

# Identifying the Constructs of Organization Culture Being Influenced by English Language- An Empirical Study in the Banks of Bhilwara(Raj)

Nidhi Bhatnagar<sup>1</sup>, Premashish Roy<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, School of Applied Science, Sangam University, Bhilwara, India

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor & Dy. Dean

School of Management Studies, Sangam University, Bhilwara., India

**Abstract:** Twenty first century is an era of advancement in science and technology therefore in this era English Language (EL) has widespread recognition in trade and industry. The need of competence in EL is also been felt among various professionals. English plays a vital role in promoting the Organization Culture (OC). After globalization internal and external interaction of an organization is becoming one of the challenges that cannot be ignored. This study intends to explore the role of EL on OC with special emphasis on banking sector. Here a pilot study has been initiated in the private and public banks of a city called Bhilwara in Raj. In this study an attempt has been made to identify the constructs of OC of banks being influenced by EL (EL).

**Key Words:** English Language, Banking, Organization Culture.

## I INTRODUCTION

With the influx of globalization, the entire scenario of corporate world took a different turn. Now the trade and commerce are not constrained within a single region but it is extending across the globe. As a result, the need for a common language has emerged, through which everyone can communicate. Effect Communication plays a very pivotal role in the Success of the business. English, the most preferred language in today's corporate world crossed international borders and surpassed all language barriers. As English is spoken in almost all the countries therefore language is no more a barrier for people who intend to settle down in other countries. C. Gallois, & Callan, V. J. (1997).

The business professionals are trained for commercial expansion in tune with the mission and goals of the company. Globalization has broadened the parameters of the domestic companies to think beyond their nations. A. Al Dabbagh, (2005) ...noted that "The results regarding the effect of global English on individual's lives, culture and identity were particularly revealing." Al Dabbagh further emphasized that Language is said to be the soul of corporate.

### 1.1 English: A Commercial Language

EL dominates the business and plays imperative role in the different walks of business. In the trade world people call it the 'Commercial English'. Every job description for a new position on the manager's staff includes the following line: "Required - effective organization skills and mastery of EL in written and oral forms." Presently, the repute of an industry, a nation depends on the quality and quantity of information they possess, transmit and exchange. English is a means of communication in almost all organizations including the Banking Sector. Now a day this global language has prevailed to such an extent that it is being used as the official language in over 70 countries. Thus, the knowledge of English is mandatory requirement for good jobs. As Welch et al (2005) argued, language skills are individual skills. For instance, language skills can provide some individuals power to control communication.

EL plays a catalytic role to develop the personality of the employee and establishes professional growth of a company. Previous literature has pointed out that language skills and cross-cultural communication skills are considered essential for expatriates, contributing a better job performance Bhatti et al. (2013). In the same line Smita Menon (2016) stated that English is important because it may be the only language that truly links the whole world together.

### 1.2 Role of EL for Better Work Culture

Communication between employer and the employee needs to be effective for better work culture. Through language the management spread necessary information to all the employees so that they would be acquainted with rules, regulations and policies at the

workplace. Organizational variables such as strategies, intentions, and outcomes are what differentiate corporate communication from other types of communicative contexts, (DeWine (1993). The diversity in workplaces and constant changes in the business environment also contribute to the increasing literature around corporate communication (Hargie & Tourish (2000). EL boost confidence of the employees and creating a work culture. Employees should be more efficient in written communication as compared to verbal communication because email, messaging are important techniques of communication at the workplace. Corporate communication is a fundamental part of the organizational system. Therefore, EL plays a pivotal role in the activities of organization so the demand for English speakers are growing to create global milieu.

### 1.3 Reviews of Literature

Shields and Price (2002) conducted a study to survey the role of English in the Australian job market and found that occupational success is associated with speaking fluency. But she argued that not all participants were in agreement as to the importance of communication skills in English; contrary to this study which argued that all respondents agreed on that high importance of English. Asta Pundzienė, et.al (2007) explored that managers' communication competence required for successful change management within the enterprises. As Said, F.F.S. (2011) powerfully believed that losing a language is losing a culture and losing a culture is losing one's identity. M.S. Menon, & M. N. Patel (2012) titled Importance of EL in corporate world took India as an example where EL has become a criterion to prosper in all spheres and to be more visible in the global world. According to these researchers English has become a key language of national and international business. It serves as a uniting element in every sector and every sphere of life. Another study by M.M. Roshid and R. Chowdhury (2013) about EL proficiency and employment tried to reveal the impact of mastering EL by Bangladeshi immigrants upon their employment in the Australian job market. Ritu Soryan, et. al (2014) observed that people deal with others in EL especially in business world Scientific world and others. So, the point here is that it is very difficult to get a pretty good job or promotion without knowing effective communication. This paper is an insight on importance and impact of English in changing the organization culture.

we may find an urgent need for English for dealing with foreign customers, understanding new electronic administration requirements and dealing with English documents and endorsements and getting use of some foreign experience in developing culture of an organization. However, it is note that most of the literature about organization culture but there was limited literature about role of English in the organization culture. This paper intended to use empirical data in order to reflect the effect of language on organization culture. Ibrahim Alfarhan (2016) identified that English is a global language and its effect on cultural identity is inseparable. He examined how EL influences one's cultural identity.

## II RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The research primarily aims to establish the following two Objectives

1. Exploring the role of English Language on Organization Culture.
2. Identifying the constructs of Organization Culture being influenced by English Language.

## III. RESEARCH DESIGN

In this study a questionnaire was developed to get relevant information from the sample elements. In this questionnaire 27 questions had been framed.

- a) Particularism v/s Universalism: Universalists emphasis more on rules than on relationships whereas a Particularists does not go with the rules, situation varies from person to person no matter what the rules say. A particularistic treat everyone as unique.
- b) Collectivism v/s individualism: Collectivism involves the group culture emphasis on sharing, assistance, and group synchronization. People in individualistic cultures emphasize their achievements in job or private wealth and aiming up to reach a better job position.
- c) Power Distance: Power distance states the degree to which people accept hierarchical authority and how far they are willing to subordinate themselves. The inequality in the company is based on the physical and intellectual capacities which can grow over time into inequalities in power and wealth.
- d) Achievement and Ascription: In achievement-oriented cultures the status and respect derived from the knowledge of the person therefore related to prove competence and success. In ascription-oriented cultures the status ascribed in relation to age, social origin, education, profession and affiliation etc.
- e) Uncertainty avoidance: It expresses the extent to which employees of a company attempt to deal with the unease by curtailing uncertainty.

- f) Internal v/s external control: Internal control emphasizes on self, individual functioning, in contrast to that, an external control culture represents the team-work and prefer for joint achievements over individual attainments.
- g) Norms: The term 'culture' refers to attitudes and patterns of behavior in a given group. 'Norm' refers to attitudes, Norms are unwritten rules and regulations of an organization.
- h) Value: The next level according to Schein which constitute the organization culture is the values of the employees. The values of the individuals working in the organization play an important role in deciding the organization culture. The thought process and attitude of employees have deep impact on the culture of any particular organization.
- i) Attitude: An attitude is a psychological tendency or mental predisposition that is expressed by evaluating an object or entity with some degree of like or dislike, favor or disfavor. Attitudes are affective, reflecting emotions or feelings attached to categories or objects

Each question is linked with the EL and various constructs of OC. Basically when a respondent answer any of this question it would reflect his or her perception about EL and its influence on various constructs of OC. In this study a construct of OC in regard to banking industry has been selected through a normative study. Each construct had three questions.

A Pilot study was initiated in the banks of Bhilwara – A City in Rajasthan. Around 110 sets of questionnaires were given to the executives of various private and public banks. Finally, we received 55 feedbacks from the bank executives. The reliability and validity of the questionnaire had been verified with various statistical measures as mentioned in the later part of the research. After verifying the validity and reliability we tried to identify the constructs of OC being influenced by EL.

**3.1 Reliability Testing :** (Gay 1987) Reliability is the degree to which a test consistently measures whatever it measures. Errors of measurement that affect reliability are random errors and errors of measurement that affect validity are systematic or constant errors. The reliability testing of the instruments was done by three methods.

**3.1.1 Inter Item Correlation:** To check the consistency of the scale to be administered for the research work Briggs and Cheek (1986) have suggested that the mean of inter-item correlations for a scale provides information about whether that scale is unidimensional or not. More information about the dimensionality of a scale is provided by the frequency distribution function of inter-item correlations.



Table 1: Inter Item Correlation Matrix

		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21	Q22	Q23	Q24	Q25	Q26	Q27
Ques1	Pearson Correlation	1	.276*	.477**	.404*	.349*	.082	.619*	.291*	.524*	.188	.223	.291*	.106	.497*	.471*	.078	.175	.372*	.208	.537*	.188	-.139	.034	.324*	.357*	-.005	.511*
Ques2	Pearson Correlation	.276*	1	.254	.036	.498*	.433*	.206	.320*	.199	.014	-.017	.390*	.283*	.139	.211	.357*	.337*	.370*	.035	.201	.405*	.199	.257	-.010	.150	.230	.327*
Ques3	Pearson Correlation	.477*	.254	1	.219	.284*	.168	.270*	.256	.316*	-.102	-.096	.201	.089	.415*	.143	.148	.279*	.368*	-.013	.547*	.185	-.182	.208	.282*	.240	.161	.257
Ques4	Pearson Correlation	.404*	.036	.219	1	.139	.006	.319*	.365*	.075	.453*	.263	.226	.475*	.270*	.493*	.211	.076	.238	.095	.128	.163	.015	.140	.320*	.132	.255	.337*
Ques5	Pearson Correlation	.349*	.498*	.284*	.139	1	.118	.371*	.137	.252	.171	.205	.463*	.207	.265	.200	.213	.224	.389*	.243	.455*	.407*	.012	.279*	.228	.316*	.497*	.394*
Ques6	Pearson Correlation	.082	.433*	.168	.006	.118	1	.123	.360*	.265	.051	.093	.117	.158	-.011	.103	.217	.315*	.087	-.082	-.013	.402*	.035	.025	.001	-.070	.050	.234
Ques7	Pearson Correlation	.619*	.206	.270*	.319*	.371*	.123	1	.035	.307*	.180	.184	.122	.008	.320*	.321*	.178	.158	.371*	.143	.374*	.328*	-.076	.178	.268*	.170	.133	.195
Ques8	Pearson Correlation	.291*	.320*	.256	.365*	.137	.360*	.035	1	.244	.217	.335*	.463*	.201	.361*	.505*	.162	.386*	.230	.093	.234	.316*	.009	.187	.289*	.413*	.247	.392*
Ques9	Pearson Correlation	.524*	.199	.316*	.075	.252	.265	.307*	.244	1	.137	.044	.159	-.110	.140	.258	.056	.194	.208	.204	.441*	.186	-.160	-.208	.230	.160	-.085	.298*
Ques10	Pearson Correlation	.188	.014	-.102	.453*	.171	.051	.180	.217	.137	1	.408*	.120	.343*	-.034	.074	.297*	.085	.176	.020	.225	.216	.015	.045	.224	.094	.211	.254
Ques11	Pearson Correlation	.223	-.017	-.096	.263	.205	.093	.184	.335*	.044	.408*	1	.034	.200	.333*	.221	-.017	.103	.239	.292*	.221	.263	-.115	.091	.383*	.209	.334*	.389*
Ques12	Pearson Correlation	.291*	.390*	.201	.226	.463*	.117	.122	.463*	.159	.120	.034	1	.228	.269*	.417*	.144	.492*	.261	.015	.347*	.255	.196	.262	.205	.222	.159	.391*
Ques13	Pearson Correlation	.106	.283*	.089	.475*	.207	.158	.008	.201	-.110	.343*	.200	.228	1	.043	.124	.402*	.296*	.179	.114	.193	.046	.320*	.319*	.165	.204	.274*	.261
Ques14	Pearson Correlation	.497*	.139	.415*	.270*	.265	-.011	.320*	.361*	.140	-.034	.333*	.269*	.043	1	.488*	-.032	.308*	.459*	.288*	.367*	.152	-.166	.154	.464*	.357*	.023	.312*
Ques15	Pearson Correlation	.471*	.211	.143	.493*	.200	.103	.321*	.505*	.258	.074	.221	.417*	.124	.488*	1	.151	.233	.474*	.046	.229	.167	.149	.115	.203	.268*	-.009	.390*
Ques16	Pearson Correlation	.078	.357*	.148	.211	.213	.217	.178	.162	.056	.297*	-.017	.144	.402*	-.032	.151	1	.375*	.288*	-.009	.252	.344*	.281*	.211	-.016	.262	.179	.154
Ques17	Pearson Correlation	.175	.337*	.279*	.076	.224	.315*	.158	.386*	.194	.085	.103	.492*	.296*	.308*	.233	.375*	1	.300*	.007	.442*	.247	.179	.307*	.209	.347*	.262	.403*
Ques18	Pearson Correlation	.372*	.370*	.368*	.238	.389*	.087	.371*	.230	.208	.176	.239	.261	.179	.459*	.474*	.288*	.300*	1	-.092	.427*	.499*	.140	.229	.382*	.212	.133	.399*
Ques19	Pearson Correlation	.208	.035	-.013	.095	.243	-.082	.143	.093	.204	.020	.292*	.015	.114	.288*	.046	-.009	.007	-.092	1	.216	.019	-.105	.142	.204	.307*	.167	.066
Ques20	Pearson Correlation	.537*	.201	.547*	.128	.455*	-.013	.374*	.234	.441*	.225	.221	.347*	.193	.367*	.229	.252	.442*	.427*	.216	1	.176	-.101	.383*	.527*	.408*	.168	.335*
Ques21	Pearson Correlation	.188	.405*	.185	.163	.407*	.402*	.328*	.316*	.186	.216	.263	.255	.046	.152	.167	.344*	.247	.499*	.019	.176	1	-.004	.129	.173	.110	.184	.372*
Ques22	Pearson Correlation	-.139	.199	-.182	.015	.012	.035	-.076	.009	-.160	.015	-.115	.196	.320*	-.166	.149	.281*	.179	.140	-.105	-.101	-.004	1	.377*	-.083	.084	.185	-.054
Ques23	Pearson Correlation	.034	.257	.208	.140	.279*	.025	.178	.187	-.208	.045	.091	.262	.319*	.154	.115	.211	.307*	.229	.142	.383*	.129	.377*	1	.310*	.216	.430*	.083
Ques24	Pearson Correlation	.324*	-.010	.282*	.320*	.228	.001	.268*	.289*	.230	.224	.383*	.205	.165	.464*	.203	-.016	.209	.382*	.204	.527*	.173	-.083	.310*	1	.128	.080	.371*
Ques25	Pearson Correlation	.357*	.150	.240	.132	.316*	-.070	.170	.413*	.160	.094	.209	.222	.204	.357*	.268*	.262	.347*	.212	.307	.408*	.110	.084	.216	.128	1	.301*	.223
Ques26	Pearson Correlation	-.005	.230	.161	.255	.497*	.050	.133	.247	-.085	.211	.334*	.159	.274*	.023	-.009	.179	.262	.133	.167	.168	.184	.185	.430*	.080	.301*	1	.208
Ques27	Pearson Correlation	.511*	.327*	.257	.337*	.394*	.234	.195	.392*	.298*	.254	.389*	.391*	.261	.312*	.390*	.154	.403*	.399*	.066	.335*	.372*	-.054	.083	.371*	.223	.208	1

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**3.1.2 Reliability Statistics:** The reliability test of the questionnaire was done by inter - item correlation for each of the 27 items of organization culture. Here correlation coefficient among each of the items was calculated and Cronbach Alpha coefficient was determined. The entire data of 55 respondent's feedback for 27 questions were administered using SPSS (version 20) Thus, the researcher can conclude that the scale can be administered for further research.

**Table:2 Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.882	27

The Cronbach Alpha coefficient is 0.882 for 27 items is statistically very significant and it also suggests that there is adequate inter item agreement among individual scores for each dimensions of OC.

**3.1.3 The Split-Half Method** – To measures the internal reliability of questionnaires all 27 questions were split into the odd-even strategy. It measures the extent to which all parts of the test contribute equally to what is being measured.

**Table:3 Split Half Test Matrix of Dimensions**

Reliability Statistics			
Cronbach's Alpha	Part 1	Value	.814
		N of Items	5 <sup>a</sup>
	Part 2	Value	.762
		N of Items	4 <sup>b</sup>
	Total N of Items		9
Correlation Between Forms			.720
Spearman-Brown Coefficient	Equal Length		.837
	Unequal Length		<b>.838</b>
Guttman Split-Half Coefficient			.822
a. The items are: Particularism v/s Universalism, Individualism v/s Collectivism, Power Distance, Achievements v/s Ascription, Uncertainty Avoidance.			
b. The items are: Uncertainty Avoidance, Internal v/s External control, Norms, Value, Attitude.			

The Spearman Brown coefficient of Dimensions is 0.838. This value of reliability coefficient indicates that the nine dimensions used in the questionnaire of this study is capable of eliciting quite consistent reliable responses. Therefore, all the dimensions in the questionnaires are highly correlated and homogeneous.

**Table 4: Split Half Test matrix of Items**

Reliability Statistics			
Cronbach's Alpha	Part 1	Value	.791
		N of Items	14 <sup>a</sup>
	Part 2	Value	.782
		N of Items	13 <sup>b</sup>
	Total N of Items		27
Correlation Between Forms			.754
Spearman-Brown Coefficient	Equal Length		.860
	Unequal Length		.860
Guttman Split-Half Coefficient			.858
a. The items are: Item-1, Item- 2, Item- 3, Item- 4, Item- 5, Item- 6, Item- 7, Item- 8, Item- 9, Item -10, Item -11, Item- 12, Item -13, Item -14.			
b. The items are: Item-14, Item-15, Item-16, Item- 17, Item- 18, Item- 19, Item- 20, Item- 21, Item- 22, Item- 23, Item- 24, Item- 25, Item- 26, Item- 27.			

The spearman Brown coefficient of items is 0.858. This value of reliability coefficient indicate that the 27 questions used in this study are capable of eliciting quit consistent reliable responses. Therefore, all the items are highly corelated.



**3.1.4 Three Alternative Forms** - Used to assess the consistency of the results of tree groups constructed in the same way from the same content domain. To determine whether scores will generalize across different sets of items or tasks. The three groups of the test are correlated to yield a coefficient of equivalence

**Table 5: Alternative forms of reliability test**

Dimensions	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Particularism v/s Universalism	2.55	3.09	2.71
Collectivism v/s individualism	3.04	2.95	2.82
Power Distance	2.31	2.84	2.60
Achievement v/s Ascription	2.67	2.55	2.78
Uncertainty Avoidance	3.27	2.35	2.56
Internal v/s External control	2.93	3.05	2.87
Norms	2.89	2.62	3.15
Value	3.15	3.13	2.51
Attitude	2.91	3.11	2.93

Group 1 is the average of 1<sup>st</sup> item of all dimensions

Group 2 is the average of 2<sup>nd</sup> item of all dimensions

Group 3 is the average of 3<sup>rd</sup> item of all dimensions

In this method, 27 items/ statements were divided into three groups in such a way that each group contained only one of the three statements used to measure a given dimension. The sequence of statements in the questionnaire is such that the first nine statements cover all the nine dimensions of organization culture as to the middle and the last nine statements. Using that very sequence the items were clubbed together into three groups. The three group of statements mentioned above were obviously well matched in terms of item content. Now the data of all these three groups were administered using SPSS (Version 20) and coefficient alpha was calculated.

**Table 6: Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.878	27

Reliability Statistics: The Coefficient alpha is .878 and the number of items is 3. Once again it is observed that the coefficient alpha is statistically significant and the questionnaire as a whole has a very high reliability.

**3.2 Validity Testing:** The concept of validity was formulated by Kelly (1927, p. 14) who stated that that a test is valid if it measures what it claims to measure. Validity can be measured as logical and empirical. In this study two methods were used to test validity of the instrument in which one is logical and another is empirical.

**3.2.1 Face validity:** Face validity indicates effectiveness and appearance of the questionnaire. A well-constructed statement is more likely to elicit positive responses. Validity is an important tool to validate questionnaire. To check the validity of the items Normative study was carried out on 27 items in such a way that each group contain one of three statements used to measure nine dimensions.

**Table -6: Item validity Matrix: Discriminatory power and validity index of each item**

Item no.	High	Low	Discriminatory Power	Validity Index
1	3.34	1.15	2.19	.670**
2	3.43	1.73	1.7	.520**
3	3.48	1.55	1.93	.496**
4	3.56	1.50	2.06	.514**
5	3.37	1.71	1.66	.617**
6	3.30	1.53	1.77	.311**
7	3.18	1.47	1.71	.543**
8	3.25	1.73	1.52	.588**
9	3.40	1.48	1.92	.367**
10	3.29	1.60	1.69	.391**
11	3.11	1.55	1.56	.450**
12	3.32	1.67	1.65	.540**
13	3.50	1.71	1.79	.437**
14	3.20	1.63	1.57	.562**

15	3.19	1.37	1.82	.547**
16	3.44	1.69	1.75	.421**
17	3.38	1.60	1.78	.564**
18	3.50	1.68	1.82	.608**
19	3.42	1.71	1.71	.286**
20	3.37	1.30	2.07	.677**
21	3.49	1.60	1.80	.509**
22	3.50	2.00	1.5	.447**
23	3.53	1.67	1.86	.423**
24	3.46	1.52	1.94	.544**
25	3.46	1.56	1.90	.526**
26	3.47	1.78	1.59	.397**
27	3.53	1.59	1.94	.631**

Here each item in the questionnaire was analyzed in terms of discriminatory power. The respondents are divided into two groups one is high scoring and other is low scoring. The mean score of high score and the mean score of low score of each item was calculated. In this pilot study the total respondents are 55. The difference between the mean of high score and the mean of low score of each item is calculated. This difference is "Discriminatory Power" and the validity index has also been calculated. Validity index of an item is co-relation coefficient between the score of that item and the total score of all 27 items. As mentioned, response to each of the 27 items was calculated on five-point scale ranging from 0 to 4. If 1 is taken to represent a low score and 4 is considered as high score the midpoint between low and high score is 2 refer table no.2. It would be noticed that each mean score of high score is higher than 2 and each mean score of lower score is lower than 2. The difference -of- mean test has also been performed to ascertain whether the two groups differ significantly. The result shows that all differences are statistically significant ( $P < 0.001$ ). Hence it may be concluded that each of the 27 items in the questionnaire has adequate discriminatory power and that is why it is valid. The correlation coefficient between each item score and the total score of all 27 items are calculate which is used as an index of validity for each item. The entire validity index is significant please refer table no. 6

**Table: 7-Dimension Validity Matrix: Discriminant Validity of Nine Dimensions**

Dimensions	High	Low	Discriminatory power	Validity index
Particularism v/s Universalism	3.4	2.2	1.2	.740**
Collectivism v/s individualism	3.4	2.3	1.1	.759**
Power Distance	3.2	2.1	1.1	.671**
Achievement v/s Ascription	3.2	2.2	1.0	.683**
Uncertainty Avoidance	3.2	2.3	0.9	.743**
Internal v/s External control	3.4	2.3	1.1	.707**
Norms	3.3	2.1	1.2	.759**
Value	3.4	2.3	1.1	.556**
Attitude	3.4	2.3	1.1	.743**

Besides verifying the validity of individual item, it may also be useful to examine the discriminant validity of each of the nine dimensions refer table no 7 this elaborates mean scores and related details of the high and low scoring groups in respect of nine dimensions. All differences are statistically significant and valid index are significantly valid. Therefore, we can conclude that both items and dimensions are valid.

**Table: 8 Mean Score Percentage Matrix**

S.No	Dimensions	Mean Score	Mean Score Percentage	Ranking
1	Particularism v/s Universalism	8.3	69.16	4
2	Collectivism v/s individualism	8.7	72.5	2
3	Power Distance	7.7	64.16	7
4	Achievement v/s Ascription	8.0	66.66	6
5	Uncertainty Avoidance	8.2	68.33	5
6	Internal v/s External control	8.9	74.16	1
7	Norms	8.6	71.66	3
8	Value	8.7	72.5	2
9	Attitude	8.9	74.16	1

In this method average of three items taken which are actually the constructs of organization culture. The mean score of each is calculated and then all the mean scores of the items of each dimensions were added. Finally, the summation of the items was divided by 12. The high score of each item is 4 therefore in a dimension there three items and hence the maximum score would be  $3 \times 4 = 12$ . After this mean percentage of each dimension was calculated and further the ranking of all the mean score percentage had been calculated.

Through Mean score percentage, it has been observed that Internal v/s External control, Attitude, collectivism v/s individualism, Value, Norms, Particularism v/s Universalism all these six dimensions are having high score and being influenced by great extent by EL. It is also to be noted that some dimensions have same ranking. However, Power Distance, uncertainty avoidance, Achievement v/s Ascription are having least influence of EL. This analysis explored the role of EL on OC. Thus, these parameters reflect that the first objective of this paper has been achieved.

#### IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS:

We had established the relationship between organization culture and EL, and observed that Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Achievement v/s Ascription are not being influenced by EL adequately, here are some key findings

a) Power Distance: Power demonstrates the space between higher authority and subordinates. This is an abstract attribute and non-verbal concept. Interestingly the low mean score percentage indicates that in proximity EL does not work therefore power distance is not being influenced by EL.

b) Achievement v/s Ascription: A person acquires the higher designation with efforts, skills and caliber. English has nothing to do with Achievement v/s Ascription. However, success of a person depends on the qualities like intelligence and patience. Hence Achievement v/s Ascription is having least influence of EL.

c) Uncertainty Avoidance: This construct of OC deals with the feeling of tolerance of uncertainty. This is basically related with the behavior of the person so EL do not have any concern with this construct. Therefore, it has low mean score.

These three dimensions of OC doesn't have any relevance with the EL. It has been justified with the least mean score percentage.

a) Internal v/s External control: Self-confidence enhances when an individual or group use effective EL to convey the message.

b) Particularism v/s Universalism: Mode of transferring the information in the banks is mailers, even the vision and mission statement taglines, notices and correspondence from RBI and other organizations also written in EL. Therefore, Particularism v/s Universalism is having high score and greatly influenced by EL.

c) Collectivism v/s individualism: The annual appraisal and feedback of an employee has been taken in the fixed formats which is basically in EL. EL is also used in the bank meetings in the view of global competencies. Hence Collectivism v/s Individualism greatly influenced by EL.

d) Norms: Corporate sectors are inspired by foreign culture by adopting dress code, that showcases their professionalism. Most of the terminologies, software's and correspondence between national and international or government organization takes place in EL. Greetings to the fellow in EL develops a good culture in banks. Thus, this construct is having high Mean score and influenced by EL. Societal culture of English People

e) Value: Knowledge of EL provides better job opportunities and helps in day to day working. A Few English expressions like "well done", "Keep it up", "Good Job" can boost the morale of employees and directly, indirectly affect the culture and increases the productivity of organization. Therefore, EL has a significant influence on this construct of organization culture.

f) Attitude: EL helps to improve the brand image of an organization as well as by using English one can improve his attitude towards work culture. Right attitude influences the effectiveness of organization. Hence attitude is greatly influenced by EL.

With these findings it has been observed that Particularism v/s Universalism, Internal v/s External Control, Collectivism v/s Individualism, Value, Norms, Attitude, all these six dimensions are having high score and being influenced by great extent by English

**V. CONCLUSION:** We have done a pilot study in the banking sectors of Bhilwara. This study cannot be generalized and the dimensions which has been analyzed can also not be generalized, however it gives a reflection that organization culture is surely being influenced by EL. A progressive bank may do a mapping of their organization culture and check how it is being influenced by EL and any other Vernaculars



**REFERENCES**

- [1] Al Dabbagh, A. 2005. Globalism and Universal Language. *English Today* 21 (2), pp.28.
- [2] Alfarhan, Ibrahim. Global Language and the Effects on Culture and Identity Graduate Student, School of Education. *American Research Journal of English and Literature (ARJEL)*.
- [3] Bhatti, M. A., Battour, M. M. & Ismail, A. R. 2013. Expatriates adjustment and job performance: An examination of individual and organizational factors. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management* 62(7), 694–717.
- [4] Briggs, S. R. and Cheek, J. M. 1986. The role of factor analysis in the development and evaluation of personality scales. *Journal of Personality*, 54, 106-148.
- [5] DeWine, S., & Daniels, T. 1993. Beyond the snapshot: Setting a research agenda in organizational communication. *Communication Yearbook*, 16, 331-346.
- [6] Gallois, C. & Callan, V. J. 1997. *Communication and Culture: A Guide for Practice*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- [7] Gay, L., 1987. *Educational research: competencies for analysis and application*. Merrill Pub. Co., Columbus.
- Cronbach, L., 1990. *Essentials of psychological testing*. Harper & Row, New York.
- [8] Hargie, O., & Tourish, D. (Eds.). 2009. *Auditing organizational communication: A handbook of research, theory and practice*. Routledge.
- [9] Menon, M.S., & Patel, M.N. 2012. Importance of EL in Corporate World. *International Journal*, 1(1).
- [10] Mugenda, A.B. 2008. *Social Science Research: Theory and Principles*. Nairobi: Applied Research and Training Services.
- [11] Pundzienė, A., Alonderienė, R., & Solveiga Buožiūtė, S. B. 2007. Managers' change communication competence links with the success of the organizational change. *Engineering Economics*, 54(4).
- [12] Roshid, M.M., & Chowdhury, R. 2013. EL Proficiency and Employment: A Case Study of Bangladeshi Graduates in Australian Employment Market. *Online Submission*, 3(1), 68-81.
- [13] Said, F.F.S. 2011. "Ahyaanan I text in English ashaan it's ashal": language in crises and linguistic development? The case of how Gulf Arabs perceive the future of their language, culture and identity. In Al-Issa, A., and Dahan, L.S. (eds), pp.179-212
- [14] Shields, M. A., & Price, S. W. 2002. The EL fluency and occupational success of ethnic minority immigrant men living in English metropolitan areas. *Journal of population Economics*, 15(1), 137-160.
- [15] Soryan, Ritu, Chavi Chabra, Anupam Kumar. 2014. Role and Significance of Communication in Corporate world. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Information Security*. 1 (3).
- [16] Welch, D., Welch, L., Piekkari, R. 2005. Speaking in tongues: The importance of language in international management processes. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 35(1): 10-27