type of organisations are widely present in India and other parts of the world in IT and knowledge based companies. Their presence is quite evident
in the forms of outsourced and outsourcing companies in IT and other knowledge sectors.

Further, Sherriton and Stern (1996)\textsuperscript{54} envisaged new challenges in IT and knowledge based companies and arrived at the concept of high-performing teams as the appropriate solution of the problem. Again, going through the real situation in IT and knowledge based companies, it is found that today 'team culture' and 'high performing teams' have taken deep root in these new breed companies in India and elsewhere in the world.

In fine, the above views and assumptions given by various management thinkers and researchers are actually happening in today's IT and knowledge based companies in various ways. In modern IT and other new breed companies, they are evident in the forms of - flat organisations, responsibility hierarchy, high performing teams, decentralized and atomized organizations etc.

2.4 The Emerging Corporate Cultures

2.4.1 Traditional Corporate Cultures in Crisis

Deal and Kennedy (1999)\textsuperscript{26}, in their recent research based book "New Corporate Cultures : Revitalizing the Workplace after Downsizing, Mergers and Reengineering", observed that 'with the changing time, technology, competitiveness, market forces, globalization and fast changing business environment – the traditional meaning and values of 'corporate culture' have under gone sea changes since late 1980s, and the process is still continuing as this being the transition phase. The old values and ways of working are loosing their meanings and new dimensions and new elements of corporate culture are invading its old domain. Corporate cultures are in disarray. Employees are frightened about their future job prospects. Loyalties to companies has flown out of window. Cynicism about management is rampant. Self interest rules the roost. People yearn for the "good old days." The shareholder value thinking drove most of the changes in a decade's time' (p. 17).
The authors also pointed out that 'until the early-to mid 1980s, most managers balanced the interests of the various "stakeholders" in their business and used accounting measures of performance to help them keep score.' Deal et. al. also cited Ralph Cordiner, highly respected CEO of General Electric through the late 1950s, who argued that 'the senior executives were responsible for managing the enterprise "in the best-balanced interests of shareholders, customers, employees, suppliers, and plant community cities"; and, David Packard who commented in his 1995 book, The HP Way, about a business conference he attended in the late 1940s where he expressed the view that "business had responsibilities beyond making a profit for their shareholders........ We had important responsibilities to our employees, to our customers, to our suppliers and to the welfare of society at large" (p. 44).

2.4.2 Emergence of New Corporate Cultures

Deal et. al. (1999) observed that 'the traditional corporate cultures are in crisis', and also found that 'New dimensions in the corporate cultures have emerged threatening and crushing the old ones.' All such findings by the authors are cited below as:

First, The Rise of Shareholder Value and Short-termism – led by discounted cash flow (DFC), "bootstrap" (a new concept by Jerome (Jerry) Kohlberg Jr. and George Roberts), LBOs (leveraged buyouts), KKR (Kohlberg, Kravis and Roberts, 1976, 1982-86 and onwards) etc. - The aggressiveness of the takeover artists, combined with hefty profits, pushed the concept of shareholder value to center stage. In the beginning most of the deals were "friendly" and there were certain level of protection towards management teams as well as taking care of investors. But as the time passed by, the notorious trend of "hostile takeovers" became the rule of the game. The rest is history. The world changed since then, and so the corporate cultures. Hostile takeovers, corporate raiders, painful mergers, acquisitions, restructuring, belt tightening, and the likes
became the names of the vicious games – greatly damaging the traditional fabric of corporate cultures.

And, on **short-termism** (short-term management) front, the pressure imposed on managers by the threat of the takeover artists of the 1980s in some cases encouraged companies to act on their own behalf. Companies went on restructuring spree, cost cutting, and work-force became the first victim of such restructuring. its business, and to start with ordered an 8% reduction in employment level around the company. Also, companies went on building critical mass through acquisition in the core-competencies. The combination of all these actions was a very short-termist view on the part of managers. The age of the shot-term managers has arrived (p. 43-62).

**Second, Downsizing and Reengineering (corporate lobotomy)** - which has cut the soul out of many corporations, throwing thousand of workforce on the road by making them jobless, and the lost of trust which had taken years to build (p. 63-88).

**Third, Outsourcing (corporate amputation)** - which has emerged as the new tool of cost cutters just when conventional cost-reduction approaches have begun to run out of steam (p. 89-107).

**Fourth, Merger Mania (shotgun marriage)** - which has forced the most unlikely of combinations on workforces still reeling from the waves of cost cutting that decimated them in the early 1990s (p. 109-129).

**Fifth, Computers (cultural isolation)** – computerization, potentially a tool for liberating workers from drudgery, has instead isolated workers from one another and made them servants to machines (p. 131-148).

**Sixth, Globalization** – the narrowing boundaries of the world have thrown peoples together to create a virtual Tower of Babel in the global workplace (p.149-168).
And, finally, the combination of these factors has decimated traditional corporate cultures, replacing joy, commitment, and loyalty with fear, alienation, and self-interest (p. 169-187).

2.4.3 New Dimensions in Corporate Cultures

Sherriton and Stern (1996)^54, while discussing emergence of new dimensions in corporate cultures during the last one decade and meeting these challenges, observed that:

‘Mergers and acquisitions are rampant, and there is no letup in sight. According to Mergerstat (Philip, 1995)^55, a merger research service, deals worth over $248 billion were made in the first quarter of 1995. Mergers and acquisitions are usually designed to produce synergism between the participating companies and overall cost reduction through economies of scale. In each deal, the merging of the companies means the ultimate merging of critical functions within companies, such as distribution systems, marketing programs, sales organizations, or manufacturing facilities’ (p. 3).

‘Globalization is another factor. L’Oreal, a French company, recently announced a merger with the third largest U.S. cosmetic firm, Maybelline. Another, .....Matsushita’s acquiring MCA .....In these cross-border deals, a company has to cope not only with the corporate culture issues but with the added issues of national culture mixes’ (p. 4); ‘Many organizations have found that mergers and acquisitions route is fraught with problems, and they have sought a less permanent, less complex strategy to achieve the expected synergy. ...viz...Strategic alliances .....Partnering .....to make operations more efficient .....Alliances are also common in the health care industry....’ (p. 4).

Sherritton and Stern, moving on further, observed ‘Perhaps the greatest impact on American business today is the advent of downsizing, or rightsizing, or any of a number of euphemism for layoffs as a survival strategy. Foreign and domestic companies in every industry find their bottom lines adversely affected by increasing costs for personnel, raw materials, real estate, and equipment. At
the same time, prices for products and services are being driven down by competition, new technology, and increased productivity. This new environment of keener competition has prompted companies to cut their costs in order to remain competitive – indeed, to survive. As a result, over the past five years organizations have been shedding employees at a frantic rate. IBM has reduced its workforce by close to 50 per cent, ...Mobil Oil ...by 30 per cent, ...AT&T ...announced cutting 40,000 more. It is difficult to find a company that has not attempted a cutback strategy of some kind’ (p. 4-5).

The authors further added that ‘Reengineering is another strategy of late. ...business...to reengineer its processes to become as effective and efficient as possible’ ; and “Total Quality Management” (TQM), ‘a movement that has swept into government and industry and created a dramatic change in how we act, think, do work, and structure (restructure) our organizations’ (p. 5).

And ‘All these strategies have been implemented to make organizations more effective’ (p. 5); and the author further explained that all these measures and strategies being emerging trends in the corporate lives and cultures and posing challenges are implemented in the organizations ‘to make themselves more effective and to ensure their survival ....trying to make dissimilar cultures compatible’ (p. 6); and all these implementations ‘cost the organizational cultures heavily, result in job cuts, unemployment, under employment; distort the cultural fabrics, bring miseries and pains in the lives of thousands of effected employees'; but the authors further observed that ‘such phenomenon is inevitable in the present economic and competitive scenario'; and thus, they try to find out ‘some solution to minimize its ill effects on the corporate culture and lives of workers and employees'.

Sherriton and Stern, in the above context further observed that ‘In looking at how companies are trying to meet the challenges posed by today’s business environment, we have found that the most typical response involves the increased use of teams in accomplishing work. Organizations are discovering that with reduced workforces, but usually no reduction in the work itself, they
must change how they do things. A major way to do so is through the use of teams’ (p. 6).

And that ‘The mergers and acquisitions and alliance strategies have also dictated the need for the newly merged and aligned organizations to embrace the tenets of teams. Successfully meshing these organizations into teams that can meet the established goals is the point of the strategy, after all. The hope and expectation is to have an “organization team” where branches, divisions, and departments from dissimilar cultures come together in synergy. ... ... So teams and teaming are upon us and are here to stay’ (p. 7).

The researchers further added that ‘Clearly, the change to teams must be addressed as an overall change in culture. There is an obvious need for a specific methodology to address changing an organization’s culture’ (p. 8); further, they have developed appropriate methods and models for this purpose and maintained that ‘Teaming is a vital way to structure work, fine-tuning the culture and meet today’s business as well as cultural challenges’ (p. 9).

2.4.4 Emerging Culture in IT and Knowledge Era Companies

IT and Knowledge based companies are relatively new phenomenon and their cultures are still evolving. It has already been separately discussed above in details, as it (corporate culture in ‘Indian IT companies’) constitutes a major part of the topic of the research study. It is covered under heading 2.3 and sub-headings 2.3.1 (“Flat” Organisations : IT and Knowledge Based Companies), 2.3.2 (“Flat” Organizations and Leadership), 2.3.3 (The Ladder of Responsibilities and a Responsibility Hierarchy), 2.3.4 (Corporate Cultures in the Age of IT and Advanced Technologies), and 2.3.5 (Team Culture : IT and Knowledge Based Companies).
2.4.5 "Corporate Charisma" - Company’s Image, Personality, Brands and Culture

Temporal and Alder (1998), in their book “Corporate Charisma”, while discussing corporate ‘culture and its resultant performance’ under caption “How to achieve world-class recognition by maximizing your company’s image, personality, brands and culture”, had merged ‘corporate image, personality and brands’ with ‘corporate culture and performance’. The authors also had stressed upon strengthening these factors as “they will lead companies well into the next millennium (21st century)” (p. 2).

The authors, further explained the importance of ‘corporate image, personality, brands and culture’ as “these factors will create value-driven visions and mission; develop lasting corporate identity; establish road map for future strategic direction; create sustainable competitive advantage; create and manage a powerful corporate brand; reverse declining customer loyalty; boost employee morale and commitment; attract new customers; dramatically improve internal and external customer service; provide focus and direction for advertising and public relations; escape the product life cycle trap; achieve corporate immortality; and finally lead companies well into the next millennium” (p. 3).

2.4.5.1 Charisma and Corporate Personality

Temporal and Alder, while talking about charisma and corporate personality, observed that “Your personality embraces everything about you - what you are and want to be, your values, dreams and unique characteristics. It is your personality what makes you you. We often refer to some persons as having charisma when there is something special and attractive about them. Their personality seems to go beyond any of the more visible talents and resources they might possess. Whatever their other characteristics, charismatic people attract others to them” (p. 3-4)
Temporal et. al. further added that “A Company's personality is what makes it different to It's competitors. And, just as with individuals, there are companies that have the special charishma, and others, even large conglomerates, seem nondescript by comparison. A distinctive corporate personality is what enables the customer to single you out, what makes them remember you, and what creates loyalty. It is what gives a company, organization or institution life - human qualities in the mind of its customers that they can relate to. It is what can make an otherwise soulless legal entity seem dependable, caring, lovable, professional or cute and cuddly (a close and trusted friend like). A company, depending on your own personality, you like to do business with” (p. 4).

Moving on, the authors also brought out that “A company personality often reflects how its customers see themselves, or how they would like to be seen. ....... We tend to like people who are like us. And that 'likeness' is perceived in terms of human characteristics that go to form personality” (p. 4).

Further, comparing corporate charisma with corporate personality, the authors further asserted saying “Of course it isn't vital to be charismatic to succeed. We all know people who we would not describe as having charisma yet we admire and respect them for who they are and their own, unique personality. An the sample applies to companies. Some world class businesses that attract millions of loyal customers may be dependable, sensitive, caring, mature, trendy, or classy – in fact they have a distinct that appeals to a certain market segment. And that genuine, consistent personality is the key to their long term success......The term corporate personality embraces the ideal of charisma that many companies aspire to, but does not exclude other characteristics that might appeal to your customers” (p. 4).

2.4.5.2 Unique Personality – A Foundation for World-class Recognition

Further, Temporal and Alder, while describing the importance of developing a unique personality, opined that “Charisma, or any personality trait,
is in the eye of the beholder, of course, and a successful personality strategy will depend on perception and positioning in the minds of your customers. It is not just about image. In the long run people will be attracted to you for who you really are – your true identity, not an image or façade. So the strategic process involves identifying your true personality, and if need be to change it to align with your mission, vision, values, culture, branding and positioning strategy, and of course your customers. In this way you can project a unique personality that will attract and keep customers and be your foundation for world class recognition” (p. 4 – 5).

And, the authors further asserted that “Companies that single-mindedly set about creating and managing corporate personality along with culture will be the survivors and winners in the next century” (p. 6). Temporal et. al. further added that “Corporate personality is not a discretionary extra, but, whatever your core product or service, the core attribute for your company to succeed competitively. Everything else from quality control to information technology can be copied, acquired or eventually home-grown. Personality is different. It is your unique identity” (p. 7).

The authors, on importance of uniqueness of personality, further observed that “Every human being is unique. And it is not only our physical looks that makes each of us different, it is also our personality. Consequently it is very difficult to copy someone else – to behave like them consistently. Not only are we unique, but we have an unerring tendency to act consistently over time. We tend to stay true to our personality. Wild swings in behaviour are regarded as abnormal; extreme swings, schizophrenic. And the same rules apply to corporate personality. Inconsistency between what you say and what you do, or from one month to the next, will expose you as an impostor, a liar, a cheat” (p. 8).

And, on people like people due to personality and a magnetic attraction, the authors put a question “Why do some products and companies seem to have a special power that draws people to them?” The authors resolved it citing the power of personality as - “The answer is that they have a personality. People like
people – or at least who are like themselves. They don’t like dealing with
machines any more than faceless bureaucracies. And they particularly like
people who are like them.” And, they further clarified “But relationships are a two
way process. So if a company can understand who its customers are and what
are like as people, then build a similar personality for them to identify with, they
will create a magnetic attraction” (p. 8).

Furthermore, the authors brought out important implications arising out of
the above facts and opined that: Firstly, “If a company can provide itself or each
of its products with its own personality, then imitations will be difficult to create. In
this way, personality is an invaluable intangible asset that cannot be copied or
owned by competitors. Other companies can copy or acquire technology,
processes, systems, structures and products, but not personality. If they try, not
only will they will be seen as ‘mimicking’ someone else, but also it will be difficult
for them to do that consistently” (p. 9). And, secondly, “Companies must be
consistent in their behaviour, otherwise they will be seen as wild, erratic or
unreliable. This is one of the rules of personality” (p. 9).

2.4.5.3 Strength of Personality - Beating the Competition and Creating
Family Bond

Temporal et. al., while talking about personality and competitive
advantage, observed, “Personality then, because it is unique, provides a source
of sustainable competitive advantage. And if customers or potential customers
like what they see in this ‘person’ then there is every likelihood that they will
develop a lasting relationship and they will become ‘friends’.” They further added
that “Some of the world’s greatest companies and products grow and prosper on
the strength of their Personality”, and cited ‘Coke’ as example (p. 9).

Moving on, the authors, in the context of corporate personality and image,
observed, “A company is like a family in all respects. Some of the most
successful companies – big or small – are those that have been true to their
‘family values’, projecting a consistent personality and image. Employee
behaviour or corporate activities that are out of ‘character’ can result in a tarnished image, a loss of face, and even loss of company friends – customers.” And, further argued, “Strong corporate personalities have much the same emotional bonding as families. Personality creates the bond, and the difference. For companies, personality is the key differentiator – the one thing that cannot be owned by another company, but which can endure and attract more friends. .... Corporate personality is more than a name. As with a family, it is what is behind name that counts. You will stand or fall by what your company name means to the outside world” (p. 10-11).

2.4.5.4 Personality and Corporate Success

Temporal and Alder (1998)⁵⁶, in their current work, had treated ‘corporate personality’ as the reflection of a comprehensive and all inclusive ‘corporate culture’ which is the key factor responsible for ‘corporate performance and success’. The authors included in it other components (making it comprehensive one) and discussed them under various captions like - corporate vision and mission, brand building and corporate image, positioning and differentiation, advertising and promotion, culture and employee attraction, and the bottom line. A brief account of the same is given below:

2.4.5.4.1 Vision and Mission

The authors observed, “Vision and mission statements are the ways of expressing the aspirations of a company. Invariably, they include references to their philosophy of business and their values that underpin this”. They further clarified it as “Companies often start (sometimes unintentionally) to lay down the foundations for a corporate personality at this stage.” And, the authors also cited a well-devised and intentional ‘vision statement’ of a bank which strived to be the ‘heartbeat of the community’ wherever it operated. Accompanying that ‘vision’ was ‘a whole set of strategies’ for exercising social responsibilities, community development projects, environment and ecological upgradation etc. That bank’s ‘core value’ included being caring, friendly, responsible and resourceful. All these
had given rise to unique personality and positioning statements which
differentiated that company (bank) from other. That became the basis of
organisational success in this case (p. 11–12).

2.4.5.4.2 Brand Building and Corporate Image

In this context Temporal et. al. pointed out: "Some of the world's most
successful companies have built their corporate and product brands, by adding
personality. This can apply to intangible items which the customers value and
feel attracted to, over and above the basic products and services. People are
attracted to personalities that are part of the brand proposition. So corporate
personality can be the basis of a successful brand strategy."

The authors further added, "Image is the pooled perceptions that
consumers hold about a company. It shows how people see you. The image
that eventually appears in consumer minds is a product of a filtering process as
they subconsciously sort out what they like and don't like about a company, its
products and services." And, "If the company develops a distinct personality
and consumers identify with this, the image evoked is much more likely to be strong
and favourable. Companies with strongly developed brand personalities usually
have strong positive images" (p. 12).

2.4.5.4.3 Positioning and Differentiation

The authors argued that "Positioning is all about influencing the mind of
the consumers to view the company or its products or services differently from
competitors." The further clarified that companies may adopt different
positioning strategies, even then the personality provides a consistent platform.
And added that "Individual personalities who are well liked find it easier to
interact with different people. So it is with companies – if a company is well liked
by individuals, businesses and other market segments, success will be easier to
achieve." And, they further clarified "But, as with image, positioning is the
customers' perception rather than the company's intention. In this case it is what
the customer sees relative to another company" (p. 12–13).
2.4.5.4.4 Advertising and Promotion

The authors further observed, “In order for companies to build strong brands and images, and encourage customer loyalty, there has to be a consistent platform upon which to base these. The key to successful advertising and promotion is to make your campaigns creative and different whilst making sure that they are both consistent and appropriate. Personality provides the foundation. Strong values and personality traits can be used in creative but appropriate ways to communicate consistent messages.” They further added, “The physical appearance of a company through sales outlets can be a turn-on or turn-off to customers. As with advertising and promotion, the company becomes more easily recognizable if colour, layout and materials, for instance, are kept consistent. People are largely consistent in their behaviour, and they like it when companies are too.” And further, the authors opined “The personality of a the company can strengthen this perception if it is built into the physical interface with the customer” (p. 13).

2.4.5.4.5 Culture and Employee Attraction

Temporal and Alder, further observed, “Staff feel proud and exhibit loyalty to firms that portray the values important to them. Motivation is much higher than in companies that do not care about their values, and staff turnover is less of a problem. Recruitment becomes easier as the company's reputation as a value-driven organization spreads. On top of this, inspired employees create profitable businesses, so values affect the bottom line. The impact of values on employees tends to be self-fulfilling.”

The authors further added, “If staff see the company – and to them this usually means the CEO and senior managers – operating true to its personality, they will tend to behave in the same way. If the values are practiced widely and continuously within the company, the value driven culture and personality become the one. You cannot fake culture for long and inevitably people, particularly customers, notice” (p. 13-14).
2.4.5.4.6 The Bottom Line

Finally, Temporal and Alder (1998)\(^{56}\) concluded it as: "Corporate personality and the personality values affect consumer and employee behaviour which combine to impact heavily on the bottom line – profit. Over time large increases in sustainable profits and asset value are the rewards." And, it is true for ‘corporate culture and its core values’ as well – as corporate culture and corporate personality both merge with each other and become one' (p. 14).

Hence, the message is: 'Corporate personality and culture – armed with vision, mission, core values, image and brand value – pay well' (p. 14).

2.4.6 Corporate Image, Brand, Identity, Communication and Global Operations
(In the context of Corporate Culture and Organisational Performance / Success)

2.4.6.1 Introduction

In today's fast changing global business environment and emergence of a global village, both corporate culture and organisational performance have assimilated various other factors under them to remain relevant. Some of such factors being – corporate image, brand, identity, personality, communication, global operations etc. Factors like image, brand, personality and identity have been traditionally under marketing domain. Communication has been an integral part of all the facets of corporate life. And, in a globalised market, global operations have become the order of the day. As such, in the present day corporate life (and time ahead), all these factors have started forming part of a comprehensive corporate culture and exerting their bearings on companies' performance and their global operations.

Hence, it is pertinent to examine some views of eminent scholars and researchers in these fields. It may help in understanding the concept a 'comprehensive corporate culture' (independent variable) and a resultant 'total
organisational performance’ (dependent variable). Some such views are cited below:

2.4.6.2 Corporate Image and Identity

Nicholas (1990)^57, in his work ‘The Corporate Brand’, while discussing corporate image observed, “Corporate image is in the eye of receiver. An organization may transmit a message about itself to its employees, its investors, its customers, and all its internal and external audiences. It may indeed wish to convey a particular self image, but it is the reception of the message that is the important factor. The corporate image is simply the picture that an audience has of an organization through the accumulation of all received messages” (p. 21).

And, while discussing corporate identity in the context of corporate culture, Nicholas argued, “Corporate identity, in the view of employees, will be determined by the overall culture of an organization – the assumptions and values of the organization that are transmitted by the collective attitudes and behaviour – and the communication process.” Further, the author also discussed about various strategies for effective corporate identity programmes, their values, and a distinct corporate culture and image building for its success and growth (p. 21).

2.4.6.3 Brand and Brand Image

Randall (2001)^58, while discussing the underlying meanings of brand, quoted some famous British advertising men defining the term as - ‘Brands are a part of the fabric of life’ (David Ogilvy); ‘Just about the only thing brands have in common is a kind of fame’ (Jeremy Bullmore); ‘The brand is a cult object......it has charishma’ (Judie Lannon); and an allied view of it as ‘The brand as hero’ (p. 3). Further, while discussing brand image, the author observed, “Brand image is a phrase used rather loosely, particularly by people outside marketing. ......In fact the image of a brand is what exists in the mind of the consumers. It is the total of all the information they have received about the brand – from experience,
word of mouth, advertising, packaging, service and so on – modified by selective perception, previous beliefs, social norms and forgetting" (p. 7).

2.4.6.4 Corporate or Company Brands

Nicholas (1997)\textsuperscript{57}, while defining corporate brand, first explained the basics by citing understanding of brand given by Stephen King (King, 1984)\textsuperscript{59} as “A product is something that is made, in a factory; a brand is something that is bought, by customer. A product can be copied by a competitor; a brand is unique”; and Nicholas further explained ‘corporate brand’ as “It is the joining together of two words – corporate and brand – that suggests a new way of looking at organizations (p. 3). The author further observed, “A corporate brand is more than just the outward manifestation of an organisation – its name, logo, visual presentation. Rather it is the core of values that defines it. The communication of those values is of course an important part of what an organisation is. Also, the corporate brand must be able to meet the needs of the often competing claims of its stakeholders. To achieve that it must have clarity of vision, of values and of leadership” (p. 13). The author also clarified it giving an example, “Apple Computers is more than its name and its Garden of Eden apple. It is a company with history, a set of values, a reputation and a strategy for the future, managed and worked for by people. In Stephen King’s terminology, the Apple is something that is ‘bought’ by a wide variety of audiences: everyone from shareholders to employees to consumers” (p. 3).

And Randall (2001)\textsuperscript{58}, while discussing company brands observed, “In the market place, both company brands as well as individual product brands do exist simultaneously and in the case of company brands – the name of the company identifies the brand”. The author further added, “It was striking that when The Economist surveyed people in Japan, the United states and Europe asking about familiarity with and esteem of brands, the list of world brands was only twelve and a few of them were Coca-Cola, IBM, Sony, Toyota, Mercedes Benz etc.” (p. 113-114).
2.4.6.5 Global Brands and Going Global

Furthermore, Randall (2001)^56, while arguing for the company as global brand, has quoted Stephen King (1990) who wrote: “The company brand will become the main discriminator. That is, consumers’ choice of what they buy will depend less upon an evaluation of the functional benefits to them of a product or service, rather more on their assessment of the people in the company behind it, their skills, attitudes, behaviour, design, style, language, greenism, altruism, modes of communication, speed of response, and so on – the whole company culture, in fact.” And, the author further quoted Hamel and Prahalad (1994), the most influential writers on strategy in the 1990s, who had earlier cited SONY (any new product bearing four famous letters) and advocated for “banner brands” (multiple products and businesses) and said: ‘We believe that any company that fails to take advantage of the logic of banner branding will find itself, long-term, at a competitive disadvantage’ (p. 114-115).

Further, Randall, while discussing global brands and going global, observed, “Coca-Cola and McDonald’s are famous examples of global brands, the Japanese car and consumer electronic manufacturers are as near as global brands” (p. 122). The author further added, “Going global is always going to be expensive and difficult, but seems a prize worth aiming for and the reasons being - must be global to survive, clients are going global, markets are becoming the same, competition, global economies of scale, profit opportunities, etc.” (p. 129-130). Randall further maintained, ‘World is becoming more global, we talk of the ‘global village’, in the current age, globalization is an irreversible phenomenon, all the iron walls which existed in the different parts of the world had shattered long back. globalization is here to stay’, and the author argued, ‘then why not to take the maximum benefits out of it by going global?’ (p. 121, 132).

And, Nicholas (1997)^57, while discussing global image and brand for corporates, observed, “Being more ‘global’ means earning the trust with all of an organisation’s stakeholders throughout the world by consistent quality and service, especially when a company lacks control over more downstream...
activities. However, most organisations could and should be able to build a consistent approach to branding. The first and most obvious element of global corporate branding is a consistent approach to naming. The true global corporate brands employ the same name everywhere: Nike, Apple, Microsoft, Sony, McDonald's and IBM" (p. 150).

2.4.6.6 True Global Brands and Global Corporate Culture

Furthermore, Nicholas (1997)\textsuperscript{57}, while discussing true global brands and global corporate culture observed, "True global brands – of which there are very few – plan and manage on a global basis. They transcend nationality in their thinking and their cultures. The dominant element in their make-up is not national heritage – although there may be some elements of this – but a global corporate culture. To create a global corporate brand requires the integration of a consistent approach to human resources, so that service levels and employee attitudes and behaviour are similar in all countries – a measure of the strength of the corporate brand – together with a consistency in the tone of marketing communications" (pp. 155).

2.4.6.7 India Inc. and Global Brands

Klaus Schwab (2004)\textsuperscript{60}, chairman of the World Economic Forum (WEF), recently spoke during an interview with the Times of India, "India is among the fastest growing economy in the world. It has beginning to attract attention as a global investment destination." And, Schwab further maintained, "I see a big change in corporate India. Indian companies, which earlier enjoyed protected markets, have adapted well to the opening of the economy. India is a classic example. I am impressed by how well Indian companies have moved from a management style rooted in a protected environment to a management style which is exploiting global competitiveness. The change has become visible only in the last year. The next step for Indian companies is to become global multinationals. There
are only a handful of Indian MNCs. India has to build global brands. There should be at least 30 global Indian companies."

And finally, Mukesh Ambani (2003)\(^6\), chairman of Reliance Group, urging Indian corporates to build global brands and focusing on India’s knowledge and IT strengths - what he called ‘the 21st century miracle’ and maintained – “India’s moment has arrived. We have once-in-a-life-time opportunity to lead the world led by our knowledge strengths and building global brands in information technology (IT) and other knowledge based industries.”

2.4.7 **Discussions : Emerging Corporate Cultures**

The traditional companies (old economy companies) and their cultures that ruled the industrial and business scenario world over for decades (and couple of centuries) are increasingly becoming less relevant. Even their age old rigid ‘hierarchy system’ and the ‘brains’ at the top and ‘the hands’ at the bottom concept is shattering. Their culture’s fabrics have developed holes and the culture is on decline.

Now, IT and knowledge based companies (new economy companies) of the modern era are dominating the business scenario. Their structure is different, their people are highly skilled, their working and business environments are different and the entire organisation is stuffed with knowledge. Their new corporate cultures are emerging. Various observations of different scholars and researchers on this topic have been presented above (under heading 2.4 and sub-headings 2.4.1 – 2.4.6) which give an insight into it. However, a brief discussion on the subject and further analysis of the same will enable us to draw conclusions and inferences which may be helpful in solving the research problem of the current research study on ‘corporate culture and performance of Indian IT companies’. It is presented below :

Deal and Kennedy (1999)\(^26\) found that the traditional corporate cultures were in crisis. The traditional ‘corporate culture’ underwent a sea change and the
process is still continuing. It happened due to changing technologies, market forces, globalization and fast changing business environment worldwide.

On **emergence of new corporate cultures**, Deal et. al. (1999) further established that 'the rise of shareholder value and short-termism' were the first and foremost cause behind this happenings. They have also been threatening and crushing the old culture and its values. The other such causes being – 'downsizing and reengineering' (corporate lobotomy), 'outsourcing' (corporate amputation), 'merger mania' (shotgun marriage), 'computers' (cultural isolation) and 'globalization'. And, as a result, the combination of these factors decimated traditional corporate cultures, replacing joy, commitment, and loyalty with fear, alienation, and self-interest.

On **new dimensions in corporate cultures**, Sherriton and Stern (1996) found the emergence of new dimensions in corporate cultures during the last one decade. Their emergence was largely attributed to rampant 'mergers and acquisitions', followed by 'globalization', 'downsizing' or 'rightsizing' etc. which stirred up the old business environment and posed various challenges. They distorted the old culture and their values. The authors further tried to find suitable solutions of the problems posed by the emerging dimensions. They suggested new strategies which included - 'reengineering', 'Total Quality Management' (TQM), 'team culture', 'high performing teams' and 'organisational team' etc. as the possible solutions.

On **emerging culture in IT and knowledge era companies**, it was presented earlier under heading 2.3 (and sub-headings 2.3.1 - 2.3.5), and views of various scholars like Turner (1990) and Deal and Kennedy (1982) were presented. Their observations were further discussed and analyzed under subheading 2.3.6. The main points discussed by these scholars included - 'flat' organisations, 'breaking down of authority', 'responsibility hierarchy', organizations stuffed with knowledge, leader to manage the culture etc. (Turner, 1990); and **highly decentralized organizations, atomized organization etc.** (Deal and Kennedy, 1982).
On ‘corporate charisma’ - company’s image, personality, brands and culture, Temporal and Alder (1998)^56 found that these factors create, develop and manage many favourable things in the organisations, and to mention a few - value-driven visions and mission, lasting corporate identity, future strategic direction, competitive advantage, powerful corporate brand, customer loyalty, boost employee morale and commitment, attract new customers, improve internal and external customer service, provide focus and direction for advertising and public relations, escape the product life cycle trap, achieve corporate immortality, and finally would lead companies well in the right direction to take on future challenges.

A person’s personality includes everything – one’s present self and future aspirations, one’s values, dreams and other unique characteristics. A charisma is created when there is something special and attractive about a person. Charismatic people attract others to them. Same thing goes for a corporate and its personality – i.e. ‘corporate personality’.

A ‘charismatic corporate personality’ attracts millions of people and customers in various ways and brings long term success. Personality is the key differentiator. An ‘unique personality’ lays down a foundation for world-class recognition. The ‘strength of personality’ beats the ‘competition’ and creates ‘family bond’ which is important for corporate success. Also, personality is an invaluable intangible asset that cannot be copied or owned by competitors. Other companies can copy or acquire technology, processes, systems, structures and products, but not personality.

Also, ‘vision and mission statements’ are the ways of expressing the ‘aspirations of a company’. They also reflect ‘personality’ of the corporation and philosophy of their business. Successful companies build their ‘corporate and product brands’ by adding ‘personality’ to it. ‘Image’ is the pooled perceptions that consumers hold about a company. Company’s ‘culture and their values’ attract people and present and potential employees towards it. These employees
create profitable business. As a result, corporate personality, image and brand bring corporate success and world-class recognition.

Finally, the bottom line: Temporal and Alder (1998) concluded as "Corporate personality and the personality values affect consumer and employee behaviour which combine to impact heavily on the bottom line -- profit." And, same thing goes for 'corporate culture and its core values' and 'corporate culture and corporate personality both merge with each other and become one'.

And, the message being - 'Corporate personality and culture -- armed with vision, mission, core values, image and brand value -- pay well'.

Further, on corporate image, brand, identity, communication and global operations, Nicholas (1990) opined about 'corporate image as the picture that an audience has of an organization', and 'Corporate identity is determined by the overall culture of an organization which includes the assumptions, values collective attitudes and behaviour'.

And, different views on brand came as -'Brands are a part of the fabric of life' (David Ogilvy); 'Brands have a kind of fame' (Jeremy Bullmore); 'The brand has charisma' (Judie Lannon); and, 'The brand as hero' (an allied view). Also, brand image was defined as -- 'The image of a brand is what exists in the mind of the consumers' (Randall, 2001).

About Corporate or Company Brands, Nicholas (1997) first compared a product and a brand as - 'A product is made in a factory, but a brand is bought by consumers. A product can be copied but a brand is unique'. And, then he opined about corporate brand as -- 'A corporate brand - it is the core of values that defines it.'

Further, Randall (2001) described company brands as -- 'The name of the company identifies the brand'. And, some famous brands were cited as - Coca-Cola, IBM, Sony, Toyota, Mercedes Benz etc.
And, in the context of global brands - 'the company brand will become the main discriminator. It represents – the whole company culture, in fact' (Stephen King, 1990). And, Hamel and Prahalad (1994) advocated for “banner brands” (multiple products and businesses). Randall (2001)^58 identified ‘Coca-Cola and McDonald’s as global brands and found Japanese car and consumer electronics as near as global brands.

Furthermore, 'going global' is a prize worth aiming for, as world is becoming more global and now people talk about a ‘global village’ ‘ (Randall, 2001)^58. And, Nicholas (1997)^57 advocated for global image and brand for corporates as - ‘Being more ‘global’ means earning the trust with all of an organisation’s stakeholders throughout the world’, and pointed out that ‘The true global corporate brands employ the same name everywhere : Nike, Apple, Microsoft, Sony, McDonald’s and IBM.’

Nicholas (1997)^57 also talked about the ‘True global brands’ and pointed out that ‘True global brands are very few, they plan and manage on a global basis, they transcend nationality in their thinking and their cultures, and represent a global corporate culture.’ And, Nicholas further asserted that ‘To create a global corporate brand requires the integration of a consistent approach to human resources, so that service levels and employee attitudes and behaviour are similar in all countries – a measure of the strength of the corporate brand – together with a consistency in the tone of marketing communications.’

Thus, above views and findings of various scholars reconfirm that there exist close interrelationships between brand and corporate culture, corporate identity and overall organisational culture, global brand and global corporate culture, global brand and global performance, brand performance and corporate performance, global operations as a part of organisational operations and performance etc. And, there may exist interrelationships among these various factors and set of factors too. Hence, some of these factors may be selected as factors related to ‘corporate culture of Indian IT companies and their organisational performance’ which is also the topic of the present research study.
And finally, while talking about India Inc. and Global Brands, Klaus Schwab (2004)^60, having assessed the strengths of Indian corporates, asserted that "India is among the fastest growing economy in the world. ... I am impressed by how well Indian companies have moved ...to a management style which is exploiting global competitiveness. The change has become visible ... The next step for Indian companies is to become global multinationals. There are only a handful of Indian MNCs. India has to build global brands. There should be at least 30 global Indian companies."

And, Mukesh Ambani (2003)^61, urged Indian corporates to build global brands and expressed his faith in India's knowledge and IT strengths - what he called 'the 21st century miracle' and asserted - "India's moment has arrived. We have once-in-a-life-time opportunity to lead the world led by our knowledge strengths and building global brands in information technology (IT) and other knowledge based industries."

The above two statements by two leading corporate and business personalities of the world reconfirm strengths of Indian corporates, and particularly information technology (IT) companies, and also indicate an urgent need to build 'Global Brands', and possibly 'India's Global IT Brand' – which is already happening.

2.4.8 Analysis and Inferences: Emerging Corporate Cultures

Thus, on the emergence of new corporate cultures (Deal and Kennedy, 1999)^26, and on new dimensions in corporate cultures (Sherriton and Stern, 1996)^54, the views expressed by those authors in two different studies are quite similar and supporting each other's observations. In fact, these newly emerged dimensions, such as, 'the rise of shareholder value and short-termism', 'downsizing', 'reengineering', 'outsourcing', 'mergers and acquisitions' 'computers' and 'globalization' etc. have greatly affected the values and culture in organisations as well as millions of workers' lives. Though, they have some positive effects also in terms of corporate profitability and performance, but at the
cost of culture and workers’ welfare. Some of these factors may be useful in understanding the present research problem, which is focussed on ‘corporate culture and organisational performance’.

And, the views of Turner (1990)\textsuperscript{11}, and Deal and Kennedy (1982)\textsuperscript{23} - on emerging culture in IT and knowledge era companies, appear to be quite relevant in solving research problem of the present study. As the topic of the present research study directly relates to IT and knowledge based companies. (The research topic being - ‘corporate culture and their total organisational performance of Indian IT companies’). Hence, it is inferred that their views and findings may provide useful cues in formulating research strategies and solving research problem in the current study.

Further, the views and research findings of Temporal and Alder (1998)\textsuperscript{56} about ‘corporate charisma’ - company’s image, personality, brands and culture, are quite appealing. They appear to be quite relevant for the new breed companies like ‘Indian information technology (IT) companies’ (directly related to current research topic), which are operating globally, possess global culture, image, personality and brand value, and have also attained global stature and world class recognition and performance. Hence, authors’ views as well as the above factors may form part in studying ‘corporate culture and organisational performance’ of Indian IT companies in the current research study.

And finally, the views and research findings of various scholars on corporate image, brand, identity, communication and global operations – in the context of corporate culture and organisational performance were examined in above discussions. It has been established above that close interrelationships exist among corporate image, corporate identity, corporate and product brands, global brands, corporate culture, global corporate culture etc., and also corporate image and organisational performance, brand performance and corporate performance, going global, global operations and organisational performance etc.
And, Indian IT companies are already operating globally, have attained global image, brand and stature. They have also developed their global corporate culture. Hence, some of the above factors like – corporate image, identity, brand, global culture, global brand, going global, global operations, global performance etc. may be included in the current research study ('corporate culture and organisational performance').
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