



# Assessing the Organization Culture Influence in Employee Involvement and Empowerment

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Aabha Singhvi, <sup>2</sup>Mr. Yash C Doshi, <sup>3</sup>Dr. Ravindra. R. Kaikini

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, ROFEL GRIMS MBA, Vapi, Gujarat, India

<sup>2</sup>Research Scholar, Gujarat Technological University, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India

<sup>3</sup>Professor, Sahyadri college of Engineering & Management, Mangalore, Karnataka, India

**Abstract:** Employee involvement and empowerment are two deep factors that affect the daily performance of the organization; however, both these aspects of involvement and empowerment are highly influenced by the organizational culture prevalent. The organizational culture thus, has a greater role in the level of involvement and empowerment. Organizational culture is the way the organization works its planning and strategizing, which further provides an impetus for the employees to stay. Culture does play a pivotal role in the organization. Employee involvement is the level of interest shown by the employee to accomplish the overall strategy of the organization whereas employee empowerment is the level of freedom towards the decision-making employees are allowed to make. This research paper is basically an assessment towards analyzing these factors in-depth. The outcome of the research shows tremendous influence of organization culture in employee empowerment and employee involvement.

**Keywords:** employee empowerment, employee effectiveness, employee involvement, employee performance, organizational culture.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

There has been a paradigm shift in the application of HRD. We are seeing plenty of change inside the organizations which claim to have set up HRD branch which has all at once replaced training branch. The activities blanketed within the HRD maybe classified into 3 categories. The first category is largely primarily based on humanistic considerations, the philosophy of the proprietor supervisor, top management, in which the organizations said that their responsibility is to train and devolve people. However, they did not always regard them to be their part and parcel of the organization.

The second category is, reciprocal approach in which the owners stated that they have issues, the organization needs to be developed. In this pursuit, the feelings of the employees, their feedback, were considered with view to enhance their strength, capabilities and skills. And it was believed that unless the management takes care of the employees, development of organization remains a dream. The third category is “effective approach”, where the management is concerned with developing leadership for the future and therefore, they pick the number of people who display high potentials for progress and help individual or collective program in order to achieve their predefined objectives.

## 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Organizational Culture

Culture is crucial for the success of any organization and to maximize the effectiveness of human resources. Organizational culture, accepts organizational needs as the commonality of language, defined organizational limits, process of selection, allocation of authority, status, power, resources, various criteria of punishments and rewards and the means of coping with stress and unpredictable scenarios [1]. A robust organizational culture could be the basic provider of actual motivation and high commitment [2]. As very well mentioned by [3] contemplating the various values, beliefs and opinions is a requirement for an organization as to sketch out a collective culture that mainly occurs in the current and observed methods. Further pursued by the organization in a way which people comprehend its occurrence in the organization [3]. The organizational guidelines and the perceived methods of the manner in which activities are conducted within an organization, the culture of the organization could be interpreted [4][5].

Designing of culture is a key element that impacts the perceptions of employees' involvement and the connection with the climate of the organization. As the organization that needs to have an ethical and enriching performance as well as intellect from the employees, should be having a strong cultural environment [6]. The vital affective attitudes of dedication, job satisfaction, and stress need to be looked at and build a supporting atmosphere, hence predicting employees' involvement. Grading an employee for their excellent contributions with commitment and involvement leads to the empowerment of the employee which is directly proportional to the organization [6].

### 2.2 Employee Involvement

Involvement has an equally important role dependent on organizational culture. The practices thus help employee with various opportunities in order to taking decisions regarding the career and in the overall business [7].



With the involvement in multiple programs, multidisciplinary skills could be developed in employees by developing and implementing human capital (Lawler, 2005). Additionally, with the significant growth of human capital, higher involvement in HR practices is now a higher value addition for organizations [8]. Higher participation of human resources placement increases the organizational competitiveness of the firm, and both are positively correlated [9]. In the non - insurance business, proper internal marketing methods relate to high performance and job satisfaction [10]. Besides the ultimate common practices of human resource practices favoring involvement of employee, the highlight of literature provides employee with power, skills, motivation, and information [11][12][13]. Practices like these could lead to a transformational of the employees towards fulfilment of a competitive advantage that is sustainable [14]-[17]. Literature reviewed by [18] indicates that the fundamental notion virtually behind every study examining high-performance work structures and organizational functioning is employee involvement.

### 2.3 Employee Empowerment

Empowerment denotes a common organizational alignment where in employees have the option to make an everyday decision regarding activities of work [19], empowerment empowers employees to provide additional roles, exhibited higher autonomy at work and carry out add on responsibilities. With higher involvement in task, empowerment would create an intrinsic motivation and built-in positive attitudes at work [20]. Empowerment does provide stimulates employee's initiative and efforts to drive more involvement in their work [21]. Therefore, some of the researchers have an opinion that empowerment is as a high performance important HRM practice [22]. Empowerment enriches the dedication of employees, creating an emotional attachment, therefore influencing indirectly organizational performance [23]. Additionally, indication of empowerment enables employees avoiding the levels of hierarchy and immediately solving problems. Employees could immediately respond to requirements of customer needs and service delivery [19]. In the service context, enhanced competitive advantage of organizations can be derived through the practice of empowerment [9]. Conger, J.A. and Kanungo, R.N. looked at empowerment in perspective as a set of necessary conditions for task motivation which is intrinsic [24]. Thomas and Velthouse defined empowerment by the presence of four components those are competence, choice, impact, and meaningfulness [25].

## 3 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES, HYPOTHESIS AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The following are the objectives of the research.

- To highlight the nature and key dimensions of organizational culture.
- To assess the perception of Empowerment and Involvement of employee programs across various levels within the organization.
- To analyze the important factors influencing perceptions of Employee Involvement and Empowerment.
- To find out major inhibitors to the successful implementation of Employee Involvement and Empowerment Programs

The following hypotheses for research have been articulated for further investigation in this research study:

- H1: Organizational culture tends to impact the perceptions of employee involvement and empowerment.  
H2: There exists a positive, significant correlation between employee involvement and empowerment.

The present study is purely based on views and perceptions of employees of Life Insurance Corporation of India in Uttar Kannada District, and it does not cover the other providers of life insurance such as post offices, and other private players. A comprehensive, structured, and pretested questionnaire to all the 310 respondents in the Uttar Kannada District of Karnataka, who are employees of Life Insurance Corporation of India. Cronbach's alpha test was used to test the reliability of all the constructs. Measures of central tendency were used besides rating scale. Diagram and graphs were used to represent the parameters. Mannwhintney test was used to compare managerial and non-managerial groups for the rating scale data. Further, Karl Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation was calculated to ascertain the agreement between changeable. Regression analysis was employed to evaluate connection with the variables and their impact on outcome variables. The nature of relationship between variables has been analysed to find out low, moderate, or high degree of impact by considering five-point scales. Accordingly, the range of scores less than 2.5 have been considered as low, between 2.5 and 3.5 have been considered as moderate and above 3.5 have been considered as high.

## 4 DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

### 4.1 Profile of the Organization

Life Insurance Corporation of India in Uttar Kannada district operates through its five branches of different taluks in the district namely Dandeli, Sirsi, Karwar, Kumta and Honavar. The above table indicates the total number of respondents included in the present study. As stated earlier, the organization in Uttar Kannada has totally five branches as indicated in the table and the total numbers of employees amounts to 301 which form the part of study undertaken. The data clearly indicate that Sirsi branch has the highest number of employees (28.90%) as compared to other branches in the district. Dandeli has the least number of employees with 12.30%. Kumta branch ranks second in the overall staff strength of the organization.



Table 1. Branch wise Classification of the Respondents

Branch	Number of Respondents (Employees)	Percentage
Dandeli	37	12.30
Sirsi	87	28.90
Karwar	52	17.27
Kumta	66	21.92
Honavar	59	19.61
<b>Total</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>100</b>

#### 4.2 Profile of the Respondents

The information pertaining to Category and Gender classification of respondents in the present organizations given in the Table 2. From the 301 respondents in the five branches of the study organization, 18.61% were managers, while the remaining accounted for 81.39%. Gender classification of respondents, Female managers (0%) were overtaken by male managers (100%). Similarly, male other than manager category accounted for 63.45% while remaining 17.94% were women non – managers. This should be taken into perspective that from the 54 women respondents, all of them epitomized other than managers.

Table 2. Category and Gender Classification of Respondents

Gender	Managers	%	Non-managers	%	Total	%
Male	56	18.61	191	77.95	247	82.05
Female	0	0	54	22.05	54	17.95
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>18.61</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 3. Age wise classifications of Respondents

Age group (in years)	Managers	%	Non managers	%	Total	%
Below 30	0	0	15	05.26	15	04.98
30-40	3	05.35	65	22.80	71	23.59
40-50	16	28.58	137	62.10	187	62.12
Above 50	37	66.07	28	9.84	28	09.31
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>100</b>

As seen in Table 3, higher number of the managers (62.5%) are in the age group above 40 years and for non-managers (62.10%) 40-50 years. From 301 respondents, age group of more than 50 years was only 9.84%.

Table 4. Designation wise Classification of the Respondents

Designation	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Managers	56	18.6
Other than Managers	245	81.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>100</b>

From Table 4, it is clearly shown that 81.4 % of the respondents are non – managers.

Table 5. Educational and Insurance Related Qualifications of the Respondents

Qualification	No. of Respondents	Percentage
SSLC and Below	0	0
SSLC and Insurance qualification	0	0
PUC/Diploma	0	0
PUC/Diploma and Insurance qualification	05	02.00
Graduation	275	91.36
Graduation and Insurance qualification	03	01.00
Postgraduation	18	5.64
Postgraduation and Insurance qualification	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>100</b>



From Table 5, it is visible that the maximum respondents had completed graduation with 91.36 percent.

Table 6. Position Tenure-based Classification

Position tenure (in years)	Managers	%	Non-managers	%	Total	%
Below 5	12	21.42	15	6.12	27	8.97
5-10	29	51.78	202	82.44	231	76.74
10 and above	15	26.80	28	11.44	43	14.29
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>100</b>

Regarding the “tenure” of the employees, it might be investigated with dual possibilities: “organization tenure” and “position tenure”. Position tenure is the period for working in the particular position, while organization tenure is the time period held by the employee in the particular organization. Based on the filed survey 81% of managers and around 88% of non-managers had a position tenure extending from 5 to 10 years. Overall as many as (94%) of the respondents had position tenure 10 years and less.

Table 7. Organization Tenure-based Classification

Position tenure (in years)	Managers	%	Non-Managers	%	Total	%
Below 5	12	21.42	9	3.67	21	6.97
5 to 10	33	58.92	164	66.94	197	65.77
10 to 15	4	7.14	58	23.67	62	20.59
15 and above	7	12.52	14	5.72	21	6.97
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>100</b>

Regarding organization tenure, significant number of the managers (50%) and others (56.8%) had a total service of 5-10 years in their organization. From 301 respondents, persons with five years and less in the organization tenure represented 3.30%, while 19.60% respondents had above 15 years of organization tenure.

### 4.3 Organizational Culture

#### 4.3.1 Octa Pace Profile

Organizational culture addresses the "fingerprints" of an association. Organization culture ought to advance individual, relational, group, intern group, and eventually organizational learning. On a basic level, representative inclusion and strengthening programs emphatically imbedded a positive authoritative culture, rely upon advance persistent learning and improvement via ceaseless work environment learning and upgrade of hierarchical adequacy. Drawing adequate sign from this methodology, the analyst put forth a genuine attempt to direct the indicative assessment of organizational culture at Disaster protection Organization of India, in light of the reactions got from 301 respondents (56 administrators and 245 other than directors). To investigate the reactions, the specialist received eight essential fixings initially created and approved by Pareek which are featured in the prior sections. To analyze the responses, the researcher adopted eight vital ingredients formerly created and authenticated by Pareek which are highlighted in the foregoing paragraphs.

#### 4.3.2 Openness

As shown in Table 8 (a), nevertheless of their position, the respondents specified their discernment of “openness” to a greater range towards free collaboration amongst employees, each concerning others feeling, ability and judgmental sense (managers: mean = 4.93, SD = 0.26 and non-managers: mean = 4.97, SD = 0.17), sincere information sharing, thoughts and feeling in meetings (managers: mean = 4.0, SD = 0.00 and non-managers: mean = 4.0, SD = .00), furthermore, unrestricted and forthcoming correspondence within different levels in the organization so as to aid tackling issues. (Managers: mean = 4.93, SD = 0.26 and non-managers: mean = 4.98, SD = 0.14). They additionally announced their more grounded confidence in transparency as mirrored in their impression of unrestricted conversation and correspondence among managers and subordinates (managers: mean = 4.00, SD = 0.00 and non-managers: mean = 4.00, SD = 0.00). A large portion of the managers additionally communicated the impression of transparency in their association about exchanging their emotions freely (manager: mean = 4.93, SD = 0.26 and non-managers: mean = 4.98, SD = 0.14).



Table 8(a). Learning Culture: Openness

Statement		Very little	A little	Some	Quite a bit	Very Great deal	Total	Mean	SD	Mann Whitney Test Z Value	P
Free interaction with employees, each respecting others“ feelings, competence & sense of judgement (Count & Percentage)	Managers	0	0	0	4	52	56	4.93	0.3	1.54	0.12
		0	0	0	7.1	92.9	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0	7	238	245	4.97	0.2		NS
		0	0	0	2.9	97.1	100				
Genuine sharing of information, feelings and thoughts in meeting. (Count & Percentage)	Managers	0	0	0	56	0	56	4	0	0	1
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0	245	0	245	4	0		NS
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
Free discussion and communication between seniors and subordinates (Count & Percentage)	Managers	0	0	0	4	52	56	4.93	0.3	2.02	0.04
		0	0	0	7.1	92.9	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0	5	240	245	4.98	0.1		NS
		0	0	0	2	98	100				
Active managers put a lid on their feelings (R) (Count & Percentage)	Managers	0	0	0	56	0	56	4	0	0	1
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0	245	0	245	4	0		NS
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
Free and frank communication between various levels helps in solving problems (Count & Percentage)	Managers	0	0	0	4	52	56	4.93	0.3	0.56	0.06
		0	0	0	7.1	92.9	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0	5	240	245	4.98	0.1		NS
		0	0	0	2	98	100				

Table 8(b). Overall Openness

Category	Number of Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mannwhintney Test Z Value	P Value
Managers	56	4.56	.16	1.00	0.318 NS
Non-Managers	245	4.58	.11		
<b>Total</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>4.57</b>	<b>.12</b>		

As is evident from Table 8(b), both categories of employees experienced high openness in their organization. Finally, it could be inferred that both categories experienced same level of impact on “openness”. As can be seen in the Table 8(a) above, Openness has been assessed through five questions. To measure the overall level of openness, scores of each respondent on the five questions were summed up and averaged. The score of overall openness below 2.5 has been categorized as low, 2.5 to 3.5 as moderate and above 3.5 as high. The Table 8(c) below represents the distribution of employees according to various categories of “openness”.

Table 8(c). Overall Score: Openness

Range of Scores	Managers	Non-managers	Total
<2.5(Low)	0	0	0
2.5 – 3.5 (Moderate)	0	0	0
>3.5(High)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

The Range of scores from Table 8(c) reveals that both categories have experienced very high levels of openness in their organization.



### 4.3.3 Confrontation

The attribute of confrontation towards learning society is being perceived as the capacity and ability of the representatives to confront business related issues forthright instead of fleeing from them. As shown in the Table 9(a), the greater part of the supervisors covered by this examination saw this social quality of confrontation was esteemed a considerable amount in their association. (Mean values going from 1.05 to 4.98, SD values from .00 to .78, normal mean=3.63, normal SD =.10). Major share of the other than managers saw the presence of this cultural attribute only to a certain level.

Table 9(a). Learning Culture: Confrontation

Statement		Very little	A little	Some	Quite a bit	Very Great deal	Total	Mean	SD	Mann Whitney Test Z Value	P
		1	2	3	4	5					
Facing and not shying away from problems	Managers	0	0	0	56	0	56	4	0	0	1
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
	Non-managers	0	0	0	245	0	245	4	0		NS
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
Going deeper rather than doing surface level analysis of interpersonal problems.	Managers	0	0	0	56	0	56	4	0	0	1
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0	245	0	245	4	0		NS
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
Facing challenges inherent in the work situation	Managers	0	0	0	4	52	56	4.93	0.3	1.56	59
		0	0	0	7.1	93	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0	4	241	245	4.98	0.1		NS
		0	0	0	1.6	98	100				
Pass the buck tactfully when there is a problem (R)	Managers	52	0	0	4	0	56	1.21	0.8	1.56	0.06
		92.9	0	0	7.1	0	100				
	Non managers	241	0	0	4	0	245	1.05	0.4		NS
		98.4	0	0	1.6	0	100				
Surfacing problems is not enough, we should find the solution	Managers	0	0	0	56	0	56	4	0	0	1
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0	245	0	245	4	0		NS
		0	0	0	100	0	100				

Table 9(b). Overall Confrontation

Category	Number Of Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mannwhintney Test Z Value	P
Managers	56	3.63	.10	1.56	.059 N
Non-Managers	245	3.61	.05		
<b>Total</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>.06</b>		

As is evident from Table 9(b), both types of employees experienced high confrontation in their organization. However, the level of confrontation felt by managers was slightly higher than the other category. As can be seen in the Table 9(a) above, “confrontation” has been assessed through five questions. The overall level of “confrontation” has been measured by summing up and averaging the scores of each respondent on the five questions. The score of overall openness below 2.5 has been categorized as low, 2.5 to 3.5 as moderate and above 3.5 as high. Accordingly, Table 9(c) below represents the distribution of employees according to various categories of “openness”.



Table 9(c). Overall Score Confrontation

Range of Scores	Managers	Non managers	Total
<2.5Low	0%	0%	0%
2.5 – 3.5Moderate	0%	0%	0%
>3.5High	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

As far as overall score of confrontation is concerned, both managers and non- managers perceived high level as shown in Table 9(c).

#### 4.3.4 Trust

A trustworthy organization showcases a mounting spiral of trust. In such organizations employees can expect moral support being offered by one to another in times of crises. This normally upgrades relational and uphold, trusting in seniors unafraid that they would abuse the trust, lastly individuals can generally depend on others in the midst of emergencies. Regardless of the framework of the respondents, the two classes of representatives detailed the component of trust occurred distinctly to very incredible extent in their organization. (Manager: mean qualities going from 4.0 to 4.95, SD values going from .00 to .23, overall mean =4.38, overall SD =.09; non-managers: mean values extending 4.0 to 4.97, SD values extending .00 to .17, overall mean = 4.39, overall SD =0.7)

Table 10(a). Learning Culture Trust

Statement		Very little	A little	Some	Quite a bit	Very Great deal	Total	Mean	SD	Mann Whitney Test Z Value	P
		1	2	3	4	5					
Extending moral support and help to fellow employees in the organization during crises	Managers	0	0	0	3	53	56	4.95	0.2	0.94	0.35
		0	0	0	5.4	95	100				
	Non-managers	0	0	0	7	238	245	4.97	0.2		NS
		0	0	0	2.9	97	100				
Interpersonal contract and support among people	Managers	0	0	0	56	0	56	4	0	0	1
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
	Non-managers	0	0	0	245	0	245	4	0		NS
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
Confiding in seniors without fear that they will misuse the trust.	Managers	0	0	0	56	0	56	4	0	0	1
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
	Non-managers	0	0	0	245	0	245	4	0		NS
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
Trust begets trust.	Managers	0	0	0	3	53	56	4.95	0.2	0.94	0.35
		0	0	0	5.4	95	100				
	Non-managers	0	0	0	7	238	245	4.97	0.2		NS
		0	0	0	2.9	97	100				
People cannot depend on others in times of crises.	Managers	0	0	0	56	0	56	4	0	0	1
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
	Non-managers	0	0	0	245	0	245	4	0		NS
		0	0	0	100	0	100				



Table 10(b). Learning Culture – Overall Trust

Category	Number Of Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mannwhintney Test Z Value	P
Managers	56	4.38	.09	.94	.347 NS
Non-Managers	245	4.39	.07		
<b>Total</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>4.39</b>	<b>.07</b>		

Table 10(c). Learning Culture Trust

Range of Scores	Managers	Non managers	Total
<1.5Low	0%	0%	0%
2.5 – 3.5Moderate	0%	0%	0%
>3.5High	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 10(c) clearly shows that both employee groups experienced the presence of trust to a high level in their organization.

#### 4.3.5 Authenticity

Authenticity refers to ensuring a little distance between what is said and what is done. As can be seen from Table 11(c), 7.1% Managers perceived and reported moderate level of authenticity, 92.9 percent reported high level of authenticity. Similarly, 1.6% other category reported moderate level of authenticity while 98.4% reported a high level. Manager: mean values extending 3.00 to 4.86, SD values extending .00 to .52, overall mean =3.93, overall SD= .26; non-managers: mean values extending .13 to 4.97, SD values extending .00 to 4.0, overall mean = 3.98, overall SD= .13 [Table 11(b)] In brief, overall, 97.3% reported high level authenticity. (Table 11(c))

Table 11(a). Learning Culture Authenticity

Statement		Very little	A little	Some	Quite a bit	Very Great deal	Total	Mean	SD	Mann Whitney Test Z Value	P
		1	2	3	4	5					
Minimum gap between what people say and do.	Managers	0	0	4	52	0	56	3.93	0.3	1.56	0.06
		0	0	7.1	92.9	0	100				
	Non-managers	0	0	4	241	0	245	0.13	4		NS
		0	0	1.6	98.4	0	100				
Tactfulness, Smartness and even a little manipulation to get things done (R)	Managers	0	0	56	0	0	56	3	0	1.16	0.12
		0	0	100	0	0	100				
	Non managers	0	0	245	0	0	245	3	0		NS
		0	0	100	0	0	100				
Owning up to mistakes	Managers	0	0	4	52	0	56	3.93	0.3	1.56	0.06
		0	0	7.1	92.9	0	100				
	Non managers	0	0	4	241	0	245	3.98	0.1		NS
		0	0	1.6	98.4	0	100				
Telling a polite lie is preferable to telling the unpleasant truth (R)	Managers	0	0	4	52	0	56	3.93	0.3	1.56	0.06
		0	0	7.1	92.9	0	100				
	Non managers	0	0	4	241	0	245	3.98	0.1		NS
		0	0	1.6	98.4	0	100				
Perception is reality- People generally are what they appear to be	Managers	0	0	4	0	52	56	4.86	0.5	1.16	0.12
		0	0	7.1	0	92.9	100				
	Non managers	0	0	4	0	241	245	4.97	0.3		NS
		0	0	1.6	0	98.4	100				





Table 11(b). Learning Culture Overall Authenticity

Category	Number of Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mannwhintney Test Z Value	P
Managers	56	3.93	.26	1.56	.059 NS
Other than Managers	245	3.98	.13		
<b>Total</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>3.97</b>	<b>.16</b>		

Table 11(c). Learning Culture Authenticity

Range of Scores	Managers	Non managers	Total
<1.5Low	.0%	.0%	.0%
2.5 – 3.5Moderate	7.1%	1.6%	2.7%
>3.5High	92.9%	98.4%	97.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

#### 4.3.6 Proaction

To be proactive is expect the unexpected in advance and get prepared to face the situation. Proaction often saves the organization as well as the employees from various potential risks or eventualities. In this connection, how far the employees feel that their organization is proactive is very important.

Table 12(a). Learning Culture – Proaction

Statement		Very little	A little	Some	Quite a bit	Very Great deal	Total	Mean	SD	Mann Whitney Test Z Value	p
		1	2	3	4	5					
Preventive action on most matters.	Managers	0	0	0	4	52	56	4.93	0.26	1.34	0.182
		0	0	0	7.1	92.9	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0	8	237	245	4.97	0.18		NS
		0	0	0	3.3	96.7	100				
Seniors encouraging their subordinates to think about the development and take action in that direction	Managers	0	0	0	56	0	56	4	0	0	1
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0	245	0	245	4	0		NS
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
Considering both positive and negative aspects before taking action.	Managers	0	0	0	4	52	56	4.93	0.26	1.34	0.182
		0	0	0	4.71	92.9	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0	8	237	245	4.97	0.18		NS
		0	0	0	3.3	96.7	100				
Prevention is better than cure	Managers	0	0	0	4	52	56	4.93	0.3	1.34	0.18
		0	0	0	4.71	92.9	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0	8	237	245	4.97	0.2		NS
		0	0	0	3.3	96.7	100				
A stitch in time saves nine	Managers	0	0	0	4	52	56	4.93	0.3	1.34	0.18
		0	0	0	4.71	92.9	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0	8	237	245	4.97	0.2		NS
		0	0	0	3.3	96.7	100				



As displayed in Table 12(a), 12(b) and 12(c), managers extensively identified the occurrence of Proaction within the organization. (Mean values 4.00 to 4.97, SD values extending .00 to .26, overall mean= 4.77, overall SD=.16.

Table 12(b). Learning Culture – Overall Proaction

Category	Number Of Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mannwhintney Test Z Value	P
Managers	56	4.74	.21	1.34	.182
Non-Managers	245	4.77	.14		
<b>Total</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>4.77</b>	<b>.16</b>		NS

Table 12(c). Learning Culture Proaction

Range of Scores	Managers	Non managers	Total
<1.5Low	.0%	.0%	.0%
2.5 – 3.5Moderate	.0%	.0%	.0%
>3.5High	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

#### 4.3.7 Autonomy

Autonomy means the power given to the employees to take proper decisions. Employees are supportive with their independent decision making in such organizations.

Table 13(a). Learning Culture – Autonomy

Statement		Very little	A little	Some	Quite a bit	Very Great deal	Total	Mean	SD	Mann Whitney Test Z Value	p
		1	2	3	4	5					
Taking independent action relating to their jobs.	Managers	0	0	0	5	51	56	4.91	0.3	1.16	0.12
		0	0	0	8.9	91.1	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0	3	242	245	4.99	0.1		NS
		0	0	0	1.2	98.8	100				
Close supervision of and directing on action (R)	Managers	0	0	0	56	0	56	4	0	0	1
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0	245	0	245	4	0		NS
		0	0	0	100	0	100				
Obeying and checking with seniors rather than acting on your own (R)	Managers	0	0	0	4	52	56	4.93	0.3	1.56	0.06
		0	0	0	7.1	92.9	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0	3	242	245	4.99	0.1		NS
		0	0	0	1.2	98.8	100				
Freedom to employees breeds indiscipline (R)	Managers	0	52	0	4	0	56	2.14	0.5	1.56	0.06
		0	92.9	0	7.1	0	100				
	Non managers	0	242	0	3	0	245	2.02	0.2		NS
		0	98.8	0	1.2	0	100				
A good way to motivate employees is to give them autonomy to plan their work.	Managers	0	0	0	4	52	56	4.93	0.3	1.16	0.12
		0	0	0	7.1	92.9	100				
	Non managers	0	0	0							NS
		0	0	0							



Table 13(a), 13(b) and 13(c) highlight autonomy. Almost all the managers supposed and conveyed the existence of autonomy in the organization at a substantial level (mean values extending 2.02 to 4.99, SD values extending .00 to .52, overall, mean= 4.19, overall SD=.03. As shown in the table 13(c), 100% of both the classes of employees experienced high degree of autonomy in the organization.

Table 13(b). Learning Culture Overall Autonomy

Category	Number Of Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mannwhitney Test Z Value	P
Managers	56	4.18	.06	1.56	.059
Non-Managers	245	4.20	.02		
<b>Total</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>4.19</b>	<b>.03</b>		NS

Table 13(c). Learning Culture – Autonomy

Range of Scores	Managers	Non managers	Total
<1.5Low	.0%	.0%	.0%
2.5 – 3.5Moderate	.0%	.0%	.0%
>3.5High	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

#### 4.3.8 Collaboration

The organization which culturally believes in the value of collaboration encourages teamwork, accepts, and appreciates support of each other, and practices the art of winning together with direction, pride, and sense of purpose.

Table 14(a). Learning Culture Collaboration

Statement	Very little	A little	Some	Quite a bit	Very Great deal	Total	Mean	SD	Mann Whitney Test Z Value	p
	1	2	3	4	5					
Teamwork and team spirit.	Managers	0	0	6	0	50	56	4.79	0.6	2.85
		0	0	10.7	0	89.3	100			
	Non managers	0	0	6	0	239	245	4.95	0.3	
		0	0	2.4	0	97.6	100			
Accepting and appreciating help offered by others.	Managers	0	0	6	0	50	56	4.79	0.6	11.34
		0	0	10.7	0	89.3	100			
	Non managers	0	197	6	0	42	245	2.54	1.1	
		0	80.4	2.4	0	17.1	100			
Performing immediate task rather than being concerned about large organizational goals (R)	Managers	0	0	6	0	50	56	4.79	0.6	8.92
		0	0	10.7	0	89.3	100			
	Non managers	0	0	6	197	42	245	4.15	0.4	
		0	0	2.4	80.4	17.1	100			
Usually, emphasis on teamwork dilutes individual accountability	Managers	0	0	56	0	0	56	3	0	11.4
		0	0	100	0	0	100			
	Non managers	0	0	48	197	0	245	3.8	0.4	
		0	0	19.6	80.4	0	100			
Employees' involvement in developing inorganization's mission and goals contributes to productivity.	Managers	0	0	6	0	50	56	4.79	0.6	2.85
		0	0	10.7	0	89.3	100			
	Non managers	0	0	6	0	239	245	4.95	0.3	
		0	0	2.4	0	97.6	100			



Table 14(b). Learning Culture Overall Collaboration

Category	Number Of Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mannwhintney Test Z Value	P
Managers	56	4.43	.50	8.92	.000 HS
Non-Managers	245	4.08	.28		
<b>Total</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>4.14</b>	<b>.36</b>		

Table 14(c). Learning Culture – Collaboration

Range of Scores	Managers	Non-managers	Total
<1.5Low	.0%	.0%	.0%
2.5 – 3.5Moderate	10.7%	2.4%	4.0%
>3.5High	89.3%	97.6%	96.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 15(a). Learning Culture – Experimentation

Statement		Very little	A little	Some	Quite a bit	Very Great deal	Total	Mean	SD	Mann Whitney Test Z Value	p
		1	2	3	4	5					
Trying innovative ways of solving problems.	Managers	0	0	2	27	24	56	4.45	0.57	4.77	0 HS
		0	0	3.6	48.2	48.2	100				
	Non managers	0	0	4	46	195	245	4.78	0.45		
		0	0	1.3	18.8	79.6	100				
Encouraging employees to take a fresh look at how things are done.	Managers	0	0	2	0	54	56	4.93	0.37	0.93	0.4 NS
		0	0	3.6	0	96.4	100				
	Non managers	0	0	4	0	241	245	4.97	0.25		
		0	0	1.6	0	98.4	100				
Making genuine attempts to change behaviour on the basis of feedback.	Managers	0	0	29	27	0	56	3.48	0.5	4.63	0 HS
		0	0	51.8	48.2	0	100				
	Non managers	0	0	199	46	0	245	3.19	0.39		
		0	0	81.2	18.8	0	100				
Thinking out and doing new things to tone up the Organizations vitality.	Managers	0	0	2	27	27	56	4.45	0.57	4.18	0 HS
		0	0	3.6	48.2	48.2	100				
	Non managers	0	0	4	195	46	245	4.17	0.42		
		0	0	1.6	79.6	18.8	100				
In today's competitive situation, consolidation and stability are more important than experimentation (R)	Managers	0	0	29	27	0	56	3.48	0.5	4.81	0 HS
		0	0	51.8	48.2	0	100				
	Non-managers	0	0	50	195	0	245	3.8	0.4		
		0	0	20.4	79.6	0	100				

As can be seen from the Table 14(c), managerial and other than managerial category reported 89 and 97% high degree of collaboration respectively. At the same time, 10.7% of manages and 2.4% of others reported moderate degree of collaboration. Manager: mean values ranging from 3.00 to 4.79, SD values ranging from .00 to .62, overall mean= 4.43, overall SD=.50; other than managers: mean values ranging from.42 to 4.95, SD values rangingfrom.31 to 1.13 overall mean=4.08, overall SD= .28 [Table 14(b)].



A majority of the managers experienced high degree of collaboration in their respective organization, and so also the non-managers. Since the mean values in respect of managers are marginally higher than the other colleagues, it could be construed that the managers experienced the spirit of collaboration more than the non-managers did [Table 14(b)].

#### 4.3.9 Experimentation

This is related to ideas and social behavior in an organization. When this exists, the employees try their own way in solving problems by resorting to ingenious approach bringing about some changes in the behavior of the employees.

Table 15(b). Learning Culture –Overall Experimentation

Category	Number Of Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mannwhintney Test Z Value	P
Managers	56	4.16	.22	.93	.350
Non-Managers	245	4.18	.15		
<b>Total</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>4.18</b>	<b>.17</b>		NS

Table 15(c). Learning Culture – Overall Experimentation

Range of Scores	Managers	Non-managers	Total
<1.5Low	.0%	.0%	.0%
2.5 – 3.5Moderate	3.6%	1.6%	2.0%
>3.5High	96.4%	98.4%	98.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 16. OCTAPACE Summary

Statement	Category	N	Mean	S.D.	Median	Mann Whitney Test Z Value	P
Openness	Managers	56	4.56	.16	1.00	1.00	.318 NS
	Non-Managers	245	4.58	.11			
	Total	301	4.57	.12			
Confrontation	Managers	56	3.63	.10	1.56	1.56	.059 NS
	Non-Managers	245	3.61	.05			
	Total	301	3.61	.06			
Trust	Managers	56	4.38	.09	.94	.94	.347 NS
	Non-Managers	245	4.39	.07			
	Total	301	4.39	.07			
Authenticity	Managers	56	3.93	.26	1.56	1.56	.059 NS
	Non-Managers	245	3.98	.13			
	Total	301	3.97	.16			
Proaction	Managers	56	4.74	.21	1.34	1.34	.182 NS
	Non-Managers	245	4.77	.14			
	Total	301	4.77	.16			
Autonomy	Managers	56	4.18	.06	1.56	1.56	.059 NS
	Non-Managers	245	4.20	.02			
	Total	301	4.19	.03			
Collaboration	Managers	56	4.43	.50	8.92	8.92	.000 HS
	Non-Managers	245	4.08	.28			
	Total	301	4.14	.36			
Experimentation	Managers	56	4.16	.22	4.20	.93	.350 NS
	Non-Managers	245	4.18	.15			
	Total	301	4.18	.17			



The trend is explicitly visible in Table 15(c). The managers experienced the spirit of experimentation in their organization to a great extent, by reporting 96.4% and the others by 98.4% while a little 3.6 % of managers and 1.6% of non-managers experienced moderate level of experimentation in their organization. In summary, almost all the managers and non-managers perceived extensively confrontation, openness, autonomy, proaction and trust, however authenticity and collaboration has been analyzed to be moderate. Ultimately, an inference can be extended to organizational culture that it tends to influence perceptions of employee involvement and empowerment. Besides, non – managers had a lesser positive understanding of learning culture as compared to managers.

## 5 TESTING HYPOTHESIS

Based on results in Tables 8 to 16, the hypotheses of research have been accepted by rejecting the null hypotheses.

Table 17. Summary of Hypotheses

No.	Description	Confirmation
H1	Organizational culture tends to influence the perceptions of employee involvement and empowerment.	Confirmed
H2	There exists a positive, significant correlation between employee involvement and employee empowerment	Confirmed

### 5.1 Limitations of the Study

The present study is purely based on views and perceptions of employees of Life Insurance Corporation of India in Uttar Kannada District, and it does not cover the other providers of life insurance such as post offices, and other private players. This might not be applicable for other regions of India.

### 5.2 Future Scope of the Research

This paper can be researched further and provides a great extension to the current scope of the study. The study of influence of organizational culture on the involvement and empowerment can be further extended to various other industries in the services sector. Thus, providing a comparative study in various other service industries. This study also provides scope of employee involvement and empowerment with relation to its effectiveness of direct contact with the customers, which has further implication on the consumers as well. The studies can be further important for academicians especially in the human resources department.

## 6 CONCLUSIONS

The findings relating to the investigative assessment of organizational culture in Life Insurance Corporation of India of Uttar Kannada District were presented in this chapter. Basically, the relationship between the individual characteristics of the employees and the organization has been examined. The individual characteristics of employees like age, marital status, education, gender, organizational tenure etc. have been studied in this chapter. Further, organizational culture has been measured in terms of OCTAPACE. Therefore, it has been inferred whether the organizational culture in the organization is strong, moderate or weak. In this process, the individual characteristics of employees have considered as the antecedents and organizational culture has served as instrumentality factor. That means to say, the organizational culture will be instrumental in bringing about a change in the form of employee involvement and employee empowerment and job attitudes. The effect of organizational culture has also been separately measured on employee involvement and empowerment. Therefore, whether the employee involvement and empowerment are high, moderate or weak has been examined.

Considering the organizational culture, the managers and non-managers perceived more positive grade. Therefore, perceptions of involvement and empowerment are proved to be dominated by the firm's lifestyle. It is worth noticing perception of involvement of employees is positively correlated to the perception of empowerment of employee. To conclude, it can be interpreted that the etiquette what a firm carries with it has a vital role to play to make the employees feel that they are empowered. And this line of thought in their mind should be always maintained and sustained by the superiors for a longer duration.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Shrivastava, M., & Dave, S., "Compatibility: Between Culture and Change," *SCMS Journal of Indian Management*, vol. 7, issue 1, 2010.
- [2] Mobley William h., Wang Lena, Fang Kate, "Measuring and Developing IT in Your Organisation," *Behaviour*, vol.14, pp.379-394, 2005.
- [3] Soni, S., "Impact of Organizational Culture on Employee Engagement and Effectiveness in Indian Manufacturing Company," *IITM Journal of Management and IT*, vol. 42, 2019.
- [4] Kuscu, Z.K., Yener, M. & Gürbüz, F.G., "Learning Organization and its Cultural Manifestations: Evidence from a Global White Goods Manufacturer," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 210, pp.154-163, 2015.



- [5] Marin-Garcia, J. A., & Bonavia, T., “Relationship between employee involvement and lean manufacturing and its effect on performance in a rigid continuous process industry,” *International Journal of Production Research*, vol. 53, issue 11, pp.3260-3275, 2015.
- [6] Athahar, P., “Employee Involvement and Organizational Culture,” *Journal of Business and Management*, pp.79-84, 2019.
- [7] Lawler, E.E., Mohrman, S.A., & Benson, G., “Organizing for high performance: Employee involvement, TQM, reengineering, and knowledge management in the Fortune 1000,” San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2001.
- [8] Lawler, E.E., “Treat people right,” San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2003.
- [9] Browning, V., Edgar, F., Gray, B., & Garrett, T., “Realising competitive advantage through HRM in New Zealand service industries,” *The Service Industries Journal*, vol. 29, issue 6, pp.741-760, 2009.
- [10] Shiu, Y.M., & Yu, T.W., “Internal marketing, organisational culture, job satisfaction, and organisational performance in non-life insurance,” *The Service Industries Journal*, vol. 30, issue 6, 793–809, 2010.
- [11] Benson, G. S., and E. E. Lawler III, “Employee Involvement: Utilisation, Impacts, and Future Prospects.” Chap. 9 in *The Essentials of the New Workplace: A Guide to the Human Impact of Modern Working Practices*, edited by D. Holman, T. D. Wall, C. W. Clegg, P. Sparrow, and A. Howard, 153–172. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2005.
- [12] Lawler III, E. E., “High Involvement Management,” San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991.
- [13] MacDuffie, J. P., “Human Resource Bundles and Manufacturing Performance: Organisational Logic and Flexible Production Systems in the World Auto Industry,” *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, vol. 48, issue 2, 199-221, 1995.
- [14] Guerrero, S., and V. Barraud-Didier, “High-Involvement Practices and Performance of French Firms.” *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 15, issue 8, pp.1408-1423, 2004.
- [15] Guthrie, J. P., C. S. Spell, and R. O. Nyamori, “Correlates and Consequences of High Involvement Work Practices: The Role of Competitive Strategy,” *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 13, issue 1, 183-197, 2002.
- [16] Wood, S., and L. M. de Menezes, “Comparing Perspectives on High Involvement Management and Organizational Performance across the British Economy.” *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol.19, issue 4, pp.639-683, 2008.
- [17] Zatzick, C. D., and R. D. Iverson, “High-Involvement Management and Workforce Reduction: Competitive Advantage or Disadvantage?” *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 49, issue 5, pp.999-1015, 2006.
- [18] Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G., “Organisation development and change,” 9th edition. Cincinnati: OH Southwestern college publishing, 2008.
- [19] Bowen, D.E., & Lawler, E.E., “The empowerment of service workers: What, why, how, and when,” *Sloan Management Review*, vol. 33, issue 3, pp.31-39, 1992.
- [20] Eby, L., Freeman, D., Rush, M., & Lance, C., “Motivational bases of affective organisational commitment: A partial test of an integrative theoretical model,” *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, pp. 463-483, 1999.
- [21] Pfeffer, J., & Veiga, F., “Putting people first for organisational success,” *Academy of Management Executive*, vol. 13, issue 2, pp. 37-48, 1999.
- [22] Black, S.A., Lynch, L.M., & Krivelyova, A., “How workers fare when employers innovate,” *Industrial Relations*, vol. 43, issue 1, pp. 44-66, 2004.
- [23] Tata, J., & Prasad, S., “Team self-management, organisational structure, and judgments of team effectiveness,” *Journal of Management Issues*, vol. 16, issue 2, pp.248-256, 2004.
- [24] Conger, J.A. and Kanungo, R.N., “The empowerment process: integrating theory and practice”, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp.471-82, 1988.
- [25] Thomas, K.W. and Velthouse, B.A., “Cognitive elements of empowerment: an ‘interpretative’ model of intrinsic task motivation”, *Academy of Management Review*, vol.15, pp.666-81, 1990.