CHAPTER V

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Industrial production and prosperity of a nation depends upon the system of industrial relations, besides technology and other factors. The industrial relations is a dynamic concept which accommodates a variety of interpretations. The construct of the concept of industrial relations is highly influenced by the academic contributions of the Scholars which are well delineated in the previous chapters. In this chapter, the researcher has made an attempt to analyse the role of organisational culture and organisational commitment in the system of industrial relations in Madras Refineries Limited. The primary data collected from the respondents (n = 250), viz. 100 supervisory and 150 non-supervisory personnel are statistically analysed. The results are drawn individually and collectively for all the variables namely the organisational culture, the organisational commitment and the industrial relations and are tabulated and interpreted.
## Table 2: Socio-Economic Profile of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Supervisors (n = 100)</th>
<th>Non-Supervisors (n = 150)</th>
<th>Statistical Results (Chi-Square)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Manufacturing (Refineries)</td>
<td>17 17.0</td>
<td>50 33.3</td>
<td>(x^2 = 2.133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Maintenance (Refineries)</td>
<td>16 16.0</td>
<td>41 27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Other than (a) and (b) in Refineries</td>
<td>21 21.0</td>
<td>27 18.0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other than Refineries</td>
<td>46 46.0</td>
<td>32 21.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Male</td>
<td>94 94.0</td>
<td>129 86.0</td>
<td>(x^2 = 3.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Female</td>
<td>6 6.0</td>
<td>21 14.0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Married</td>
<td>83 83.0</td>
<td>110 73.0</td>
<td>(x^2 = 0.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Unmarried</td>
<td>14 14.0</td>
<td>34 22.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Widow</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>3 2.0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Widower</td>
<td>1 1.0</td>
<td>2 1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Separated</td>
<td>2 2.0</td>
<td>1 0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Hindu</td>
<td>77 77.0</td>
<td>96 64.0</td>
<td>(x^2 = 8.459)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Christian</td>
<td>12 12.0</td>
<td>41 27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Muslim</td>
<td>11 11.0</td>
<td>13 8.7</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Nuclear</td>
<td>66 66.0</td>
<td>73 48.7</td>
<td>(x^2 = 7.705)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Joint</td>
<td>24 24.0</td>
<td>59 39.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Extended</td>
<td>10 10.0</td>
<td>18 12.0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Table 2, reflects the socio-economic profile of the respondents such as department, sex, marital status, religion and family type.

17% of supervisors and 33.3% of non-supervisors are engaged in the manufacturing (Refineries) division. 16% of supervisors and 27.3% of non-supervisors are from the maintenance (Refineries); 21% of supervisors and 18% of non-supervisors belong to other than manufacturing and maintenance (in Refineries); 46% of supervisors and 21.3% of non-supervisors belong to general categories (Other than Refineries). There is a significant difference between supervisors and non-supervisors with regard to their department. 83% of supervisors and 73% of non-supervisors are married, while 14% of supervisors and 22.7% of non-supervisors are unmarried.

77% of supervisors and 64% of non-supervisors belong to Hindu religion, while 12% of supervisors and 27.3% of non-supervisors are Christians. 11% of supervisors and 8.7% of non-supervisors are Muslims.

The dominance of Hindus over the other communities has in no way affected the peace of work in Madras Refineries Limited. This coincides with the findings of Chaturvedi (1987).

66% of supervisors and 48.7% of non-supervisors belong to the nuclear family type, while 24% of
supervisors and 39.3% of non-supervisors are from joint families. There is a significant difference between the supervisors and non-supervisors with regard to their family types. This gives a clue that the joint family system is slowly deteriorating which is not connected with the industrial life of the employees.

The distribution of respondents by departments, sex, marital status, religion and family type exhibits significant differences in their socio-economic profile.

The quantifiable socio-economic variables and their distribution are tabulated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
<th>Quantifiable Socio-Economic Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>Supervisors (n = 100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Income (in Rupees)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2,381.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>945.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (in Years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (in Years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>39.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (in Years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Table 3, depicts that the average monthly income of supervisors is Rs.2381/- (S.D = 945.8), whereas for non-supervisors it is Rs.1927/- (S.D = 654.5). There is a significant difference between supervisors and non-supervisors with regard to their monthly income (‘t’ = 4.18 and significant at 95% confidence limit).

The years of experience of supervisors is, on an average, 10 years (S.D = 7.52) whereas for non-supervisors it is 8 years (S.D = 4.39). Also, it is evident that there is a significant difference between supervisors and non-supervisors with regard to their years of experience (‘t’ = 3.28).

The average age of supervisors is 40 (S.D =8.82) while for the non-supervisors it is 33 years, (S.D = 5.9). There is a significant difference between the supervisors and the non-supervisors with regard to their age (t = 6.47).

The average educational level of supervisors is 16 years, i.e. upto graduation (S.D = 1.68) while for the non-supervisors it is 14 years, i.e. upto a diploma after school education (S.D = 2.04). It can be seen that there is a significant difference between supervisors and non-supervisors with regard to their education (‘t’ = 9.06).

The quantifiable socio-economic factors significantly differentiate the income, experience, age
and education. Though they belong to the same organisation, the socio-economic factors significantly differentiate them into two groups. This is an appropriate factor for the study to compare the perception of these two groups in the organisation with regard to organisational culture, organisational commitment and industrial relations, the chosen variables.

TOTAL PERCEPTION OF RESPONDENTS ON ALL THE VARIABLES

Organisational Culture

**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.No</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Mean Score Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>64.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>65.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Conflict tolerance</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Performance reward</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Individual responsibility</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Risk tolerance</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>70.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Individual autonomy</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>68.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>20.68</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>68.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Group norms</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Exercise of authority</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>65.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>63.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Table 4, presents the mean scores of perception of all respondents on organisational culture and the corresponding mean score percentages. The percentages of the mean scores are equated proportionately with all items in each dimension of the tool, so as to avoid the mean value differences in the total number of supervisory (n = 100) and non-supervisory (n = 150) respondents; based on the number of statements in each dimensions. The mean score percentages for the dimension support is 64.14 (S.D = 4.19); for structure 65.60 (S.D = 2.35); for conflict tolerance 61.00 (S.D = 2.57); for performance reward 65.00 (S.D = 3.38); for individual responsibility 64.00 (S.D = 1.18); for risk tolerance 70.28 (S.D = 3.89); for individual autonomy 68.28 (S.D = 3.93); for beliefs 68.93 (S.D = 4.32); for group norms 61.00 (S.D = 1.11); for exercise of authority in the organisation 65.33 (S.D = 1.56);, and for identity 63.75 (S.D = 2.57).

The results are envisioned in the Bar diagram (Figure 1), which indicates a better clarity over the total perception of all respondent of the study on the eleven dimensions on organisational culture.

It is evident from the Figure 1, that the perception of employees on organisational Culture in
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general is constant with no fluctuation in any dimensions. The mean score percentage minimum is 61% (group norms and conflict tolerance) and the maximum is 70.28% (risk tolerance). The Figure 1 and the Table 4 indicate that the culture is strong, that is the level of perception of the employees are high in the organisation. The trend in the results warrants the attention on the studies of Mowday et. al., (1982), where in they have found that the strong culture builds cohesiveness, and loyalty.

Organisational Commitment

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.No.</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Mean Score Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-12</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>72.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13</td>
<td>Job-involvement</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>64.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-14</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>32.64</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>66.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table 5, shows that the mean score perception of the respondents on organisational commitment. Also it depicts the corresponding mean score percentages on the dimensions namely, identification, job involvement and loyalty; the percentages are 72.50 (S.D = 5.10), 64.19 (S.D = 2.04), and 66.61 (S.D = 4.87), respectively.
The mean scores percentage are indicated in the Figure 2, where again we notice them to be more or less uniform with manageable deviations.

The results on the perception level of all respondents indicate that they have high scores the minimum mean score percentage is 64.19, and the maximum is 72.50. This means that the employees are highly committed to the organisation.

The trend in the results guide us to fall in line with the studies of Mowday et al., (1982) and Martin and Nicholls (1987). It implies that the organisation under study satisfies all fundamental psycho-needs and provide all facilities while at work.
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### TABLE 6

**Mean Scores of Perception on Industrial relations**  
(*n = 250*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.No</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Scores %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Inter-personal relations</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>65.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Labour relations</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>62.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>63.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Individual inhibitions</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>31.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Compensation &amp; working conditions</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>71.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>67.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>63.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Grievance</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>68.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>70.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Labour participation in management</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>65.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Social integration</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>64.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table 6 shows the total mean scores of (*n = 250*) all the respondents on industrial relations with the mean score percentages.

The results exhibit clearly that all dimensions, except the individual inhibitions (D18) are highly perceived by them. It shows that the respondents, have some inhibitions in their approach, which are to be
identified by further research to strengthen the system. The training and development programmes are to be given much priority to this aspect to bring out the employees from the shells of the "inhibitions".

The mean scores percentage are distributed in the Bar diagram - Figure 3 which exhibits the level of perception of all sample over the 11 dimensions (D15 - D25) on industrial relations.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.No</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Supervisors (n = 100)</th>
<th>Non-supervisors (n = 150)</th>
<th>Statistical Results</th>
<th>D.No</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Supervisors (n = 100)</th>
<th>Non-supervisors (n = 150)</th>
<th>Statistical Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Mean 22.98</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>'t' = 1.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Mean 22.10</td>
<td>22.98</td>
<td>'t' = 1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.D 4.13</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Mean 9.89</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>'t' = 0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conflict Tolerance</td>
<td>Mean 11.03</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>'t' = 6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Performance Reward</td>
<td>Mean 12.96</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>'t' = 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Individual Responsibility</td>
<td>Mean 6.52</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>'t' = 2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Risk Tolerance</td>
<td>Mean 17.56</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>'t' = 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Individual Autonomy</td>
<td>Mean 17.24</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>'t' = 0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Inferable Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Mean 20.82</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>'t' = 0.41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Group Norms</td>
<td>Mean 5.87</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>'t' = 1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.D 4.66</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.D 0.97</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Exercise of Authority</td>
<td>Mean 9.16</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>'t' = 3.60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Mean 12.72</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>'t' = 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.D 1.24</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.D 2.62</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The scores of perceptions of supervisory and non-supervisory employees on the various aspects of support, structure, conflict tolerance, performance reward, individual responsibility, risk tolerance, individual autonomy, beliefs, group norms, exercise of authority and identity on organisational culture are computed and the mean values are tabulated.

The Table 7 shows the mean value of the observable culture and inferable culture.

In observable culture, the mean value of supervisors towards the dimension on support is 22.98 (S.D = 4.13), and for the non-supervisors it is 22.10 (S.D = 4.20). It can be seen that, in case of structure, the mean value for supervisors is 9.89 (S.D = 2.56) while for non-supervisors it is 9.80 (S.D = 2.12). It is found, that with regard to conflict tolerance, the mean value for supervisors is 11.03 (S.D = 2.06) while for non-supervisors it is 12.98 (S.D = 2.58). In case of performance reward, the mean value for supervisors is 13.07 (S.D = 3.34) while for non-supervisors it is 12.96 (S.D = 3.40). It can be seen that, in case of individual responsibility, the mean value for supervisors is 6.21 (S.D = 1.06) while for non-supervisors it is 6.92 (S.D = 1.24). With
It reveals that the respondents have uniform perception on organisational culture and this study implies that the organisational culture is strong in the organisation under study.

... Philip and Narayanaswamy (1990) in their studies reveal that the organisation has good ethos and based on the overall performance of the prevailing practices. The present study by their studies by with regard to group membership the supervisors is 5.87 (S.D = 0.97), while the supervisors it is 6.05 (S.D = 1.18).

By comparing the mean values of observable culture - on support, structure, performance reward, risk tolerance and individual autonomy, there is no significant difference in their perception. On the aspects of beliefs, group norms and identity of the inferable culture too, there is no significant difference in the perceptions of the respondents. However, there is a significant difference in their perception with regard to conflict tolerance and individual responsibility of observable culture. But these differences are not so high, which are well within the man
It reveals that the respondents have uniform perception on organisational culture and this study implies that the organisational culture is strong in the organisation under study.

Philip and Narayanaswamy (1990) in their studies reveal that the organisation has good ethos and work culture, based on the overall performance of the organisation and the prevailing practices. The present empirical study add a new dimension to their studies by quantifying the differences in the perception of the supervisory and non-supervisory employees on organisational culture. An interesting result that emerges out of the study is that the mean values of non-supervisors with regard to conflict tolerance, individual responsibility and exercise of authority are slightly higher than that of supervisory category. It implies that the significant difference ($p < 0.05$) for these aspects are due to the lower level of perception of the supervisors. It is due to the prevalence of "mosaic culture" i.e. the inheritance of American-Iranian management style mixed with typical Indian style of management. That is why the supervisory personnel have less scores on these aspects when compared to non-supervisors. This "syndrome" is to be taken care of to protect the system of the organisation.
from any "cultural cleavage". However, when all the
imensions are taken together, the differences become
insignificant and within the negligible limit.

The results of this study strengthen the
conclusions of Deal and Kennedy (1982), Peters and
Waterman (1982), and Robbins (1988); have attempted to
differentiate strong and weak cultures and argued that
the strong culture have a greater impact on employee
behaviour and more directly related to reduced turn
over.

The present study in a sense supports the views
of Mowday, Porter, et. al., (1982). They have argued
that a strong culture would demonstrate high agreement
among members about what the organisation stands for,
and such unanimity of purpose builds cohesiveness,
loyalty and organisational commitment. These in turn,
reduce the propensity for employees to leave the
organisation.

Further the overall results implies that the
variable organisational culture, has a strong
foundation in the organisation under study.
TABLE 8
Comparison of the Scores of Respondents on Organisational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.No.</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Supervisors (n = 100)</th>
<th>Non-Supervisors (n = 150)</th>
<th>Statistical Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>19.84</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>t = 1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Job-involvement</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>t = 0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>32.05</td>
<td>33.04</td>
<td>t = 1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table 8, envisages that the mean scores of supervisors on identification is 19.84 (S.D = 5.48), while for non-supervisors it is 20.60 (S.D = 4.81). With regard to job involvement, it is found that the mean value of supervisors is 13.39 (S.D = 1.96) while that for non-supervisors it is 13.54 (S.D = 2.09). It can be seen that, in case of loyalty, the mean value of supervisors is 32.05 (S.D = 4.06), while for non-supervisors it is 33.04 (S.D = 6.19).
From the above Table 8, it is concluded that both the categories of respondents perceive organisational commitment uniformly. The results of 't' tests show no significant differences with regard to, their perceptions on identification, job-involvement and loyalty (t = 1.13, P > 0.05; t = 0.60, P > 0.05; t = 1.52, P > 0.05). This means that the employees have a greater commitment towards the organisation; they breath and live with their organisational culture which leads to commitment.

An another inference that can be drawn from the Table 8 is that the non-supervisory respondents are more committed than the supervisory respondents (Mean value for supervisors = 19.84 (S.D = 5.48); 13.39 (S.D = 1.96); 32.05 (S.D = 4.06); and for non-supervisors they are 20.60 (S.D = 4.81); 13.54 (S.D = 2.09); 33.04 (S.D = 6.19); respectively. It implies a slight variation in the scores of perception. Perhaps these differences between them are due to the significant differences in the aspects of conflict tolerance, individual responsibility and exercise of authority, which should be given higher priority when the organisation is stepping forward to create a total committed workforce.
organisation, sense of excitement

of organisation, style to construct organisational commitment. The present study adds a new dimension to the studies of Martin and M. (1987) by introducing organisational culture as the fourth pillar in construct of the concept organisational commitment. The fourth pillar by all means provides strong stability for the structure, that is organisational commitment.

Model of Organisational Commitment

Based on the findings of organisational commitment and organisational culture, a model of organisational commitment has been developed (Figure 4). The model exhibits the fact that the fourth pillar will add a new strength to the construction of the concept.
ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT - A MODEL

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS SYSTEM (DEPENDENT VARIABLE)

I PILLAR

SENSE OF EXCITEMENT IN THE JOB COMMITMENT

III PILLAR

CONFIDENCE IN MANAGEMENT STYLE COMMITMENT

INTERVENING VARIABLE

SENSE OF BELONGING TO THE ORGANISATION COMMITMENT

IV PILLAR

ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE (INDEPENDENT VARIABLE)

FIGURE 4
### TABLE 9
Comparison of the Scores of the Respondents on Industrial Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Supervisors (n = 100)</th>
<th>Non-Supervisors (n = 150)</th>
<th>Statistical Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inter-personal Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>'t' = 4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.05 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Labour Relations</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>'t' = 3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.05 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attitudes</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>'t' = 1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Individual Inhibitions</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>'t' = 5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.05 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quality of Work Life

| 5. Compensation & Working Conditions |                        |                           |                     |
| Mean                                | 7.00                  | 7.18                      | 't' = 0.78          |
| S.D                                 | 1.88                  | 1.83                      | p > 0.05 NS        |
| 6. Training and Development         | 13.48                 | 13.42                     | 't' = 0.20          |
| Mean                                | 1.75                  | 2.36                      | p > 0.05 NS        |
| S.D                                 |                       |                           |                     |
| 7. Communication                   | 6.30                  | 6.37                      | 't' = 0.48          |
| Mean                                | 1.17                  | 1.22                      | p > 0.05 NS        |
| S.D                                 |                       |                           |                     |
| 8. Grievances                       | 6.95                  | 6.78                      | t = 0.76            |
| Mean                                | 1.72                  | 1.71                      | p > 0.05 NS        |
| S.D                                 |                       |                           |                     |
| 9. Discipline                       | 7.25                  | 6.92                      | t = 1.44            |
| Mean                                | 1.73                  | 1.74                      | p > 0.05 NS        |
| S.D                                 |                       |                           |                     |
| 10. Labour Participation in Management | 9.73                 | 9.95                      | 't' = 1.09          |
| Mean                                | 1.39                  | 1.82                      | p > 0.05 NS        |
| S.D                                 |                       |                           |                     |
| 11. Social Integration             | 6.24                  | 6.58                      | 't' = 1.92          |
| Mean                                | 1.04                  | 1.29                      | p < 0.05 S         |
| S.D                                 |                       |                           |                     |
they have a positive attitude towards each other. Again with regard to individual inhibitions, the mean value for supervisors is 7.76 (S.D = 9.71) while for non-supervisors it is 2.66 (S.D = 3.11). There is a significant difference between supervisors and non-supervisors with regard to individual inhibitions.

In the first part of industrial relations the results reveal that there is a significant difference with regard to interpersonal relations, labour relations, and individual inhibitions, in the perceptions of supervisory and non-supervisory employees. This should be improved upon in the long run. However, the results exhibit that they have positive attitude towards each other (t = 1.48, P > 0.05).

The second part of the Table 9, shows the perception of respondents on Quality of Work Life, which is considered as the part and parcel of industrial relations.

It is observed from the Table 9 that the mean value of the scores of supervisors with regard to compensation and working condition is 7.00 (S.D = 1.88) while for non-supervisors it is 7.18 (S.D = 1.83). There is no significant difference in their perception.
The perception of respondents in the case of training and development, the mean value for supervisors is 13.48 (S.D = 1.75) while for non-supervisors, it is 13.42 (S.D = 2.36). With regard to communication, the mean value for supervisors is 6.30 (S.D = 1.17) whereas, for non-supervisors it is 6.37 (S.D = 1.22). The mean value for grievances in case of supervisors is 6.95 (S.D = 1.72) while for non-supervisors it is 6.78 (S.D = 1.71). It is found that the mean value of supervisors on the aspect of discipline, is 7.25 (S.D = 1.73), while for non-supervisors it is 6.72 (S.D = 1.74). It can be seen that the mean value for supervisors in case of labour participation in Management is 9.73 (S.D = 1.39) while for non-supervisors it is 9.95 (S.D = 1.82). There is no significant difference in the perception of respondents with regard to the above dimensions. But in case of social integration, the mean value for supervisors is 6.29 (S.D = 1.07 ) while that of non-supervisors is 6.58 (S.D = 1.29); there is a significant difference between the perception of supervisors and non-supervisors (t = 1.92; P < 0.05).

The perceptions of respondents on Quality of work life is uniformly observed, which are evident from the 't' test results (Table 9), except the perception
social integration. Though statistically there is a significant difference, the difference in the scores are not so high. However, due care may be given while the organisation plans for social integration interventions.

An attempt has also been made to find out the difference between the two criteria groups when all the dimensions on organisational culture, organisational commitment and industrial relation are considered together.
TABLE 10

Total Comparison of the Mean Scores of the Respondents on Organisational Culture, Organisational Commitment and Industrial Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>or Dimensions</th>
<th>Supervisors (n = 100)</th>
<th>Non-Supervisors (n = 150)</th>
<th>Statistical Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Culture Tool 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>146.17</td>
<td>148.44</td>
<td>t = 0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>20.89</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td>49.62</td>
<td>50.38%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Commitment Tool 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>65.28</td>
<td>67.18</td>
<td>t = 1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td>49.28</td>
<td>50.72</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Relations Tool 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>101.41</td>
<td>106.10</td>
<td>t = 3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td>48.86</td>
<td>51.14</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 illustrates the total comparison of perception of the respondents, with regard to organisational culture, organisational commitment and industrial relations. In respect of total organisational culture, the mean value for supervisors is 146.17 (S.D = 19.54), while for non-supervisors it is 148.44 (S.D = 20.89). In the case of total
interpreted that these differences in the organisation plans for supervisors it is 67.10 (S.D = 11.47), **mentioned** that the mean value of total industrial relations for supervisors is 101.41 (S.D = 7.52), while for non-supervisors it is 106.10 (S.D = 12.81).

The overall results of comparison indicates that the supervisors and non-supervisors have uniform perception of organisation culture and organisational commitment, which are proved statistically ('t' = 0.88, p > 0.05, NS; 't' = 1.42, P > 0.05; NS).

But the results on industrial relations shows a significant difference in their perception ('t' = 3.64, P < 0.05), which means that the supervisory and non-supervisory respondents differ in their perception. However, the difference in the mean value is not so high (Mean value for supervisors 101.41 (S.D = 7.52) and for non-supervisors the mean value is 106.10 (S.D = 12.81).

The present study empirically analyses the differences in the perception of employees (in two groups) and has dissected the significant differences between them on interpersonal relations, labour relations, individual inhibitions and social
integration. It is interpreted that these differences are due to mosaic culture. When the organisation plans for improving industrial relations, much more attention may be given over this aspect to bind the system together.

However, there is a good sign indicated here is that the mean scores on the total perception of non-supervisory respondents are higher than the supervisory respondents (Table 10). This shows their positive attitude and confidence over the management style in the organisation and their excitement in their job.

The Table further reflects the mean percentage scores of each scale, category wise; with regard to organisational culture the percentage is 49.62% and 50.38% for supervisors and non-supervisors respectively. For organisational commitment, it is 49.28% and 50.72% and for industrial relations it is 48.86% and 51.14% respectively. The results are envisioned in Figure 5, the percentage sub-divided rectangular diagram to expose a better clarity over the results. The grandiose results exhibit the uniform perception of the respondents on the organisational culture, the organisational commitment, and the industrial relations.
MEAN SCORES OF PERCEPTION OF ALL RESPONDENTS ON ALL VARIABLES (n = 250)

MEAN SCORES IN PERCENTAGE

FIGURE 6
STRENGTH OF DISCRIMINATION

TABLE II
Discriminant Analysis—Overall Classification of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Group</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Predicted Group Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervisors</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Non Supervisors</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of correctly classified cases: 87.60%

The Table II shows that the socio-economic variables (V2, V3, V4, V9) and the other dimensions (D1 to D25) have been considered to find out their collective differentiation with regard to supervisors and non-supervisors. The strength of the discrimination is being supported by the Wilk's Lambda; (Lambda = 0.44 “chi” square significance at 0.05) and Mahalanobis $D^2$ value = 5.32 and Canonical correlation value $r = 0.75$. These values show that there is less variation between the two groups. Out of all the dimensions, the following dimensions are found to collectively differentiate between the two groups, at 87.60%; The dimensions are categorized on the basis of combined overall value.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D03</td>
<td>Conflict tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15</td>
<td>Interpersonal relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td>Job involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V03</td>
<td>Years of experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V02</td>
<td>Monthly income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D01</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D05</td>
<td>Individual responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>Exercise of authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D20</td>
<td>Training &amp; development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19</td>
<td>Compensation &amp; working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18</td>
<td>Individual inhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D25</td>
<td>Social integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D22</td>
<td>Grievances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D23</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that, out of all the dimensions considered simultaneously, the above mentioned dimensions are found to be the most important predictor dimensions, which discriminate significantly between the supervisory and non-supervisory respondents.

The Discriminant analysis, specifically the Mahalanobis model administered here, has brought out an interesting conclusion that, four socio-economic factors and twelve other factors of the major variables
relating to the organisational culture, organisation commitment and industrial relations discriminate significantly the two groups namely the supervisory and non-supervisory respondents; this is an important result that enables to build a model on industrial relations.

The association among these variables are interpreted with correlation matrices in the forthcoming discussions.
CORRELATIONS

The Table 12, envisions the inter-correlations among the variables in case of supervisory respondents. It is seen that there is a significant positive correlation among the organisational culture, the organisational commitment and the industrial relations. It can be observed that, as organisational culture increases, the organisational commitment also increases, ($r = 0.75$). When the organisational commitment increases, industrial relations also increases ($r = 0.66$), and when culture increases, industrial relations also increases ($r = 0.59$). The relationships are positive.

While analysing Quality of work life and culture, it can be seen that quality of work life is positively correlated with observable culture ($r = 0.62$), inferable culture ($r = 0.67$) and total culture ($r = 0.68$). It points out that when culture improves, the Quality of work life also improves.

It can be seen that education is positively correlated to inferable culture ($r = 0.74$). Again, there exists a positive correlation between education and industrial relations ($r = 0.65$). This shows that when education increases, industrial relations also
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V2</th>
<th>V3</th>
<th>V4</th>
<th>V9</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>QWL</th>
<th>Tool 1</th>
<th>Tool 2</th>
<th>Tool 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
increases. It can be seen that age is positively correlated to industrial relations ($r = 0.16$). When analysing experience, it can be seen that there exists a positive correlation with observable culture ($r = 0.92$). It is found that there is a statistically significant positive correlation between monthly income and education ($r = 0.16$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V2</th>
<th>V3</th>
<th>V4</th>
<th>V9</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>IR1</th>
<th>QWL</th>
<th>Tool 1</th>
<th>Tool 2</th>
<th>Tool 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 2</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 3</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Table 13 exhibits the intercorrelations of the variables in the perceptions of non-supervisors.

It is evident that there exists a statistically significant positive correlation among organisational culture, commitment and industrial relations. It is found that as commitment increases, industrial relations also increases ($r = 0.58$). As organisational culture increases industrial relations also increases ($r = 0.51$). As a result, when commitment and culture improves, industrial relations also improves.
**TABLE 14**

Inter-Correlation Matrix on all Variables, for all Respondents (n = 250)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V2</th>
<th>V3</th>
<th>V4</th>
<th>V9</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>IR1</th>
<th>QWL</th>
<th>Tool 1</th>
<th>Tool 2</th>
<th>Tool 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 2</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 analyses various variables of this study and examines their intercorrelations with regard to all respondents.

It is clear that there is a positive correlation between organisational culture, commitment and industrial relations. It is observed that as culture increases, industrial relations also increases ($\tau = 0.52$) and when commitment increases industrial relations also increases ($\tau = 0.59$). On analysing the Quality of Work Life, it can be seen that it has a positive correlation with industrial relations ($\tau = 0.83$). This shows that when Quality of Work Life increases, industrial relations also increases. Again quality of work life has a significant positive correlation with Observable culture ($\tau = 0.51$) and inferable culture ($\tau = 0.60$). It is observed that when culture increases, Quality of Work Life also increases. On analysing education, it can be seen that it is positively correlated with observable culture ($\tau = 0.10$) and inferable culture ($\tau = 0.07$). It highlights that when education increases, the culture also increases.

Thus, the present study establishes that there is a positive correlation between Quality of work life and industrial relations. Quality of work life.
The Tables 15, 16 and 17 illustrate the correlations among the various aspects of organisational culture and industrial relations, organisational culture and organisational commitment and industrial relations, and quality of work life. The results prove the following hypotheses of the study:

a) The organisational commitment is positively related to the organisational culture and industrial relations.

b) There is a positive relationship between organisational culture and industrial relations.

c) If the level of organisational commitment is higher and organisational culture is strong, the industrial relations will be good.

Further, the results infer that when the level of organisational culture increases, the commitment to the system increases; when the level of organisational commitment and organisational culture increases, the industrial relations also increase proportionately.

The study strengthens the work of Dunlop's (1958) systems theory, where he has argued that the ideology of the organisation which is shared among employees binds the system together. The "ideology" Dunlop has pointed out is the organisational culture in the present study. The culture which is shared and perceived by the employees has a tremendous effect on creating a committed workforce, which in turn binds the industrial relations system together. The
Dunlop's theory does not quantify the dissection of ideology empirically. The present study is an earnest effort to empirically quantify the systems ideology of Dunlop (1958) and to subject the same for an empirical interpretation so that the concept could withstand regress analysis.

The results bring out the fact that the industrial relations systems can not function in a vacuum. It is intercorrelated in the live matrix of culture and commitment.

The results of the study project that the organisational commitment as an intervening variable; is being predicted in the correlation matrices which contributes altogether for the construct of "bi-partitism" in industrial relations system.

To sum up, the correlation of these variables establishes that there is a positive correlation between organisational culture and organisational commitment; similarly a positive correlation exists between organisational commitment and industrial relations. The study opines that the variable industrial relations is a dependent variable. To corroborate the dependency, an attempt has been made to test the variable through multiple regressions (Stepwise) technique in the following discussions.
INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: A DEPENDENT VARIABLE

To find out the specific variables which really contribute for a better industrial relations, the researcher has used the multiple regression (stepwise) test, wherein industrial relations is considered as the dependent variable while the following variables are treated as the predictor variables or independent variables.

V02  - Monthly income
V03  - Years of experience
V04  - Age
V09  - Education
P01  - Observable culture
P02  - Inerable culture
Tool 1 - Organisation culture
Tool 2 - Organisation commitment

Table 18 portrays the multiple regression (stepwise) results, considering the industrial relations as the dependent variable as perceived by supervisors (n = 100).

From the results of the Table 18, it is seen that among all the independent variables considered for the analysis, only organisational commitment (Tool 2), is selected as the most important independent variable.
**TABLE 18**

Multiple Regression (Stepwise) Results on Industrial Relations for Supervisors  
(n = 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Simple r'</th>
<th>Multiple r'</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>B Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard B' Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>t' value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant: 67.40.  F.Ratio Value: 77.38: DF: 1,98
as perceived by the supervisors. This variable alone contributes 44% of the variance \( (R^2 = 0.44) \) to the dependent variable. There also exists a positive correlation between organisational commitment and industrial relations \( (r = 0.66, B \text{ Coefficient} = 0.52) \) and the correlation is statistically significant \( ('t' \text{ value} = 8.79, p < 0.05) \).

Though, the correlation matrix depicts correlation of socio-economic variables with industrial relations, in the multiple regression (stepwise) analysis, the associations become insignificant when compared to the variable, organisational commitment \( (P < 0.05) \). The result infers that the association of socio-economic variables with industrial relations is apparent only, and the relationship is not strong.

The supervisors perceive that the construct of industrial relations by and large as a dependent variable on organisational commitment. It can be represented mathematically as;

\[
\text{Industrial relations} = 67.40 + 0.52 (T_2) \\
\text{(Supervisory Perception)}
\]

Where 67.40 is the constant, and the Factor ratio value is 77.38, with a degree of freedom 1, 93.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Independent Dimension</th>
<th>Dimension Number</th>
<th>Simple Multiple</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$g^2$ Change</th>
<th>$g^2$</th>
<th>Standard Coefficients</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0 &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0 &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0 &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Staff size</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0 &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cont. person</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0 &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0 &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Performance Reward</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0 &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Skill Tolerance</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0 &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant 55.85  F. Ratio Value: 17.02  DF: 8.01  Result: 0 < 0.05
A further attempt has been made to find out, which dimension of organisational culture and organisational commitment contribute more for better industrial relations. Thus, again a multiple regression (stepwise) analysis was carried out by considering industrial relations as the dependent variable and the following as independent variables.

D01 - Support
D02 - Structure
D03 - Conflict tolerance
D04 - Performance reward
D05 - Individual responsibility
D06 - Risk tolerance
D07 - Individual autonomy
D08 - Beliefs
D09 - Group norms
D10 - Exercise of authority
D11 - Identity
D12 - Identification
D13 - Job-involvement
D14 - Loyalty

Table 19 illustrates that, among the 14 independent dimension considered for the analysis only 8 dimensions are selected as the most important independent variables which will determine industrial
relations. They are identification, (D12); loyalty (D14); individual responsibility (D5); beliefs (D8); conflict tolerance (D3); support (D1); performance reward (D4); and risk tolerance (D6), for which the 't' test results show significant difference (p < 0.05) and the 't' values for these dimensions are 2.69, 2.21, 2.77, 2.45, 4.05, 3.18, 2.77 and 2.38 respectively. These 8 factors together contribute 59% of variance on industrial relations (R^2 = 0.59). As R^2 value is 0.59 the goodness of the conclusions is valid. The table also explains that the maximum variance is attributed by dimension D12, i.e., Identification (R^2 = 0.34).

Thus, the industrial relations in the perception of supervisors while considering only the dimensions of organisational culture and organisational commitment can be represented mathematically as follows:

\[
\text{Industrial relations} = 0.05 + (0.36) D12 + (0.37) D14 + (1.34) D5 + (0.36) D8 + (1.31) D3 + (0.73) D1 + (0.71) D4 + (0.43) D6.
\]

These 'B' coefficients for all the 8 dimensions are statistically significant since the 't' values for 'B' coefficients are significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Simple $r'$</th>
<th>Multiple $r'$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>Standard $B'$ Coefficient</th>
<th>$t$' Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inference Culture</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant: 52.11. F.Ratio Value: 44.35; DF: 2,147
In the case of non-supervisors, it has been attempted to find out what are all the variables which really contribute to better industrial relations, as in the case of supervisors. Here again, industrial relation is considered as the dependent variable while the following are treated as the independent variables.

V2 - Monthly income
V3 - Years of experience
V4 - Age
V9 - Education
F1 - Observable culture
F2 - Inferable culture
Tool 1 - Organisational culture
Tool 2 - Organisational commitment

The Table 20 explains the Multiple regression (stepwise) analysis for non-supervisors (n = 150) taking industrial relations as the dependent variable. Of all the dimensions, it is found that organisational commitment (Tool 2) and inferable culture (F2) together contribute 38% of variance of industrial relations ($R^2 = 0.38$). The maximum variance is contributed by Tool 2 organisational commitment ($R^2 = 0.34$).

The results depict that there exists a positive correlation between organisational commitment, ($r = 0.58$) 'R' Co.eff. - 0.39) and industrial
relations. This correlation is found to be statistically significant. (organisation commitment 't' value = 5.90 and inferable culture 't' = 2.88 P < 0.05).

It is noted that the socio-economic variable such as age, education, monthly income and years of experience do not contribute significantly towards industrial relations with regard to non-supervisors, when compared with organisational commitment and inferable culture.

Thus industrial relations in the perception of non-supervisors is represented mathematically as follows:

\[ \text{Industrial relations} = 52.11 + (0.51) T2 + (0.39) F2 \]
### TABLE 21

Multiple Regression (Stepwise) Results on Industrial Relations for Non-Supervisors: Considering Dimensions D1 - D14 (n=150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Simple $R^2$</th>
<th>Multiple $R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>B Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard B Coefficient</th>
<th>t' Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant: 50.32  F. Ratio Value: 24.36  DF: 5,154  Result: $p < 0.05$ Sign.
A further attempt has been made to find out which of all the dimensions of organisation culture (Tool 1) and Organisational Commitment (Tool 2) contribute more for industrial relations with regard to non-supervisors. A multiple regression stepwise technique has been adopted by considering industrial relations as a dependent variable and the following as independent variables.

D01 - Support
D02 - Structure
D03 - Conflict tolerance
D04 - Performance reward
D05 - Individual responsibility
D06 - Risk tolerance
D07 - Individual autonomy
D08 - Beliefs
D09 - Group norms
D10 - Exercise of authority
D11 - Identity
D12 - Identification
D13 - Job involvement
D14 - Loyalty

Among these 14 dimensions considered for this technique only 5 dimensions are selected as the most important variables which will determine industrial relations.
among non-supervisors \((n = 150)\). All these 5 factors together, contribute 46\% of variance of industrial relations \((R^2 = 0.46)\). It also explains that the maximum variance is attributed by the dimension \((D14\) Loyalty \((R^2 = 0.31)\) (Table 21).

Thus, the industrial relations in the perception of non-supervisors while considering only the dimensions of organisational culture and organisational commitment can be represented mathematically as follows:

\[
\text{Industrial relations} : 50.32 + (0.88) D14 + (0.74) D7 \\
+ (1.86) D10 + (2.60) D5 \\
+ (0.95) D3.
\]

These 'B' Coefficient for the above dimensions are statistically significant, since the 't' values for 'B' Coefficients are significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Var</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Coefficient</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Environment</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Regression (Stepwise) Results on Industrial Relations for all variables; for all Respondent; (n = 250)
Table 22 shows, the Multiple regression (stepwise) results while considering industrial relations as the dependent variable for all respondents considered together.

Here, industrial relations is considered as the dependent variable and the following variables are treated as independent variables.

V2 - Monthly income
V3 - Years of experience
V4 - Age
V9 - Education
F1 - Observable culture
F2 - Inerable culture
Tool 1 - Organisational culture
Tool 2 - Organisational commitment

It can be seen that, organisational commitment and organisation culture are selected as the most important independent variables for the entire sample. These variables, together, contribute 39% of variance to the dependent variable. It is found that there exists a positive correlation among organisational commitment (r = 0.59, 'B' Coeff. = 0.47), organisational culture (r = 0.52, 'B' Coeff = 0.12) and industrial relations and it is statistically significant.
It is found out that the socio-economic variables do not contribute significantly towards industrial relations, in the perception of the respondents. Thus industrial relations for all respondents is represented mathematically as follows:

\[ \text{Industrial relations} = 55.10 + (0.47) T2 + (0.12) T1. \]

Kaufman (1989) asserts that the psychological variables play an important independent role in determining industrial relations. Here in this study it is found that the organisation culture and commitment as psychological variables play an independent role.
### TABLE 23

**Multiple Regression (Stepwise) Results on Industrial Relations for all variables and for all Respondents:**

**Considering Dimensions D1 - D14 (n = 250)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Simple R²</th>
<th>Multiple R²</th>
<th>R Change</th>
<th>B Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard B Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>Result: p &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rated in Table 23. These 4 dimensions together variance to industrial relations that the maximum

An attempt has been made by the researcher to find out which dimensions of organisational culture and organisational commitment contribute more to industrial relations, with regard to all respondents.

Accordingly, a multiple regression (stepwise) technique has been used by considering industrial relations as a dependent variable and the following dimensions as independent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D01</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D02</td>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D03</td>
<td>Conflict tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D04</td>
<td>Performance reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D05</td>
<td>Individual responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D06</td>
<td>Risk tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D07</td>
<td>Individual autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D08</td>
<td>Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D09</td>
<td>Group norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>Exercise of authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12</td>
<td>Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among these selected as the most important independent dimensions which determine industrial relations which
illustrated in Table 23. These 4 dimensions together contribute 44% of variance to industrial relations \((R^2 = 0.44)\). Table 23 also explains that the maximum variance is attributed by the dimension (D14) loyalty \((R_2 = 0.31)\).

Thus the industrial relations for all respondents, while considering organisational culture and organisational commitment, can be mathematically represented as follows:

\[
\text{Industrial relations} = 52.80 + (0.67) \text{ D14} + (0.58) \text{ D7} + (0.90) \text{ D3} + (0.41) \text{ D12}.
\]

These 'B' Coefficients for these dimensions are statistically significant since the 't' values for 'B' Coefficient are significant.

The overall results of the multiple regression techniques proves the first hypothesis, that: Industrial relations is a dependent variable upon the organisational culture.

The results also, show that the variable organisational commitment also contributes significantly to the dependent variable. It is also paradoxical to note that the socio-economic variables do not contribute, significantly to industrial relations, when compared to the other variables namely the organisational culture and the organisational commitment.
illustrated in Table 23. These 4 dimensions together contribute 44% of variance to industrial relations \(R^2 = 0.44\). Table 23 also explains that the maximum variance is attributed by the dimension (D14) loyalty \(R^2 = 0.31\).

Thus the industrial relations for all respondents, while considering organisational culture and organisational commitment, can be mathematically represented as follows:

\[
\text{Industrial relations} = 52.80 + (0.67) \text{D14} + (0.58) \text{D7} + (0.90) \text{D3} + (0.41) \text{D12}.
\]

These 'B' Coefficients for these dimensions are statistically significant since the 't' values for 'B' Coefficient are significant.

The overall results of the multiple regression techniques proves the first hypothesis, that: industrial relations is a dependent variable upon the organisational culture.

The results also, show that the variable organisational commitment also contributes significantly to the dependent variable. It is also paradoxical to note that the socio-economic variables do not contribute, significantly to industrial relations, when compared to the other variables namely the organisational culture and the organisational commitment.
However, the results exhibit four major dimensions—loyalty, individual autonomy, conflict tolerance and identifications contribute significantly \((P < 0.05)\) to the dependent variable, industrial relations.

Further, it is inferred that industrial relations is dependent upon both organisation culture and organisational commitment. The organisational commitment emerges as an intervening variable, from the study.

The study gives an additional expansion for the algebraic representation of Blain and Gennar (1970); where culture and commitment are to be incorporated in the ideology of the industrial relations system. Further, the present work confirms that industrial relations as a dependent variable.

But, the results contradict with the study of Lynn Week (1982), which is more paradoxical and emphasises that organisational culture is not an independent variable, nor can it be created discovered or destroyed by the whims of management. However, the present study concludes that organisational culture is an independent variable which influences commitment and industrial relations.
### Table 24

**Factor Loading, Communality, Eigen Value and Percentage of Variance of the Emerging Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Comumality</th>
<th>Eigen value</th>
<th>Percentage of variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Work Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>D04 - Performance reward</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>D06 - Risk tolerance</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>D02 - Structure</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>D01 - Support</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>D07 - Individual autonomy</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>D08 - Beliefs</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>D22 - Grievances</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>D23 - Discipline</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>D24 - Labour participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In management</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Group Dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>D16 - Labour relations</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>D15 - Interpersonal relations</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>D26 - Social integration</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>D18 - Individual incentives</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>D17 - Attitude</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Management Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>D05 - Individual responsibility</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>D10 - Exercise of authority</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>D09 - Group norms</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>D03 - Conflict tolerance</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>D11 - Identity</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Belongingness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>D13 - Job involvement</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>D12 - Identification with the organisation</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>D14 - Loyalty</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Human Resources Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>D21 - Communication</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>D19 - Compensation &amp; working conditions</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>D20 - Training &amp; development</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The importance of the study has been envisioned in the construction of a "six factor Model" for inculcating the concept of bi-partitism in an industry. To arrive at the model, the principle component analysis with varimax rotation has been used to find out the percentage of variance of each factor, which can be grouped together from the total pool of 25 dimensions considered in the study. The table 24 indicates factor variance percentage for each factor is 30.9, 11.5, 7.0, 6.3, 4.5 and 4.1, respectively with a total variance of 64.3%. The factors are grouped together, considering the Eigen value as 1; The factors are arranged based on the Eigen value – viz

F1 - Work culture (Eigen value 7.73)
F2 - Conflict resolution (Eigen value = 2.88)
F3 - Group dynamics (Eigen value = 1.76)
F4 - Management styles (Eigen value = 1.57)
F5 - Belongingness (Eigen value = 1.13)
F6 - Human resources development (HRD) (Eigen value = 1.01)

The Eigen value of the Factors are represented in graph (Figure 6), which shows the declining trend of Factors (from F1 to F6).

The dynamic model for inculcating "bi-partitism" has been developed based on the factors, which the researcher call them as "molecules of the bi-partitism" which bind to the factors together.
THE EIGEN VALUES OF THE EMERGING FACTORS
(F1 - F6)

EIGEN VALUES

9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
0

F1  F2  F3  F4  F5  F6

FACTORS

FIGURE 6
The factors drawn as the emerging pattern fulfill the ultimate objectives of the study. Also, these factors altogether construct the ideology of bipartitism in industrial relations system, which can be measured empirically.

The model has a strong statistical support and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test of sampling adequacy concur that the sample taken to process the factor analysis is statistically sufficient (KMO Value = 0.86).

The model while supporting the Dunlop’s (1958) theory, it adds a new dimension to the theory by dissecting the ideology of the system empirically.

It falls in line with the study of Chaturvedi (1987) and Lal Das (1983). But they have not attempted to identify the role of these ideologies in the system of industrial relations empirically, where as the present study fills up the gap and meets the current need.

However, the trend in the model favour the studies of Martin and Nicholls (1987), who have found that the three pillars—sense of belonging, sense of excitement and confidence in management, contribute a lot for creating a committed workforce. In the present factor analysis, ‘belongingness’ has emerged as an important factor, in industrial relations to create
"bi-partitism". It is a good symptom for the future development of the system in an organisational context.

The study also supports the studies of Meshizer et. al., (1991), where in they have argued that the organisational commitment acts as an intervening variable in the prediction of work-related behaviour. In this present work too, it is inferred that the organisational commitment acts as an intervening variable between the organisational culture and industrial relations, which are reflected in the factor analysis as the belongingness and group dynamics.

The model developed in the study has identified six major factors, which supports the studies of Lal Das (1983) wherein he has concluded that the industrial relations is not the product of one or two factors alone. In the present work strengthens the construct of the concept with 6 major factors in 25 dimensions.

To sum up, the results of the study prove the hypotheses and fulfil the objectives framed and suggest a dynamic model for inculcating "bi-partitism" in industrial relations (Figure ?).
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