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Abstract:
Change must be considered as the key factor to success in organization to sustain in the market, that is why total quality management is regarded as a vital tool to organizations continuous improvement, one of the quality management principles is also refers to change and emphasizes a respectable importance. Needing a change to adapt organizations to total quality management is a complex matter and can only be achieved through long-term approach. It requires employee motivation, ability, skills, management attitude, workmanship values, and cultural change for organizational transformation. Today, in competitive developments in marketing, economic, technologic and customer. In this regard it can be said that cultural change has a relative importance to create a successful TQM strategy where an organizational culture is the fundamental factor considering the implementation of TQM issues, this research also find the relationship between the cultural change and human resource quality of Amar raja Batteries limited.
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Introduction
Geert Hofstede has studied the characteristics of national and organizational cultures since the 1980’s. As part of their research, Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, and Sanders (1990) provide what believe that “characteristics of organizational/corporate culture construct: (1) holistic, (2) historically determined, (3) related to anthropological concepts, (4) socially constructed, (5) soft, and (6) difficult to change” can be summarized as organizational cultural dimensions: innovation and risk taking; attention to detail; task orientation; people orientation; team orientation; aggressiveness; and stability. (Chatman & Jeng, 1994; O’Reilly et al., 1991; Robbins & Judge, 2011), thought of “culture” as fuzzy world of purposeful thought and feeling, action and meaning that shapes what life is like within an organization but that is Very difficult to capture and define. Employees are holistic, Qualitative elements of complex and collective lives. Despite the difficulty, Edgar Schein (1992) has proposed the following clarification about culture. First, builds a holistic context within which culture is to be understood: Culture somehow implies that rituals, climate, values, and behaviors bind together into a coherent whole. This patterning of integration is the essence of “culture.” Next “formal definition” of culture: A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to these problems. Culture is built up through its continuing enhancement of an organization’s ability to deal with its problems in a way that fixes its identity. While culture is a systemic phenomenon, its primary architects are those at the very top (Schein, 1992). It has been estimated that less than 20% of HR strategic plans in the United States are formulated and integrated into the total business strategy of organizations. Total Quality Human Resources Management (TQHRM) is “An approach to Human Resources Management that involves many of the concepts of quality management”. The primary goal of TQHRM is employee empowerment. The TQHRM approach focuses on providing employee empowerment through alignment of authority, capability, and commitment. HRQ includes QWL, Cross cultural aspects and Employee satisfaction aspects.
Literature Review:

Bate (1994) accounts for these difficulties by referring to the deeply embedded nature of culture which "forms the very foundation stone of our social and organizational lives by providing…a relatively self-contained 'order' or rationale. Bate define organizational culture as the "set of, often unconsciously held, beliefs, ideas knowledge and values which shape the way things happen and makes some courses of action unthinkable". Another key feature of culture given here is that it is shared, it refers to the ideas, meanings and values people hold in common and to which they subscribe collectively. In this respect the layman's terms for organizational culture are as valid as those of the behavioral scientist. Offering a different point of view, Edgar Schein incorporates layers in his definition of organizational culture. Schein (1990) believes that culture is born of an organization’s survival instinct in which it solves problems resulting from both external and internal issues. Second, Schein finds that “Any definable group with a shared history can have a culture and that

5within an organization there can therefore be many subcultures” Third, Schein states that culture is like an organization’s personality and character, similar to that of an individual who learns how to behave, has certain beliefs and values, and allows one to adapt to one’s environment. To overcome employees’ nervousness, management and change agents have focused extensively on employee readiness predictor variables (Cinite et al., 2009). In the literature, readiness is defined as an employee’s beliefs, thoughts, and behaviors to accept the needs and capability of an organization. Readiness is known as a cognitive precursor to behaviors of either resistance or support (Armenakis et al., 1993). The literature reveals that employee readiness factors have a significant impact in preparing them mentally and physically for immediate action (Madsen, 2003).

In the literature many predictor variables have been examined by many researchers to determine employee attitudes and behaviors in the domain of change management. Shah and Shah (2010) have studied employees’ readiness for change. They stated, Miller et al. (2006) focused on employees’ readiness for change by examining three workplace factors –management/leader relationships, job knowledge and skills, and job demands –and found a significant influence on employees’ readiness for change. Rafferty and Simons (2006) focused on the factors that create readiness for two types of change: corporate transformation and fine-tuning found a Partial relation between participation and openness to change via trust in supervisors. Readiness for change is influenced by employees’ beliefs of self-efficacy, appropriateness, Management support and personal valence

According to Lockley (2012) offering training and development programs that effectively contributes to personal and professional growth of individuals is another effective employee motivation strategy. At the same time, Lockley (2012) warns that in order for motivational aspects of training and development initiatives to be increased, ideally they need to be devised and implemented by a third party with relevant competency and experience.

Alternative working patterns such as job-rotating, job-sharing, and flexible working have been branded as effective motivational tools by Llopis (2012). Moreover, Llopis (2012) argues that motivational aspects of alternative working patterns along with its other benefits are being appreciated by increasing numbers of organizations, however, at the same time; many organizations are left behind from benefiting from such opportunities.

Lockley (2012), on the other hand, addresses the issues focusing on cross-cultural differences between employees in particular. Namely, culture can be explained as knowledge, pattern of behavior, values, norms and traditions shared by members of a specific group (Kreitner and Cassidy, 2012), and accordingly, cross-cultural differences is perceived to be a major obstruction in the way of successful employee motivation.

One of the most influential studies of engagement was carried out by Kahn (1990). Conceptually, Kahn began with the work of Goffman (1961) who proposed that, “people’s attachment and detachment to their role varies” (Kahn 1990:694). However, Kahn argued that Goffman work focused on fleeting face-to-face encounters, while a different concept was needed to fit organizational life, which is “ongoing, emotionally charged, and psychologically complex” (Diamond and Allcorn
1985). In the only study to empirically test Kahn’s (1990) model, May et al (2004) found that meaningfulness, safety, and availability were significantly related to engagement. They also found job enrichment and role fit to be positive predictors of meaningfulness; rewarding co-worker and supportive supervisor relations were positive predictors of safety, while adherence to co-worker norms and self-consciousness were negative predictors. Resources were a positive predictor of psychological availability, while participation in outside activities was a negative predictor. Overall, meaningfulness was found to have the strongest relation to different employee outcomes in terms of engagement. Bhasi.M (2008) has stated the below equation in his study of Managing Human Resources Quality as

Human Resources Quality = Quality of Work Life + Employee Satisfaction + Cultural Change

The above literature emphasizes there is a need to find relationship between CC and HRQ in order to increase the productivity of the organization. Thus the present study focus on objective of finding relationship between CC and HRQ.

Methodology:

Present study is carried out using descriptive research methodology; it is considering the sample of 300 employees of Amar Raja Batteries by using sample random technique. The sample survey method was used by the administering the structured questionnaire method the questionnaire consists of 279 questions and 3 parts. Part A consists of demographic characteristics like employee name, address, gender, age, educational qualifications, designation, kind of job, years of experience. Part B consist of questionnaire regarding Cultural Change Index such as Workmanship Value (WV), management Attitude (MA), Employee Motivation (EM), Ability and Skill Attainment (ASA), Cohesive Work Force (CWF), on 5 point likert scale Part C consists of Human Resources Quality related to Cultural Change index (CC), Quality of Work Life Index (QWL), Employee Satisfaction Index (ES). The following hypothesis was tested to meet the stated objective

Table I.1 Prediction Scores of QWL, ES and CC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>QWL</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>HRQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of Questions in 5 point scale</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Score</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>1395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score obtained</td>
<td>291.69</td>
<td>334.62</td>
<td>440.30</td>
<td>1066.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following hypothesis was tested to meet the stated objective
Organization Culture influences HRQ in positive direction

Regression equation to find the relationship between CC and HRQ

\[ Y_i = b_1 + b_2 x_{i1} + \ldots + b_p x_{ip} + e_i \]

\[ Y_i = \text{Value of the } i^{th} \text{ Case of CC Scale variable} \]

\[ P = \text{No of Predictors} \]

\[ b_j = \text{The Value of } j^{th} \text{ Coefficient } j=0,\ldots,p \]

\[ x_{ij} = \text{Value of } i^{th} \text{ Case of } j^{th} \text{ Predictor} \]

\[ e_i = \text{error in the observed value for the } i^{th} \text{ Case} \]

Assumption: The error term has a normal distribution with a mean of “0”. The variance of term is constant across the cases and independent of variables in the model.

Table I.2 Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>334.62</td>
<td>26.837</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRQ</td>
<td>1066.37</td>
<td>64.134</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I.2 Model Summary for CC and HRQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>12.814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), HRQ, And Dependent Variable: CC

Model summary reports the strength of the relationship between HRQ and CC. The multiple co-efficient (R) correlation is the linear co-relation between the observed and model predicted values of the CC; its large value indicates strong relationship. The table 1.2 shows the value of R=.837. The co-efficient of the determination is the (R square) square value of multiple correlations co-efficient. It shows that about77.3%. Of the variation in CC is explained by the model. The above analysis produce a linear regression model for polishing CC, based on HRQ. Diagnostic plots of standardized residuals by the model predicted values are requested. As the further measure of the model fit the standard error estimates in the model summary table. The I.3 table is comparing the standard error of the CC reported in the descriptive statistics table. The standard error of the CC is 12.814; the standard deviation of CC is 26.837. With the linear regression model the error of estimate is considerably less than standard deviation of CC explaining that the regression model obtained from data is good fit.

Table I.3 ANOVA for CC and HRQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>166409.798</td>
<td>1013.413</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>164.207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), HRQ, And Dependent Variable: CC

The table I.3 tests the acceptability of a model from statistical perspective. The regression row displays information about the variation i.e. accounted by our model. The significant value of F statistics is less than 0.05. Which means that the variation explains by the model is not due to chance.

Table I.4 Coefficients for CC and HRQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>44.201</td>
<td>11.837</td>
<td>3.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRQ</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: CC

The table I.4 shows the co-efficient of the regression line. It states that the expected polishing CC =0.368*HRQ+44.201
Figure I.1 Histogram for CC and HRQ

A Histogram/p-p plots of the residual help us to check the assumption of the normality of the error term. The shape of the Histogram approximately follows the normal distribution. The Histogram that obtained is acceptably close to the normal distribution curve.

Figure I.2 Normal P-P Plot of regression Stand for CC and HRQ

The p-p plot residual should follow the 45° line the Histogram and the p-p plot indicates the normality assumption is not violated.
The plot of residuals by the predicted values shows that there exists variance of the errors in only certain cases. This shows good scatter graph of CC.

**Findings:**

According to the perception of 300 employees of Amarraja Batteries Limited, there is a strong relationship between HRQ & CC. Employees take pains to find out their strengths and weaknesses. Employees are not encouraged to take initiative and work on their own (Mean = 4.28). Norms and values of the organization are not known to all the employees (Mean = 3.81). Development of subordinates is seldom seen as an important part of their job by the officers (Mean = 3.98). Officers in this organization do not believe that employee behavior can be changed (Mean = 4.07), and people can be developed at any stage of their life. Delegation of authority to encourage juniors in handling higher responsibility is rare in this organization (Mean = 3.81). Performance appraisals are rarely objective in nature. Employee’s suggestions for change in work process are never considered (Mean = 3.88). The emphasis is not placed upon the quality performance (Mean = 3.81). Proper reporting, comparing and correcting procedures are seldom followed. Creativity is not encouraged within the group. Group members do not feel confident in making decisions (Mean = 3.81).

**Conclusions:**

The organization has to treat their employees as the resources, not as commodity. Human Resources Quality can be improved by proper maintenance. Employees should be encouraged to work with dedication/enthusiasm, and each and every subordinate should work according to their roles and responsibilities. It is suggested that the organization has to conduct training programs like in basket, role plays and business games to the employees, supervisors has to delegate authorities to the employees to make them accountable to their roles and responsibilities, even MBO approach should be followed and employee suggestion has to be considered on regular basis, to know the strengths and weaknesses of the employees organization has to follow 360° appraisal system, and the decision making process should be very transparent, to improve the employees confidence and productivity they should be appraised with awards and rewards, and employees should be invited to give their valuable creative and innovative thoughts.
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