

A STUDY ON WORK CULTURE AMONG ENGINEERS IN BHEL

Author

Dr.V. MAHALAKSHMI

Head, PG & Research Department of Commerce,

Idhaya College for Women,

Kumbakonam, Tamil Nadu.

Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli

ABSTRACT

In contemporary western countries, the rapid development of science, medicine and technology during the last century has led to enormous social, cultural and economical changes. The fields of industry and investment have risen dramatically and the worldwide market has become very demanding and competitive. Therefore, a certain type of culture has arisen among employees, indicating the type of the institutions' internal organization and external strategies. However, the recent worldwide financial crisis has led to unexpected fluctuation and disturbed the balance of global market. As a result, the employees' salaries have decreased, working hours have been extended and working force has weakened. Such upheavals have made employees more vulnerable to anxiety, disappointment and aggressive behavior. For this reason, the interest of experts and company managers has turned to the study of human resource management and attribution, in order to promote the employees' feeling of job satisfaction and deal with their experience of occupational stress and emotional burnout.

Key words: *Work Culture, Job Satisfaction*

INTRODUCTION

The success of any organization depends on the quality of its human resources. Human resources are the most important and valuable assets, every organization has in the form of its employees. Dynamic, competent and motivated human resources build dynamic organization and enable organization to achieve its goals. An organisation's performance and resulting productivity are directly proportional to quantity and quality of its human resources.

Work Culture, in any organisation, assumes great importance as a pivot for attaining competitive advantage. Work culture is assumed to play a decisive role in the development of a unique corporate identity which in turn provides organizations with the opportunity to leverage it to achieve strategic leadership. Work culture has a strong bearing on the character and persona of an organisation.

The term corporate culture, work culture, organization culture became a buzz word and the definition most often adopted was that developed by William Ouchi namely, “how things are done around here”. Work culture refers to a series of attitudes and behaviors adopted by employees of a certain organization, which affect its function and total well-being.

Work Culture is the pattern of values, attitudes, behavior, intention and results of the work including any instrument, work systems, technology and the language it used. Culture was closely linked to the values and the environment that lead to the meaning and philosophy of life, which would influence that attitudes and behavior at work. Culture was the result of life experiences, habits and the selection process the norms that exist in a social interaction or put himself in the middle of a particular work environment.

Individual performance of an organization community was influenced by various factors, one which was a good and conducive organizational climate to make how a person felt comfortable and safe carrying out the work according to his profession.

Someone who felt safe and comfortable in doing his job, a profession was related to the job or profession was said to be a work culture that was reflected in the work day behavior. Of course, the behavior was expected to be consistent with the vision and mission of the organization, it could be said that the behavior of a person working behavior was directly or indirectly influenced by the value of organizational culture manifested into work culture.

BHARAT HEAVY ELECTRICALS LIMITED

BHEL is one of India’s largest engineering and manufacturing enterprises in the energy and infrastructure sectors and a leading power equipment manufacture globally, is a celebration of India’s industrial achievements. In its journey of over 55

years, it has gained the status of being one of the strongest pillars of Indian industry. BHEL serves the core sectors of the economy and provides the comprehensive portfolio of products, systems and services to customers in power, transmission, transport, renewable, water, defence and aerospace, oil and gas, and industry. BHEL has created value for its stakeholders due to the scale and depth of its operations, rich experience, competent manpower, innovative eco system, diverse product-mix and focus on sustainable business solutions. BHEL's greatest assets—its highly skilled and committed work force of more than 35,000 employees is the cornerstone of its success. BHEL's committed to nation building reflects in many ways in its contribution to the countries installed power generation capacity; bringing latest state-of-the-art technology to the country; consistent highest expenditure of more than 2.5% of its turnover on R&D and innovative in the Indian engineering segment; pan-India presence; establishment of world-class assets, and contribution to the society at large through initiatives in skill youth, health, hygiene, education, cleanliness and environment protection, to name a few.

With a widespread network of 16 manufacturing facilities, 2 repair units, 4 regional offices, 8 service centres, 1 subsidiary, 3 active joint ventures, 15 regional marketing centres, 3 overseas offices and current project execution at more than 150 project sites across India and abroad. BHEL manufactures a wide range of high quality & reliable products adhering to national and international standards. BHEL has a widespread footprint in all the inhabited continents of the world with references in 83 countries including Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Indonesia, Oman, Iraq, Sudan, Afghanistan, United States and New Zealand.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To analyse the effectiveness of supervision, evaluation and appraisal of Engineers.
- To measure the extent of training and development among Engineers in BHEL
- To evaluate Engineers perception of the work environment in terms of safety and policies
- To offer findings and valuable suggestions.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research design is empirical in nature since the study is conducted by using both analytical and diagnostic type of research. The study is based on both primary and secondary data. Primary data has been collected from the respondents who were Engineers in BHEL, Tiruchirappalli. Sample size for the study was 400. Secondary data is collected from various published and unpublished sources including journals, magazines, publications, reports, books, dailies, periodicals, articles, research papers, websites, bank publications, manuals and booklets.

RESULT ANALYSIS & DISCUSSION

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*the opportunity of participating in the decision making process among the engineers work cultures*” in this study area.

TABLE – 1: WC1-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC 1	Very Low	88	3.739	.9284	.0990	3.542	3.935	2.0	5.0	2
	Low	99	3.404	.8797	.0884	3.229	3.579	1.0	5.0	4
	Moderate	104	3.587	1.0391	.1019	3.384	3.789	1.0	5.0	3
	High	93	3.344	1.1656	.1209	3.104	3.584	1.0	5.0	5
	Very High	16	3.875	1.0247	.2562	3.329	4.421	2.0	5.0	1
	Total	400	3.530	1.0182	.0509	3.430	3.630	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes that *the opportunity of participating in the decision making process among the engineers work cultures* in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is very high, ‘2’ is very low, ‘3’ is moderate, ‘4’ is low and ‘5’ is high. It is concluded that

the opportunity of participating in the decision making process among the engineers ‘very high’ work cultures in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*emphasis on rules and regulations among the engineers work cultures*” in this study area.

TABLE – 2: WC2-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC2	Very Low	88	3.773	.8126	.0866	3.601	3.945	2.0	5.0	2
	Low	99	3.404	.8797	.0884	3.229	3.579	1.0	5.0	5
	Moderate	104	3.625	.8028	.0787	3.469	3.781	2.0	5.0	3
	High	93	3.774	.9223	.0956	3.584	3.964	2.0	5.0	1
	Very High	16	3.500	.6325	.1581	3.163	3.837	3.0	5.0	4
	Total	400	3.633	.8569	.0428	3.548	3.717	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes that *emphasis on rules and regulations among the engineers work cultures* in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is high, ‘2’ is very low, ‘3’ is moderate, ‘4’ is very high and ‘5’ is low. It is concluded that *emphasis on rules and regulations among the engineers ‘high’ work cultures* in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*the opportunity for independent thought and action job among the engineers work cultures*” in this study area.

TABLE – 3: WC3-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC3	Very Low	88	3.864	.7758	.0827	3.699	4.028	2.0	5.0	1
	Low	99	3.424	.7966	.0801	3.265	3.583	2.0	5.0	4
	Moderate	104	3.635	.8819	.0865	3.463	3.806	2.0	5.0	2
	High	93	3.624	.9659	.1002	3.425	3.823	1.0	5.0	3

	Very High	16	3.250	.7746	.1936	2.837	3.663	2.0	5.0	5
	Total	400	3.615	.8681	.0434	3.530	3.700	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes that *the opportunity for independent thought and action job among the engineers* work cultures in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is very low, ‘2’ is moderate, ‘3’ is high, ‘4’ is low and ‘5’ is very high. It is concluded that *the opportunity for independent thought and action job among the engineers ‘very low’* work cultures in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*the opportunity for taking initiative among the engineers* work cultures” in this study area.

TABLE – 4: WC4-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC4	Very Low	88	3.864	.7141	.0761	3.712	4.015	2.0	5.0	1
	Low	99	3.677	.8669	.0871	3.504	3.850	2.0	5.0	4
	Moderate	104	3.740	.9030	.0885	3.565	3.916	2.0	5.0	2
	High	93	3.602	.8740	.0906	3.422	3.782	1.0	5.0	5
	Very High	16	3.688	.7932	.1983	3.265	4.110	3.0	5.0	3
	Total	400	3.718	.8453	.0423	3.634	3.801	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes that *the opportunity for taking initiative among the engineers* work cultures in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is very low, ‘2’ is moderate, ‘3’ is very high, ‘4’ is low and ‘5’ is high. It is concluded that *the opportunity for taking initiative among the engineers ‘very low’* work cultures in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*the scope of discussion of our personal problems with our seniors among the engineers* work cultures” in this study area.

TABLE – 5: WC5-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC5	Very Low	88	3.261	1.0449	.1114	3.040	3.483	1.0	5.0	2
	Low	99	3.364	.8263	.0830	3.199	3.528	2.0	5.0	1
	Moderate	104	2.981	1.1059	.1084	2.766	3.196	1.0	5.0	5
	High	93	3.204	1.1755	.1219	2.962	3.446	1.0	5.0	3
	Very High	16	3.063	.8539	.2135	2.607	3.518	2.0	5.0	4
	Total	400	3.193	1.0432	.0522	3.090	3.295	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes that *the scope of discussion of our personal problems with our seniors among the engineers* work cultures in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is low, ‘2’ is very low, ‘3’ is high, ‘4’ is very high and ‘5’ is moderate. It is concluded *the scope of discussion of our personal problems with our seniors among the engineers ‘low’* work cultures in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*the assistance from my seniors to solve the problem among the engineers* work cultures” in this study area.

TABLE – 6: WC6-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC6	Very Low	88	3.727	.9557	.1019	3.525	3.930	1.0	5.0	3
	Low	99	3.576	.8218	.0826	3.412	3.740	2.0	5.0	5
	Moderate	104	3.673	.9798	.0961	3.483	3.864	1.0	5.0	4
	High	93	3.849	.9549	.0990	3.653	4.046	1.0	5.0	2
	Very High	16	4.250	.7746	.1936	3.837	4.663	3.0	5.0	1
	Total	400	3.725	.9309	.0465	3.633	3.817	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes that *the assistance from my seniors to solve the problem among the engineers* work cultures in this study area. The different work

culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is very high, ‘2’ is high, ‘3’ is very low, ‘4’ is moderate and ‘5’ is low. It is concluded *the assistance from my seniors to solve the problem among the engineers ‘very high’* work cultures in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*the encouragement from seniors to be innovative among the engineers* work cultures” in this study area.

TABLE – 7: WC7-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC7	Very Low	88	3.602	.9534	.1016	3.400	3.804	1.0	5.0	4
	Low	99	3.505	.8376	.0842	3.338	3.672	1.0	5.0	5
	Moderate	104	3.654	.9324	.0914	3.473	3.835	1.0	5.0	2
	High	92	3.620	1.0466	.1091	3.403	3.836	1.0	5.0	3
	Very High	17	3.875	.7188	.1797	3.492	4.258	3.0	5.0	1
	Total	400	3.607	.9340	.0468	3.515	3.698	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes that *the encouragement from seniors to be innovative among the engineers* work cultures in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is very high, ‘2’ is moderate, ‘3’ is high, ‘4’ is very low and ‘5’ is low. It is concluded *the encouragement from seniors to be innovative among the engineers ‘very high’* work cultures in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*the feeling of employees that they are members of a well functioning team* among *the engineers* work cultures” in this study area.

TABLE –8: WC8-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			

WC8	Very Low	88	3.727	.9557	.1019	3.525	3.930	1.0	5.0	3
	Low	99	3.576	.8218	.0826	3.412	3.740	2.0	5.0	5
	Moderate	104	3.673	.9798	.0961	3.483	3.864	1.0	5.0	4
	High	93	3.849	.9549	.0990	3.653	4.046	1.0	5.0	2
	Very High	16	4.250	.7746	.1936	3.837	4.663	3.0	5.0	1
	Total	400	3.725	.9309	.0465	3.633	3.817	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes that *the feeling of employees that they are members of a well functioning team among the engineers* work cultures in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is very high, ‘2’ is high, ‘3’ is very low, ‘4’ is moderate and ‘5’ is low. It is concluded *the feeling of employees that they are members of a well functioning team among the engineers ‘very high’* work cultures in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*the relationship between superiors and subordinates among the engineers* work cultures” in this study area.

TABLE – 9: WC9-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC9	Very Low	88	3.682	.8241	.0879	3.507	3.856	1.0	5.0	4
	Low	99	3.606	.8308	.0835	3.440	3.772	1.0	5.0	5
	Moderate	104	3.856	.9182	.0900	3.677	4.034	1.0	5.0	2
	High	93	3.796	.8668	.0899	3.617	3.974	1.0	5.0	3
	Very High	16	4.000	.6325	.1581	3.663	4.337	3.0	5.0	1
	Total	400	3.748	.8577	.0429	3.663	3.832	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes that *the relationship between superiors and subordinates among the engineers* work cultures in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is very high, ‘2’ is moderate, ‘3’ is high, ‘4’ is very low and ‘5’ is low. It is concluded *the relationship between superiors and subordinates among the engineers ‘very high’* work cultures in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*the pride of employees to belong to this organization among the engineers work cultures*” in this study area.

TABLE – 10: WC10-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC10	Very Low	88	4.091	1.0354	.1104	3.872	4.310	1.0	5.0	3
	Low	99	3.818	.8127	.0817	3.656	3.980	2.0	5.0	5
	Moderate	104	4.096	.8421	.0826	3.932	4.260	2.0	5.0	2
	High	93	4.043	.9079	.0941	3.856	4.230	2.0	5.0	4
	Very High	16	4.250	.8563	.2141	3.794	4.706	3.0	5.0	1
	Total	400	4.020	.9009	.0450	3.931	4.109	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes that *the pride of employees to belong to this organization among the engineers work cultures* in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is very high, ‘2’ is moderate, ‘3’ is very low, ‘4’ is high and ‘5’ is low. It is concluded *the pride of employees belong to this organization among the engineers ‘very high’ work cultures* in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*management’s initiative in adopting new technology among the engineers work cultures*” in this study area.

TABLE – 11: WC11-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC11	Very Low	12	3.727	.8935	.0952	3.538	3.917	1.0	5.0	2
	Low	99	3.455	.8722	.0877	3.281	3.628	2.0	5.0	4
	Moderate	104	3.558	.9225	.0905	3.378	3.737	2.0	5.0	3
	High	93	3.333	.9706	.1006	3.133	3.533	1.0	5.0	5
	Very High	16	4.188	.7500	.1875	3.788	4.587	3.0	5.0	1

	<i>Total</i>	400	3.543	.9248	.0462	3.452	3.633	1.0	5.0	
--	--------------	-----	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-----	-----	--

Source: Primary data

The above table observes *management’s initiative in adopting new technology among the engineers* work cultures in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is very high, ‘2’ is very low, ‘3’ is moderate, ‘4’ is low and ‘5’ is high. It is concluded *management’s initiative in adopting new technology among the engineers ‘very high’* work cultures in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*the sense of responsibility among the engineers* work cultures” in this study area.

TABLE –12: WC12-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC12	Very Low	88	3.636	.8467	.0903	3.457	3.816	1.0	5.0	2
	Low	99	3.293	.7727	.0777	3.139	3.447	1.0	5.0	4
	Moderate	104	3.269	.7534	.0739	3.123	3.416	2.0	5.0	5
	High	93	3.559	.8401	.0871	3.386	3.732	1.0	5.0	3
	Very High	16	3.938	.7719	.1930	3.526	4.349	3.0	5.0	1
	<i>Total</i>	400	3.450	.8180	.0409	3.370	3.530	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes *the sense of responsibility amongst employees among the engineers* work cultures in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is very high, ‘2’ is very low, ‘3’ is high, ‘4’ is low and ‘5’ is moderate. It is concluded *the sense of responsibility among the engineers ‘very high’* work cultures in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*the effect of outstanding performance on receiving special rewards and recognition among the engineers* work cultures” in this study area.

TABLE – 13: WC13-SUMMARY

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for	Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
--	---	------	----------------	------------	-----------------------------	-----	-----	-------------

						Mean				
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC13	Very Low	88	3.489	.9222	.0983	3.293	3.684	2.0	5.0	1
	Low	99	3.212	.8116	.0816	3.050	3.374	1.0	5.0	4
	Moderate	104	3.154	.7730	.0758	3.004	3.304	1.0	5.0	5
	High	93	3.387	1.1135	.1155	3.158	3.616	1.0	5.0	2
	Very High	16	3.375	.8851	.2213	2.903	3.847	2.0	5.0	3
	Total	400	3.305	.9133	.0457	3.215	3.395	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes *the effect of outstanding performance on receiving special rewards and recognition among the engineers* work cultures in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is very low, ‘2’ is high, ‘3’ is very high, ‘4’ is low and ‘5’ is moderate. It is concluded *the effect of outstanding performance on receiving special rewards and recognition among the engineers ‘very low’* work cultures in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*the chances of taking risk by the organization among the engineers* work cultures” in this study area.

TABLE – 14: WC14-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC14	Very Low	88	3.091	.9302	.0992	2.894	3.288	2.0	5.0	4
	Low	99	3.101	.8390	.0843	2.934	3.268	1.0	5.0	3
	Moderate	104	3.337	.8431	.0827	3.173	3.501	1.0	5.0	1
	High	93	3.043	.9771	.1013	2.842	3.244	1.0	5.0	5
	Very High	16	3.250	.4472	.1118	3.012	3.488	3.0	4.0	2
	Total	400	3.153	.8867	.0443	3.065	3.240	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes *the chances of taking risk by the organization among the engineers* work cultures in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is moderate, ‘2’ is very high, ‘3’ is low, ‘4’ is very low and ‘5’ is high. It is concluded *the chances of taking*

risk by the organization among the engineers ‘moderate’ work cultures in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*rotation of the responsibilities of employees by the management among the engineers work cultures*” in this study area.

TABLE – 15: WC15-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC15	Very Low	88	3.023	.9940	.1060	2.812	3.233	1.0	5.0	1
	Low	99	2.798	.9033	.0908	2.618	2.978	1.0	5.0	4
	Moderate	104	2.827	.9290	.0911	2.646	3.008	1.0	5.0	3
	High	93	2.796	1.0990	.1140	2.569	3.022	1.0	5.0	5
	Very High	16	3.000	1.1547	.2887	2.385	3.615	1.0	5.0	2
	Total	400	2.863	.9879	.0494	2.765	2.960	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes *rotation of the responsibilities of employees by the management among the engineers work cultures* in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is very low, ‘2’ is very high, ‘3’ is moderate, ‘4’ is low and ‘5’ is high. It is concluded *rotation of the responsibilities of employees by the management among the engineers ‘very low’ work cultures* in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*the identification of employees with the organization among the engineers work cultures*” in this study area.

TABLE – 16: WC16-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC16	Very Low	88	3.159	.8289	.0884	2.983	3.335	1.0	5.0	4
	Low	99	3.495	.9077	.0912	3.314	3.676	1.0	5.0	2

Moderate	104	3.029	.9996	.0980	2.834	3.223	1.0	5.0	5
High	93	3.204	1.0274	.1065	2.993	3.416	1.0	5.0	3
Very High	16	4.063	1.0626	.2657	3.496	4.629	2.0	5.0	1
<i>Total</i>	400	3.255	.9759	.0488	3.159	3.351	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes *the identification of employees with the organization among the engineers* work cultures in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is very high, ‘2’ is low, ‘3’ is high, ‘4’ is very low and ‘5’ is moderate. It is concluded *the identification of employees with the organization among the engineers ‘very high’* work cultures in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*the effect of job performance on higher pay among the engineers* work cultures” in this study area.

TABLE – 17: WC17-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC17	Very Low	88	3.534	1.1239	.1198	3.296	3.772	1.0	5.0	2
	Low	99	3.414	.9259	.0931	3.229	3.599	1.0	5.0	3
	Moderate	104	3.269	1.0262	.1006	3.070	3.469	1.0	5.0	5
	High	93	3.301	.9756	.1012	3.100	3.502	1.0	5.0	4
	Very High	16	4.063	.7719	.1930	3.651	4.474	3.0	5.0	1
	<i>Total</i>	400	3.403	1.0139	.0507	3.303	3.502	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes *the effect of job performance on higher pay among the engineers* work cultures in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is very high, ‘2’ is very low, ‘3’ is low, ‘4’ is high and ‘5’ is moderate. It is concluded *the effect of job performance on higher pay among the engineers ‘very high’* work cultures in this study area.

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no association difference in the mean score of “*the opportunity in my job for participating in setting of goals among the engineers* work cultures” in this study area.

TABLE – 18: WC18-SUMMARY

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Rank (Mean)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
WC18	Very Low	88	3.432	.8683	.0926	3.248	3.616	1.0	5.0	5
	Low	99	3.606	.7931	.0797	3.448	3.764	2.0	5.0	3
	Moderate	104	3.490	.9754	.0956	3.301	3.680	1.0	5.0	4
	High	93	3.645	.8162	.0846	3.477	3.813	1.0	5.0	2
	Very High	16	3.688	.9465	.2366	3.183	4.192	3.0	5.0	1
	Total	400	3.550	.8714	.0436	3.464	3.636	1.0	5.0	

Source: Primary data

The above table observes *the opportunity in my job for participating in setting of goals among the engineers* work cultures in this study area. The different work culture notified clearly ranks based on average basis. Such ranks ‘1’ is very high, ‘2’ is high, ‘3’ is low, ‘4’ is moderate and ‘5’ is very low. It is concluded *the opportunity in my job for participating in setting of goals among the engineers ‘very high’* work cultures in this study area.

FINDINGS

- Majority 49 percent of the respondents are 41 to 50 years of age
- 89.8 percent of the respondents are male and only 10.2 percent of the respondents are female.
- 95.8 percent of the respondents are married and 4.2 percent of the respondents are unmarried.
- Majority 64 percent of the respondents’ work experience is 21 to 30 years
- This study shows that majority of the respondents observed that moderate work culture in this study area. It is concluded that moderate work culture among engineers in BHEL because BHEL is a Public Sector Company could not take individual decision and it depends upon the Board, Government of India.

SUGGESTIONS

When the work culture isn’t as strong, the alignment to company values isn’t quite so clear. This means that more effort needs to be placed in controlling employees, monitoring their behaviour and keeping them working as efficiently as

possible. The advantages of a good company culture are obvious. It means that less monitoring is required by managers and team leaders, and that the work of the employees is of higher value to the company.

A company with a clear culture will be able to easily induct new employees into the company's set of beliefs and encourage ways of working that cohere to the company's goals and visions as a whole. Employees within a company with a good culture are also more engaged, motivated to succeed and display more organizational loyalty, which can take the form of employees being less likely to leave the company and being more likely to become an advocate of the organization.

An increase in group cohesiveness is one of the most powerful by-products of a good organizational culture. Employees know where they stand within their teams and they trust everyone to do a good job. They also feel valued and their contribution is important to the success of the business.

CONCLUSION

With a greater focus on collaboration and teamwork, opportunities for informal learning should be created. In any work environment, only 10% of what employees learn comes from the formal training content – the rest is picked up on the job and by interacting with colleagues. The more on the job training employees receive, the better they become at doing their jobs and the more successful the organization will be.

All these aspects combine to create a good team working environment and a community of engaged employees, where everyone can contribute for the good of the whole. Clearly a good organizational culture is something to aspire to. Not only does it breed a good working environment, but it improves engagement between employees, teams, departments and the organization as a whole.

REFERENCES

- Koustelious, A. (1996) "The influence of organizational culture on job satisfaction", *International Journal of Human Resource Management and Research*, 3(2), 60-70.
- Chatman, J. et.al., (1998) "People and Organisation culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person environment fit", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.34, pp. 487-516.
- Ali, N., and Akhtar, Z. (1999) "Job satisfaction as related to organizational climate among bank officers", *Paper presented in 4th international & 35th IAAP conference at Anand (Gujarat), May 27-29.*

- *Sempene et.al., (2002) "Job satisfaction in relation to organizational culture", SA Journal of industrial psychology, 28(2), 23-30.*
- *Shurbagi, A.M., Zahari, I.B. (2012) "The Relationship between Organisational Culture and Job Satisfaction in National Oil Corporation of Libya", International Journal of Humanities and Applied Sciences, 1(3), 88-93.*
- *Belias, D., Koustelios, A. (2013a) "Organisational Culture of Greek Bank Institutions: A Case Study", International Journal of Human Resource Management and Research, 3(2), 95-104.*
- *Belias, D., Koustelios, A. (2013b) "The influence of Gender and Educational Background of Greek Bank Employees on their Perceptions of Organisational Culture", International Journal of Human Resource Management and Research, 3(5), 1-10.*
- *Thusyanthini, N., (2013) "Impact of organisation culture on Job satisfaction of employees in Insurance Industry", European Journal of Business and Management, Vol.5. No.30, 2013.*
- *Prasad L.M, "Human Resource Management", Sultan Chand & Sons, New Delhi, II Edition, 2003, pp611-623.*
- *Kothari C.R, "Research Methodology", New Age of International (p) Ltd, New Delhi, Second Edition, 2001, pp403-422.*
- *Saravanavel p, "Research Methodology", Kitab Mahal Publishers, Allahabad, XVI Edition, 2015, pp339-356.*
- *Pillai R.S.N, Bagavathi, "Practical Statistics", S.Chand & Company Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi, II Edition, 2013, pp770-776.*
- *Gupta S.P, "Elementary Statistical Methods, Sultan Chand & Sons, XVIII Edition, 2014, pp14.2-14.11.*
- *Aswathappa K, "Organisational Behaviour", Himalaya Publishing House, Mumbai, Eleventh Edition, 2013, pp345-368.*