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Modifications as per Editorial Comments Section:

In accordance with the suggestion of the first examiner the whole thesis has been edited “paragraph by paragraph to address the issues of run-on / awkward sentences, missing articles, missing punctuations, missing prepositions, typos, the transition between the paragraphs, context/ content appropriateness and the like.

1. The editing has been done using language software of Microsoft Office-2007 and PageMaker. Accordingly, some mistakes have been identified and corrected as per the suggestion. A list of the changes has been provided at the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Chapter No.</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>Original version</th>
<th>Type of Change</th>
<th>Changed version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Again the economic dynamics of the country ...</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>Again, the economic dynamics of the country ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>So it has become ...</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>So, it has become ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>he frequently alternated between ...</td>
<td>Grammar Change in tense</td>
<td>he has frequently alternated between ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>In India, Baldev Sharma in his empirical study ...</td>
<td>Writing format</td>
<td>In India, Baldev Sharma (1981) in his empirical study ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13,16</td>
<td>Chapter one Chapter two</td>
<td>Writing format</td>
<td>Chapter one Chapter two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,10, 12, 14,</td>
<td>third chapter, Chapter four, Chapter five, Chapter six</td>
<td>Writing format</td>
<td>third chapter, Chapter four, Chapter five, Chapter six</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In English language the word ‘culture’...</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>In English language, the word ‘culture’ ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Through the years definitions of culture</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>Through the years, definitions of culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correction- 1
2. Citations of all the Quotes or paraphrases have been provided. Due to typing mistakes page numbers were not provided in some cases. These have been corrected. A list has been provided at the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Line no.</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Page no. of the quote introduced (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Page no. of the quote introduced (110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Page no. of the quote introduced (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Page no. of the quote introduced (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Page no. of the quote introduced (31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correction- 2
3. The review of the literature has been done in accordance with the objective of the study. Each of the three main constructs used in the study contains huge volume of research work under its belt. However, all the works are not relevant in the context of the present study. In case of ‘societal culture’ the anthropological origin of the context and its manifestation has been extensively reviewed. The vastness and multiplicity of the conceptual frameworks of culture have been clearly pointed out when the categorization of the definitions has been mentioned (Page 8, line 2). Identification and compilation of huge number of definitions by early research workers have been noted (Page 7, line 20). In fact, only those research works, in which, the concept of societal culture has been dealt with in congruence with the concept of organizational culture, have been covered up in the review. Thus, consideration of focus and relevance has compelled the author to make certain literatures redundant.

However, it will not be inappropriate to mention that the discussion on conceptual framework of organizational culture and subsequent identification of the dimensions have repeated mentions of “GLOBE” study of House et. Al, (Page 18, line 25; Page 51, line 10) which is dated at 2004. Similarly, in the process of establishing the validity and reliability of the instruments, the reference of the paper of S. Brahma has been provided which is dated at 2009. The literature of 2010 was not possible as the thesis has been submitted on March, 2010. However, following the suggestion of the honoured 1st examiner some of the literatures have been incorporated in the section of Organizational Culture (Section 2.2). A list has been provided below:

*Added to Chapter 2 Section 2.2.1 at page 40 after paragraph 5*

I. Nelson and Quick (1994) have identified three core functions of organizational culture and have suggested that the sense of identity is a source of commitment and motivation; culture as a
sense-making device offers guidance for understanding the organization; and culture as a control mechanism guides behaviour.

II. The psychological contract (Arnold et al. 1998) is one such example of how organizational culture guides the relationship between the employee and the organization through shared assumptions and values. Since, culture does not only affect overt behaviour but also the source of behaviour, the values and norms, it represents the "largest organizational control system" (Egan in Mullins 2002) and the "social glue" (Furnham and Gunter 1993) that counteracts differentiation.

III. Recognizing this potential to shape organizational behaviour, researchers have explored the relationship between organizational culture and organizational performance (Peters and Waterman in Mullins 2002).

IV. Wilson (2001) argues that culture is a metaphor for study through which meanings are constructed and expressed through social interaction. Yet, a more modern view of organizational culture is that it is something that a organization has. Hence it is more of a variable rather than a metaphor.

V. Singh et al. (2008) in their study questions the homogeneous conception of Indian national culture which originates from the nation state concept. Their paper explores the status of the country as a heterogeneous entity using a context-situated approach and the implication of the approach on organization strategies.
Reference:


The editing of the whole text has been done as per the suggestion provided in general editorial comments. The minimum acceptable writing standard in term of language, grammar, spellings, and typing errors, etc., have been ensured using the standard software packages as mentioned in the point 1 of the editorial comment section.

Modifications as per Conceptual Deficiencies Section:

1. The study of culture as an anthropological phenomenon was pioneered by Sir, Edward Taylor (1871) who was also generally known as “Father of Anthropology”. In fact, it has been pointed out in literature survey the Anglo-Saxon concept of culture which is widely accepted by the social scientists from different disciplines is almost synonymous to the general concept of “Human Civilization” (Page 7, paragraph2). Subsequent literature survey has tried to establish that culture is a concept which is exhaustively used in a wide variety of disciplines such as
classical subjects like history, linguistics, literature, anthropology, sociology, psychology or more recent subjects like economics, management, etc. (Page 7). Each of the above mentioned disciplines has used different approach and methodology (page 8, line2). However, the fundamental conceptual framework tends to remain towards its anthropological origin. Considering culture only from sociological perspective may deviate the study from its actual objective.

As very appropriately mentioned, envisaging culture as a system is only one of the numerous sociological perspectives. However, the fundamental approach towards conceptualization of culture has not envisaged it as a system (page 9 and page 10). Following difficulties may arise if culture is envisaged as a system:

a) The conceptual framework that has been used to measure the relevant factors related to culture may not be validated.

b) The systems approach may give rise to cause-effect relationship between various entities such as values, beliefs, assumptions etc. which will be impossible to verify at the empirical level (which has been mentioned at point 2 by honoured examiner) and has never been proposed in any past study.

It may also be noted that organizational culture has never been conceived as the sub part of the societal culture. Organizational culture has been conceived as an independent entity which has the similar structure of societal culture because of the use of the almost similar framework by the organizational culture scientists (Page 29 – 40). Moreover, the epic study by Hofstede in different time scales (1980, 2001) has used the same anthropological framework, construct and empirical dimensions to measure national culture and organizational culture simultaneously. In fact, this is one of the reasons that has encouraged the present study to inquire the existence of the relationship between societal culture and the organizational culture empirically (Page 84, research objective 6). Identification of organizational culture as a subsystem of sociological culture
culture tends to make such objective redundant and establish a general law which has not been found in literature.

Finally, as very precisely pointed out in the literature review, “the primary interest on organizational culture of early eighties has evolved simultaneously from two different sources (Knights and Willmott, 1987; Barley et al., 1988; Sackmann, 1991). The first source is the group of management writers who have provided very practical practitioner’s accounts of organizational success stories, emphasizing the importance of shared values and belief systems in influencing the behaviour of the organizational members. The second one is the group of academic researchers who put their effort to conceptualize organizations in terms of meaning” (Page 35-36). The inseparability of organizational culture concept from ‘Social Culture’ (the study prefers the term societal culture) has not been found on the above mentioned section. In the subsequent review sections, extensive quest for organizational culture during nineties has been identified. Other than the works of the established theoreticians like Schein and Hofstede, the very comprehensive collection on organizational culture studies “Reframing Organizational culture” (Frost, Moore, Louis, Lundberg, and Martin, 1991) and other studies have been reviewed (page 36 - 40). None of such studies provide us any clue regarding the inseparability of two concepts.

Some of the characteristics mentioned by the honoured examiner like pt. 2), 3), have been included for the identification of the dimensions (Page 50 – 52). Part of point 5) that ‘culture is abstract/ cognitive’ has also been included. However, to inquire culture through symbols (pt. 4) and other material/ non-cognitive elements (such as food, clothing etc. mentioned in pt. 4) extensive application of participant observation method is required. The present study has got this limitation in this respect which has been mentioned at the limitation section (6.1.5).

2. The inquiry of non-cognitive material elements of societal culture and organizational culture requires long term, extensive item by item comparison in a very precise set up. Presenting such a huge canvas would be problematic from methodological and reliability point of view hence has not been incorporated in the research objectives (page 84).
The suggestion in this regard has been incorporated and the required modification has been done in the conceptual framework.

3. The conceptualization of Organizational Climate phenomenon has also been done through extensive literature survey even mentioning the points of similarities and differences of the phenomenon with the organizational culture (Page 77 - 82). It will not be irrelevant to mention that the exploration of the theoretical concept of Organizational Climate have earlier been established by the author through a research paper titled “Development of the Conceptual Framework of Organizational Climate” published in the *Journal of Commerce, Vidyasagar University*, Vol.12 March, 2007. From diversified areas of exploration, the concept has deliberately been narrowed down to the level of measurement through the perception of organizational members. The relevant framework has been mentioned in the review (Page 50-62) and has been established through subsequent discussion.

In order to measure Organizational Climate, a variety of scales have been developed by researchers and they have been mentioned in the review section. Each of the scales identifies a number of factors, the sets being unique to each other. However, the scale formed by James & Jones has been widely accepted for the purpose of perceptual measurement and has been verified and applied by established researchers like Ryder and Southey (1990). Dimensions of Organizational Climate have been selected considering their relevance and consistency with the objectives of the present study.

As organizational climate has been viewed as the property of the individuals, has been assumed to be manifested through the collective perception of the members of the organization and has been established through the survey of allied research works, some of the variables mentioned by the honoured examiner (employee morale, motivation, job satisfaction) are not coming under the purview of the present study. However, variables such as employee trust, fairness in the HR practices have been expressed through dimensions such as mutual trust and leadership facilitation and support respectively. In fact, the seven dimensions those have been identified for the study of organizational climate tend to express the general, individual and collected

*Correction- 8*
behaviour of members in relation to their organization. Moreover, the identification of the variables of organizational climate was also influenced by one research objective that these will help to identify the association of organizational climate with societal culture and organizational culture.

4. I strongly agree with the observation of the honoured examiner. The nature of socialization is never static. In fact, the whole concept has been identified through the perceptual responses of the individuals which changes with time, place, and a number of other environmental factors. This has been accepted as a universal truth in case of human behaviour. This is not only the limitation of the present study (6.1.6) but also any empirical study involving human behaviour, other than of course, in case of time-series data. In this thesis, the respondents' present status of socialization has been taken care of.

Moreover, the phenomena such as Societal Culture, Organizational Culture and Organizational Climate themselves are dynamic in nature. They undergo change influencing the behaviour of the subjects (the respondents of such study) and the changed behavioural patterns of the subjects collectively in turn influence the phenomena. Evolution of any group, community, organization or society thus results from such mutually interactive changes. Perceiving or measuring such dynamics is beyond the scope of this thesis.

According to the suggestion of the honoured examiner, following limitations have been incorporated in the study.

*Added to chapter 6, section 6.1, Page 151 after paragraph 2 (6.1.4)*

6.1.5 Limitation in terms of Conceptualization of Culture

Culture as a metaphor or as a variable includes abstract, cognitive elements as well as material, non-cognitive elements. In order to explore the interrelationships of the three variables viz. societal culture, organizational culture and organizational climate the identical set of respondents has been used. The exploration has essentially been done at the perceptual level of the respondents. Essentially, the concentration has been on the cognitive elements. However, inter-
comparison of the non-cognitive, material elements require long term comparative study in different time scale (such as how the articles used in the society changes and what are the corresponding change in organizations?). The study is therefore, limited at the cognitive aspects of the variables.

6.1.6 Limitation in identifying Respondents' Socialization

Respondents' nature of socialization is highly dynamic. It goes on changing with the passage of time, place, strength of cultural influence of a particular region etc. It has been assumed that the particular type of society, where the respondent was located during his/her early life or formative period plays a dominating role in shaping his/her socialization. Consequently, it has also been assumed that the cognitive orientation of the respondents is largely influenced by early socialization. However, a few exceptions are not impossible. Limitation appears for such cases. However, for the large sample size these cases will not influence the result.

Modifications as per Statistical Analysis Section:

1. The correlation analyses in all the cases have been done using SPSS software. In each of the cases, correlation has been proved to be significant at 0.01 level by the software itself. The fact has also been provided along with most of the tables. However, some tables have been identified where the information has not been provided due to typing error. Such tables have been identified and necessary corrections have been made. A list accordingly has been provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Tables No.</th>
<th>Modification (information is provide below the table)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Correlation significant at 0.01 level (2 tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>Correlation significant at 0.01 level (2 tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>Correlation significant at 0.01 level (2 tailed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. In analyzing the interrelationship among the variables societal culture, organizational culture, and organizational climate none of the interpretation of the thesis has assumed causality. In fact, identification of causality was not included in the objectives of the thesis. It only has dealt with the association between the three variables viz. societal culture, organizational culture, and organizational climate. In the thesis, however, it has been observed that the basis of the classification of the organizations such as age wise, location wise, and organization wise and also the classification of the respondents on the basis of socialization (rural & semi-urban, industrial township, and urban) have shown separate types of patterns of correlations among the variables of societal culture, organizational culture, and organizational climate. The causality is very straightforward and apparent in such cases. Otherwise, no such statement has been made on the thesis which may indicate towards causal relationship.

3. After the thorough search, not a single case of "use of lower positive correlation coefficients to justify a reverse of the relationship" has been identified.

4. In his book titled *Foundations of Behavioural Research*, Kerlinger (1986) points out that the closer Cronbach’s Alpha is to 1, the higher the internal consistency reliability. A value of .624 may be identified as closer to 1 and also cannot be said to have low internal consistency. While presenting the test of reliability the rationale for identifying a cut-off value of the ‘Cronbach Alpha Coefficient’ has clearly been provided in the following manner: “If a scale has several dimensions or sub scales, reliability should be computed for each subscale (Brahma, S., 2009). As a rule of thumb, alpha = 0.70 is considered as minimum accepted value; however, a value in the range of 0.60 is also acceptable for some scales (Nunally, 1978).” In fact, in his book titled *Psychometric Theory*, Nunally clearly explains the situation where we may fix the cut-off value of Cronbach Alpha Coefficient at 0.6. Hence there is no reason that a value of .624 will be below acceptable limit.

5. The situation or the issue of multi-collinearity appears only when there are more than two independent variables in the regression analysis. Multicollinearity may be defined as a statistical phenomenon in which two or more predictor variables in a multiple regression model are highly correlated. In such a situation, the coefficient estimates may change erratically in response to
small changes in the model or the data. Multicollinearity does not reduce the predictive power or reliability of the model as a whole, at least within the sample data themselves; it only affects calculations regarding individual predictors. That is, a multiple regression model with correlated predictors can indicate how well the entire bundle of predictors predicts the outcome variable, but it may not give valid results about any individual predictor, or about which predictors are redundant with respect to others. The objective of the present study do not requires such modeling in its limited scope of research. However, this suggestion may be explored for future scope of research.