EXPLORING ROLE OF RELATIONSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONAL SETUP : A RESEARCH STUDY AT PRIVATE SECTOR ORGANIZATION OF INDIA

APS Bhadauria

Ph.D, Associate Professor, Dept. of Business Administration, PSIT CHE, Kanpur
E-mail: apsb71@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Human beings interact in the organization with superiors, peers and subordinates to achieve organizational goal using various resources and technologies. To be a long distance runner, every organization requires extraordinary efforts from its people. It's the people factor that separates the mediocre organizations from the outstanding ones. When people work to the best of their abilities and work with zeal, enthusiasm and commitment, organizations grow to gigantic proportion. In this research we shall explore the role of relationship at workplace with respect to sense of belongingness in employees towards organization, commitment towards organizational goal and organizational effectiveness. Physical compensation (cash or kind) and position of an employee may vary in the organization based on his/her competence. However, need of relationship remains the same for all employees irrespective of his/her post and level of competence.

Keywords: Relationship at Workplace, Mutual Trust, Mutual Respect, Sense of Belongingness, Commitment towards Organizational Goal and Organizational Effectiveness.

INTRODUCTION

Human beings, the employees of an organization, are the heart and soul of the organization. Effective human beings (employees) along with other resources make the organization grow. An organization cannot run without human beings. Human factor is the most important factor in determining organization's objective whether it be objective setting or objective achieving. Rao (2010) says that to be a long distance runner, every organization requires extraordinary efforts from its people. It's the people factor that separates the mediocre organizations from the outstanding ones. When people work to the best of their abilities and work with zeal, enthusiasm and commitment, organizations grow to gigantic proportion. When people fail to live up to expectations, organizations fall behind in the competitive race and get pushed to the wall eventually. In fact every organization has more or less the same kind of resources

to work with – materials, equipments, land, building, finance etc. Rao (2010) considered people factor the only differentiating factor between competing organizations. He says that organizations can reach the top of the ladder if they can utilize its human resources to best advantage, He, quoting Thomas J. Watson's (founder of IBM) comment says that one can get capital and erect buildings, but it takes people to build a business In fact human resource is the backbone of any organization.

In order to achieve organizational results quickly, efficiently and effectively, organizations need to pay attention to its employee's aspirations i.e. to live in relation and also have adequate physical facilities. Human by his natural instinct wants to live in relationship. He feels happy when he is in good relation with others and unhappy when in contradiction. The term relationship here means, "a feeling of connection between one human being and the other human being wherein one human being recognizes the other human being similar to himself and behaves with him with the feelings which he/she expect for himself from others." When both interacting parties behaves with the expected feelings (trust, respect, etc.) the relationship become mutually fulfilling. If an organization understands and build relationship with its employees and help them to have healthy relations amongst themselves and remunerate them adequately, it can help it to become more effective. Harold Koontz says, "Management is the art of getting things done through and with people in formally organized groups". Human beings interact in the organization with superiors, peers and subordinates to achieve organizational goal using various resources and technologies. Organizational functioning has been influenced by the interpersonal interactions with in organization, directly or indirectly (Gabarro, 1976; Pestonjee, 1992; Rao, 1987). Interpersonal relationships are found to be most important factor for managerial effectiveness (Rao and Selvan, 1992).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Importance of Relationship in organizational context was studied during various researches whether they are on interpersonal relation, motivation or leadership style. Hawthorne Experiments (1924-1932) by Elton Mayo, Whitehead and Roethlisberger is a torch bear as far as the Human Relation movement is concerned. During the Relay Assembly Test Room Experiments the girls in the experiment were consulted before introducing a change. They were given opportunity to express their viewpoints and concerns to the superior. In some case they were allowed to take decision on matter concerning them. It indicated that they were treated as part of the organization and trusted. The girls developed a feeling of stability and sense of belongingness. Since there was more freedom of work, they developed a sense of responsibility and self discipline. The relationship between supervisor and workers became close and friendly. There was decrease in absenteeism, less supervision was required and increase morale. Prasad says, "a superior is more acceptable as a leader if his style is in

accordance with human relations approach, that is, the superior should identify himself with the workers (Prasad L.M. 2010).

Chester Barnard says, 'an organization is essentially a cultural system composed of people who work in cooperation' (in Prasad LM 2009). In hierarchy of needs by A.H. Maslow, human being's need for relationship has found in the form of social needs. Maslow says, since man is a social being, he has a need to belong and to be accepted by various groups. When social needs become dominant, a person will strive for meaningful relations with others. If the opportunity for association with other people is reduced, men often take vigorous action against the obstacles in his social interaction. In an organization, informal groups are result of social needs. David C McClelland in his 'Need Theory' says, since people are social animals, most individuals like to interact and be with others in situations where they feel they belong and are accepted (in Prasad 2010). According to F. Herzberg, Maintenance or Hygiene factors dissatisfy the employees (interpersonal relationship with superiors, interpersonal relationship with peers, interpersonal relationship with subordinate, etc.) when they are absent (in Prasad 2010).

Ouchi William G. (1981) postulated five broad features based on Japanese management practices and motivational patterns in his theory Z. The features are – Trust, strong bond between organization and employees, employee involvement, no formal structure, and coordination of human beings. Ouchi says, the purpose is to achieve commitment of employees to the development of a less-selfish-more-cooperative approach to work. Before commitment can occur, there must be understanding which comes from the open expression of skepticism through a process of debate and analysis. The leader must develop trust which consists of the understanding of fundamentally compatible goals of the desire for more effective working relationship together. To develop trust, there should be a complete openness   and candor in the relationship (in Prasad 2010). People spend a large portion of their time in an organization interacting with others - superior, subordinates, co-workers or outsiders (LM Prasad 2010). These interactions provide the connective tissues that help to hold the subparts of the organization together. They behave in a particular way, which may be either cooperative or conflicting. Prasad says conflicting relation is dysfunctional to both organization and individual. Positive thinking, mutual trust, empathy, courtesy and avoidance of ego problem are the skills for cooperative interpersonal behaviour (Prasad 2010). Trust plays pivotal role in cooperative interpersonal behaviour. Trust is a two-way traffic, that is, if someone wants that other should trust him; he must also trust other (Prasad 2010).

Deutsch (1957) saw trust as a prerequisite to the existence of a stable cooperative system. Effective cooperation amongst employees can be ensured by developing healthy relation amongst employees. Trust is the foundation of Human relation (RR Gaur, R

Sangal, GP Bagaria, 2009). Rodericks M Karmer (2009) says, "Trust is our default position: we trust routinely, reflexively, and somewhat mindlessly across a broad range of social situations. Bidault and Jarillo (1997) defined trust as "believing that the other party will behave in our best interests". RR Gaur, R Sangal, GP Bagaria (2009) defined the trust as, "To be assured that each human inherently wants oneself and the other to be happy and prosperous". For managers and professionals in organizations, developing and maintaining trust relationships is especially important. Porter et al. (1975) found interpersonal trust a pervasive phenomenon in organizational life. They say that where there is trust there is the feeling that others will not take advantage of him. It enables people to take risks. Deutsch (1973) says that trust is based on the expectation that one will find what is expected rather than what is feared. It is believed that trust opens chances for decentralization and informal collaboration. It reduces costs of governance, internalization costs and costs for transaction in and between organizations. Trust enables more open communication, information sharing and conflict management (Bidault and Jarillo, 1997; Creed and Miles, 1996; Barney and Hansen, 1994; Sako, 1992 and Blomqvist 2002; Aulakh Kotabe, and Sahay, 1997).

Employer and employees are the key partners who constitute an enterprise. Trust and commitment are the key elements to maintain the partnership, but trust is the premise to fulfill the commitment while commitment is the result of trust (Moorman et al., 1992). Morgan and Hunt (1994) argued that trust is the confidence to the partners presently, while commitment means the wish to continue the relationship in the future. So the level of trust will impact on the quality of the relationship commitment. Commitment towards the group goals is prerequisite for group performance. The commitment has to be effective. Affective Commitment is an attachment characterized by an identification to and involvement with the organization (Allen and Meyer, 2000). Affectively committed individuals tend to perform their jobs better and be more productive (Allen and Meyer, 2000; Jaramillo et al., 2005; Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001; Meyer et al., 2002; Riketta, 2002). Affective Commitment leads to fewer intentions to quit the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Vandenberghe and Tremblay, 2008), lower turnover (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Maertz et al., 2007; Meyer et al., 2002), reduced absenteeism (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Somers, 1995), more customer-oriented behaviors (Chang and Lin, 2008), and improved in-role and extra-role performance (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Jaramillo et al., 2005;Meyer et al., 2002; Riketta, 2002; Vandenberghe et al., 2004). Thus, to strive for better performance, organizations must be able to develop their employees' Affective Commitment (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001).

Trust and commitment are both the key elements to maintain the relationship. This has to be from both interacting partners/parties in the organization. Mutual Trust plays the foundational role in building relationship. The other factors such as mutual respect, healthy intercommunication, just and transparent behaviour and participation are equally important for building and maintaining relationship. Participation of

employees in group's or organizational issues give the feeling in the employees that they are considered part of the group or organization. Organizational commitment is found to effected participation in decision making (Farmer and Fedor, 1997), empowerment (Laschinger and Finegan, 2004),) and perception of fairness (McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992). Wayne, Shore, Bommer and Tetrick (2002) have found positive effect of employee's overall perception of inducements offered by organization, i.e., perceived organization support, has positive effect on employee's task performance, and organizational commitment. According to Folger and Skarlicki, (1998) people deserve to be treated with respect and dignity. They believed to seek revenge for violations of the social covenant. Foa and Foa (1980), in their adjacent principle categorized social exchange resources in six types in respective of concrete or abstract; need long time or short time to complete exchange. These six types of social resources are currency, goods, service (including behavior), information, status, and love. It has been proved that people prefer exchange of adjacent resources with similar characteristics. With regard to exchange resources in organizational relationship, economic inducements are mainly currency, and commitment is some kind of love, so economic inducements offered by organization are difficult to be paid off by employee's commitment.

Healthy intercommunication coupled with mutual respect, and just & transparent behaviour is instrumental in developing trust and relationship. Organization needs to build such procedures, which ensure justice to all its employees equally. Procedural justice theorists have argued that fair procedures serve two purposes. One is to help protect individuals' interests; over the long run, fair procedures should result in individuals' receiving what they are due. Consequently, the fairness of procedures is associated with positive attitudes toward a decision, such as satisfaction, agreement, and commitment (Lind & Tyler, 1988). The second function of fair procedures is symbolic and helps to strengthen individuals' relationships with a group, leader, and organization. Fair procedures serve as a sign to individuals that they are valued and respected members of the group or organization and thus promote harmony and trust in relationships with others.

Employees prefer equity whether in respect to behaviour (relationship) or compensation. As per J. Stacy Adams Equity Theory, there exist three types of exchange relationship between person's inputs/outcomes in relations to those of other person – overpaid inequity, underpaid inequity, and equity wherein the person experience guilt feeling, dissonance and satisfaction, respectively. Hence, fair treatment is important for employee's satisfaction. When employees feel they are not fairly treated, they engage in counter productive work behaviour (CWB). Bennett and Robinson (2003) find causal relationship between perceived unfairness and CWB. According to Bies & Tripp (1996) individuals who feel unfairly treated seek revenge, which is often manifested in CWB. Fox & Spector (1999) say that employees who feel unfairly treated may reduce their

cooperative behaviors to avoid exploitation and may engage in CWB due to thrill seeking or other proclivities for deviance for which injustice provides individuals a convenient justification. A study by Aquino, Galperin, and Bennett (2004) found that individuals who perceive greater unfairness tend to engage in more CWB. Bies & Moag (1986) and Masterson et al. (2000) found that individuals tend to direct their responses toward the perceived source of fair or unfair treatment as suggested the agent–system model of justice. Gouldner (1960) says that individuals tend to reciprocate who believe they benefit from another party's discretionary actions. He says that employees who believe they are treated fairly by their supervisors may reciprocate through coope`rative behaviors. According to Eisenberger, Lynch, Aselage,& Rohdieck, (2004) and Gouldner (1960) individuals may reciprocate through some type of negative response like CWB if they are treated unfairly. Rupp and Cropanzano (2002) say that employees form social exchange relationships with both their supervisors and their employing organizations. They may respond to perceived unfairness by engaging in CWB, depending upon whether a supervisor or the organization is perceived as the source of injustice.

Wayne Hochwarter, Paul Harvey and Jason Stoner (2007) say that employees don't leave their job or company, they leave their boss. They found in the study that good work environment was often much more important than their current pay level. Employees tend to reciprocate treatment by their organizations by adjusting their attitudes accordingly. Virtuous environment in the organization may be helpful for building commitment in employees. Organizational virtuousness (OV) refers to organizational contexts where the "good" habits, desires, and actions (e.g., humanity, integrity, forgiveness, and trust) are practiced, supported, nourished, disseminated, and perpetuated, both at the individual and collective levels (Cameron et al., 2004). Emmons (2003) and Fredrickson (1998) found that positive perceptions of organization virtuousness may lead employees to feel gratitude for working in such an organization. Coyle-Shapiro (2002) and Eisenberger et al. (2001) says that employee may reciprocate with higher affective commitment if they perceive organizational support. Employees may develop relational psychological contracts with the organization. Gavin and Mason (2004), Milliman et al. (2003), and Wright & Cropanzano (2004) find that employees may feel that work of the organization meaningful and may bring bringing their entire self (physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual) to the organization. They say that in such environment employees take work as a mission than as a mere job which in turn makes them more affectively attached to their organizations. (They may also feel that they are carrying out meaningful work, thus, and take on work more", Larson (1992) says, quoting and executive, that extra effort to help is as important as the help itself. He says that relationship has to be attended. This all is possible through healthy and effective intercommunication.

Chhabra TN (2009) says, 'it is ability to communicate effectively that has enabled people

to build organizations. Managers carry out their job functions by interacting with others: superiors, subordinates, peers, suppliers and customers. On the basis of several empirical studies on the manager's job, Mintzberg (1975) reported that managers spent most (78 per cent) of their time in relating to people, face-to-face, over the telephone or through written communications. All these interactions constitute the realm of interpersonal relations in management. The nature of employment relationship has changed from master-servant to partnership relationship. No management can manage effectively, if it does not understand the need, perceptions and feelings of the employees. The importance of communication has increased in order to fulfill the desire of the modern managers to have better understanding of the human behavior for better human relations (Chhabra TN 2009 p 1.13).

PRESENT STUDY

The present study is an attempt to explore the role of Relationship at Workplace taking some of its factors - Mutual Trust, Mutual Respect, Intercommunication, Transparency, Just, & Participation together and its effect of Sense of Belongingness, Commitment towards Organizational Goal and Organizational Effectiveness.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

Objective of the study is to find out the association of Relationship at Workplace & with Sense of Belongingness, Commitment towards Organizational Goal, and Organizational Effectiveness.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study may serve as a guide to better management of Human Capital of organizations.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sample & Data Collection: The study was conducted at a private sector organization (educational institute) at Kanpur. For this purpose, 120 academic professionals were contacted personally and requested to fill up a questionnaire. Out of 120 questionnaires distributed among the academic professionals, 110 questionnaires were returned and 105 questionnaires were found suitable for data analysis (response rate 87.5%).

Measures: A new measure to assess Relationship at Workplace (Mutual Trust, Mutual Respect, Intercommunication, Transparency, Just, & Participation); Sense of Belongingness; Commitment towards Organizational Goal and Organizational Effectiveness was developed for use in this study under the guidance of an experienced academician. Also the guidance has been taken from the items developed by Roberts and O'Reilly (1974) for constructing items of Mutual Trust. Measures of Commitment

towards Organizational Goal were taken from Ursula Wittig-berman & Dorothy Lang (1990). I used the items developed by Blake & Norton to measure Organizational Effectiveness. The measure consists of 37 items, 26 assessing Relationship at Workplace (5 of Mutual Trust, 5 of Mutual Respect, 4 of Intercommunication, 3 of Transparency, 5 of Just, & 4 of Participation); 3 assessing Sense of Belongingness; 4 assessing Commitment towards Organizational Goal; and 4 assessing Organizational Effectiveness. The questionnaire was on 5-point Likert scale, where 1 indicated Strongly Disagree and 5 indicated Strongly Agree.

Tools for Data Analysis: Item to total correlation has been applied to check the consistency of various items used in the questionnaire. Reliability method (Cronbach's Alpha) has been applied to the items. Underlined factors were found out through Factor Analysis. Linear regression was applied to find the relation between the variables using by using SPSS.

Consistency Measure: Firstly consistency of all the items in the questionnaire was checked through item to total correlation. Under this correlation of every item with total was measured and the computed value was compared with standard value i.e. 0.14.

Reliability Measure: Reliability test was carried out by using SPSS software and the reliability value through Cronbach's Alpha method was 0.957 for 37 items (Table 1). As the reliability value is good so questionnaire can be considered as highly reliable further studies.

Table 1. Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.957	37

Factor Analysis : Kaiser Meyer Olkin measure of sample adequacy (KMO - .906) indicated that the sample was good enough for the current study. Bartlett's test of sphericity (Approx. Chi-Square is 2675.122 with 666 df, which is significant at .000) indicated that data were normally distributed and data were suitable for factor analysis (Table 2). The factors were calculated with the help of total variance explained. The loading items of final five factors (variables), which come, were calculated from the principal component analysis and Varimax Rotation which was the outcome of SPSS software (Table 3). The variable identified were Relationship at Workplace, Sense of Belongingness, Commitment towards Organizational Goal, and Organizational Effectiveness.

Table 2. KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.906
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2675.122
	Df	666
	Sig.	.000

Table 3. Factor Analysis

Variable Name	Factors Name	Variable Convergence	Loading
Relationship at Workplace	Mutual Trust	1. Employees in my organization trust each other.	.734
		6. Employees of my organization are trusted by management.	.606
		11. I feel free to discuss the problem and difficulties that I have in job with other employees.	.541
		32. Employees of my organization have confidence on management.	.642
		34. I am trusted at my organization.	.648
	Mutual Respect	2. Employees are respected in my organization.	.665
		7. I am respected at my organization.	.560
		19. Employees in my organization respect each other.	.524
		23. People in my organization have regards for management.	.733
		27. Employees are given due recognition of their efforts in my organization.	.596
	Intercommunication	3. Communication amongst employees in my organization is healthy.	.445
		10. There is smooth flow of information in my organization.	.763
		16. People communicate cautiously in my organization.	.795
		36. Employees openly communicate with each other in my organization.	.405
	Transparency	4.Employees in my organization are transparent in their behavior at workplace.	.540
		9.Employees in my organization are open to each other in their behaviour.	.685
		13.There is an atmosphere of transparency at my organization.	.459
	Just	15.While making decisions, special efforts are made in my organization to maintain cordial relations with all the concerned.	.608
		18.Employees who are not treated fairly engage in works which do not give expectedresults.	.795
		21. Employees who are treated unfairly, reduce their cooperative behavior in my organization.	.820
		30. Employees in my organization are fair in their dealings with each other.	.502
		31.Decisions in my organization are made keeping the interest of the employees in mind.	.726
	Participation	5.Employees in my organization are involved in decision making process of organization.	.576
		8.Organization involves me in the decision making process of the organization.	.698
		12.Organization takes my feedback after implementing decision.	.541
		20.My organization consults the employees before making decision on the matters which affects them.	.454

Sense of Belongingness	22. I have strong affection for my organization.	.478
	25.My organization gives me the feeling of - "Part of the Family".	.759
	29.I am proud to tell others about the organization I am part of.	.787
Commitment toward organizational Goal	17.I am physically committed to the goal of my organization.	.812
	24.I am continuously committed to the goal of my organization.	.617
	33. I am psychologically committed to the goal of my organization	.658
	35.Employees of my organization are committed to the organizational goal.	.420
Organizational Effectiveness	14.Customers of my organization are happy.	.512
	26.My organization is prepared for future.	.746
	28.My organization is financially effective.	.677
	37.People in my organization are happy.	.614

Hypothesis

In order to conduct the study, the following hypotheses were framed:

Ho1: There is no significant association between Relationship at Workplace and Sense of Belongingness among employees.

Ho2: There is no significant association between relationship at workplace and Commitment towards Organization among employees

Ho3: There is no significant relationship between relationship at workplace and Organizational Effectiveness.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Analysis: The data collected through various tools and techniques was analyzed in reference to the objectives of the study. The result and discussion on the data is appended in the succeeding paragraphs.

The results of the descriptive statics (Table 4) are exhibiting that the employees have agreement on Relationship at Work place, Sense of Belongingness, Commitment towards Organizational Goal, and Organizational Effectiveness. The SD of SOB (Sense of Belongingness) is highest. It is showing that respondents vary highly as per the Sense of Belongingness is concerned. However, they feel that they are committed towards organization.

Table: 4 Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
RAW	105	1.62	4.71	3.3905	.60274
SOB	105	1.67	5.00	3.9333	.79178
CTOG	105	2.25	5.00	4.0571	.56676
OE	105	1.00	5.00	3.5643	.82845
Valid N (listwise)	105				

Correlation amongst variables: The correlation between the variables was examined using the Pearson correlation. The results of the same are appended below:

Table 5. Correlations

		RAW	SOB	CTOG	OE
RAW	Pearson Correlation	1	.733**	.652**	.789**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	105	105	105	105
SOB	Pearson Correlation	.733**	1	.680**	.697**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	105	105	105	105
CTOG	Pearson Correlation	.652**	.680**	1	.555**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	105	105	105	105
OE	Pearson Correlation	.789**	.697**	.555**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	105	105	105	105

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

RAW   – Relationship at Workplace
SOB   – Sense of Belongingness
CTOG – Commitment towards Organizational Goal
OE   – Organizational Effectiveness

Correlation matrix reveals that all the variables are correlated with each other. It also reports positive correlation among various factors. Relationship at Workplace is significantly and positively correlated with Sense of Belongingness with a correlation value of 0.733. Relationship at Workplace is also significantly and positively correlated with Commitment towards Organizational Goal with a correlation value of 0.652. Correlation value between Relationship at Workplace and Organizational Effectiveness is 0.789 which indicated that Relationship at Workplace and Organizational Effectiveness are positively and significantly correlated.

Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis was examined in order to find the relation between the variables using the linear regression by using SPSS. The results of the same are numerated below:

Ho1:   There is no significant association between Relationship at Workplace and Sense of Belongingness among employees.

Table 6. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.733a	.537	.532	.54154
a. Predictors: (Constant), RAW				
b. Dependent Variable: SOB				

Table 7. ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	34.993	1	34.993	119.321	.000b
	Residual	30.207	103	.293		
	Total	65.200	104			
a. Dependent Variable: SOB						
b. Predictors: (Constant), RAW						

Table 8. Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.670	.303		2.210	.029
	RAW	.962	.088	.733	10.923	.000
a. Dependent Variable: SOB						

The value of R^2 (.537) indicating that 53.7% of the variation in the Sense of Belongingness (SOB) are explained by Relationship at Workplace (RAW). The value of R^2 is significant as indicated by the p value (.000) of F statistic as given in ANOVA Table 8. The Beta value (.733) indicating strong relationship between the independent variable, RAW and the dependent variable, SOB. The value of Beta is significant as indicated by the p value (.000). Therefore, the null hypothesis Ho1 stating that there is no significant association between Relationship at Workplace and Sense of Belongingness among employees is rejected. Thus, it could be concluded that there is a significant and positive association between Relationship at Workplace and Sense of Belongingness among employees.

Ho2: There is no significant association between Relationship at Workplace and Commitment towards Organizational Goal among employees.

Table 9. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.652a	.425	.419	.43202
a. Predictors: (Constant), RAW				
b. Dependent Variable: CTOG				

Table 10. ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	14.183	1	14.183	75.990	.000b
	Residual	19.224	103	.187		
	Total	33.407	104			
a. Dependent Variable: CTOG						
b. Predictors: (Constant), RAW						

Table 11.Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.980	.242		8.181	.000
	RAW	.613	.070	.652	8.717	.000
a. Dependent Variable: CTOG						

The value of R^2 (.425) indicating that 42.5% of the variation in the Commitment towards Organizational Goal (CTOG) are explained by Relationship at Workplace (RAW). The value of R^2 is significant as indicated by the p value (.000) of F statistic as given in ANOVA Table 10. The Beta value (.652) indicates strong relationship between the independent variable RAW and the dependent variable CTOG. The value of Beta is significant as indicated by the p value (.000). Therefore, the null hypothesis Ho_2 stating that there is no significant association between Relationship at Workplace and Commitment towards Organizational Goal among employees is rejected. Thus, it could be concluded that there is a significant and positive association between Relationship at Workplace and Commitment towards Organizational Goal among employees.

Ho3: There is no significant relationship between Relationship at Workplace and Organizational Effectiveness.

Table 12. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.789a	.623	.619	.51127
a. Predictors: (Constant), RAW				
b. Dependent Variable: OE				

Table 13. ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	44.455	1	44.455	170.067	.000b
	Residual	26.924	103	.261		
	Total	71.379	104			
a. Dependent Variable: OE						
b. Predictors: (Constant), RAW						

Table 14. Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.113	.286		-.396	.693
	RAW	1.085	.083	.789	13.041	.000
a. Dependent Variable: OE						

The value of R^2 (.623) indicating that 62.3% of the variation in the Organizational Effectiveness (OE) are explained by Relationship at Workplace (RAW). The value of R^2 is significant as indicated by the p value (.000) of F statistic as given in ANOVA Table 13. The Beta value (.789) indicates strong relationship between the independent variable, RAW and the dependent variable, OE. The value of Beta is significant as indicated by the p value (.000). Therefore, the null hypothesis Ho3 stating that there is no significant association between Relationship at Workplace and Organizational Effectiveness is rejected. Thus, it could be concluded that there is a significant and positive association between Relationship at Workplace and Organizational Effectiveness.

DISCUSSION

This study found that there was positive and significant relationship between Relationship at Work place, and Sense of Belongingness, Commitment towards Organizational Goal, & Organizational Effectiveness.

The results indicate strong support for all hypotheses concerning the effects of consideration and influence covering four variables i.e. Relationship at Work place, and Sense of Belongingness, Commitment towards Organizational Goal & Organizational Effectiveness.

It has been proved that people prefer exchange of adjacent resources with similar characteristics. With regard to exchange resources in employee organization relationship, economic inducements are mainly currency, and sense of belongingness & commitment are some kind of love, so economic inducements offered by organization are difficult to be paid off by employee's commitment.

Relationship at workplace which encompasses mutual trust, mutual respect, intercommunication, transparency, just and participation, has come out with positive and significant relation with Sense of Belongingness, Commitment towards Organizational Goal, & Organizational Effectiveness.

RESEARCH AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study are relevant both to business academicians and to practitioners. From the theoretical perspective, this study demonstrates and validates the importance of relationship at workplace in an organization. Of course it would be inappropriate to advance generalizations based on one exploratory study. Future studies should be conducted to examine the validity of this model in other cultural contexts.

India is country where people give importance of relationship in their life. The generalization of research findings of this study to other Asian and western countries has to be tested in future studies. Comparative research in different cultural settings may further enhance our understanding of the relationship between Relationship at

Workplace with Sense of Belonging, Organizational Commitment, and Organizational Effectiveness.

From the managerial perspective, this study provides empirical support for the importance of Relationship at Workplace in managing the organizational human capital in India, and it has significant implications for international marketers. When formulating new organizational strategies in the Indian market, the model developed in this study can help the International organizations to a great extend.

The importance of relationship at workplace (in the organization) with respect to Sense of Belonging, Organizational Commitment, and Organizational Effectiveness has been positively established in this research. Right understanding of this importance has to be there at all levels in the organization. Each employee of the organization, whatever the position he/she may be holding, his/her contribution for organizational effectiveness is desirous for the sustainability of the organizational effectiveness.   Everyone's cooperation can only make it possible. Personal relations sometimes play a key role in maintaining the stability and continuity of cooperation, especially in the increasingly fierce market competition, in which employees are faced with a number of alternative employers to lure. Rao and Selvan (1992) found that both managers as well as subordinates in their independent responses to the questions of what in their opinion contributed to managerial effectiveness, indicated "Interpersonal relationship" as the most important factor.

LIMITATIONS

Since this is a pioneering study to integrate the effects of relationship at workplace in Indian context, the present findings are indicative rather than conclusive. However, some promising research directions are suggested by this study. First, one limitation of this study is its cross-sectional nature, which cannot track changes in harmony orientation. Time-series data should be collected in future studies. Second, the samples used for analysis were drawn from Kanpur, India only. Future research, therefore, can expand on the present study by gathering data from other cultures and countries so as to track the generalizability of the model. Future research should address the following issues. First, future research should assess the extent to which leaders are willing to behave based on the factors suggested in this study.

CONCLUSION

In a business perspective, interpersonal relationships can best be developed in a context of trust, of openness to other's beliefs, of a willingness to listen, and of a desire to respect and to understand others in their differences. These qualities are indispensable for reaching harmony, cooperation, and mutual enrichment in relationship. Behavioral scientists like Likert, Blake and McGregor emphasized the concept of socio-technical

system which lays down the importance of the human side of the enterprise. According to them an organization which takes into consideration human feelings and aspirations and associates employees with the process of management is likely to be more efficient and healthier as compared to an organization using the authoritarian ways of managing the employees. We can analyze for ourselves whether we want an environment at organization where trust, respect, just, healthy intercommunication, transparency and participation in organizational matters persists or otherwise will do.

REFERENCES

- Allen NJ, Meyer JP (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: an examination of construct validity. *J Vocat Behav, 49,252–76.*

- Allen NJ, Meyer JP (2000). Construct validation in organizational behavior research: the case of organizational commitment. In: Goffin RD, Helmes E, editors. Problems and solutions in human assessment: honoring Douglas N. Jackson at seventy. *Norwell, MA: Kluwer; p. 285–314.*

- Aquino, K., Galperin, B., & Bennett, R. J. (2004). Social status and aggressiveness as moderators of the relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34, 1001–1029.*

- Aulakh, P.S.; Kotabe, M. & Sahay, A. (1997). Trust and performance in cross-border marketing partnerships: A behavioral approach. *Journal of International Business Studies, (27), 1005-1032.*

- Barney, J.B. & Hansen, M.H. (1994). Trustworthiness as a source of competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal, (15), 175-190.*

- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2003). The past, present and future of workplace deviance research. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), Organizational behavior: *The state of the science (2nd ed., 247–281. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.*

- Bidault, F. & Jarillo, J.C. (1997). Trust in economic transactions. In: Bidault, F. & Gomez, P-Y. & Marion, G. (Eds.), Trust: Firm and society, Editions ESKA, Paris.

- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communications criteria of fairness. In R. Lewicki, B. Sheppard, & M. Bazerman (Eds.), Research on negotiation in organization, *(1), 43–55. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.*

- Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. (1996). Beyond distrust: "Getting even" and the need for revenge. In R. M. Kramer, & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations. 246–260. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.*

- Blau, P. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. *New York: John Wiley and Sons.*

- Blomqvist, K. (2002). Partnering in the dynamic environment – the role of trust in asymmetric partership formation. *Thesis for the degree of doctor of science, Lappeenranta University of Technology.*

- Cameron KS, Bright D, Caza A. (2004). Exploring the relationships between organizational virtuousness and performance. *Am Behav Sci. 2004, 47(6), 1-24.*

- Chang T, Lin H, (2008) A study on service employees' customer-oriented behaviors. *J Am Acad Bus Cambridge; 13(1), 92–7.*

- Chhabra T.N, Suri R.K.(2009) Industrial Relations- concepts and issues, *Dhantap Rai & Co, New Delhi, pp34.*

- Creed, W.E.D. & Miles, R.E. (1996). Trust in organisations: A conceptual framework linking organizational forms, managerial philosophies, and the opportunity costs of controls. In: Kramer.

- Deutsch, M. (1957). Trust and suspicion. *Conflict Resolution, 2, 265-279.*

- Deutsch, M. (1973). The resolution of conflict: constructive and destructive processes. *New Haven: Yale University Press.*

- Eisenberg R, Armelli S, Rexwinkle B., Lynch P.D. and Rhoades L., Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *J Appl Psychol 86 (1)(2001), 42-61.*

- Eisenberger, R., Lynch, P., Aselage, J., & Rohdieck, S. (2004). Who takes the most revenge? Individual differences in negative reciprocity norm endorsement. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30, 787–799.*

- Elton Mayo in Prasad LM, (2010). Principles and Practice Management Sultan Chand and Sons New Delhi, 43-44.

- Emmons (2003). Emmons RA acts of gratitude in organizations. In Cameron KS, Dutton JE, Quinn RE, editors. Positive organizational scholarship. San Francisco: Berrett - Koehier publishers: 200, 81-93.

- Farmer S M, Fedor D B (1997). Volunteer participating and turnover intensions: The role of satisfaction, expectations, and organizational support. *Academy of Management Proceedings, 97, 380–384.*

- Folger, R., & Skarlicki, D. P. (1998). A popcorn metaphor for employee aggression. In R.W. Griffin, A. O'Leary- Kelly, & J. M. Collins (Eds.), Dysfunctional behavior in organizations: *Violent and deviant behavior, 1, 43–81. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.*

- Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20, 915–931.*

- Fredrickson: 1993 B.L. Fredrickson, What good are positive emotions? *rev gen psycho 2 (1998), 300-319*

- Gavin J.H. and Mason R.O. (2004). The virtuous organization the value of happiness in the workplace. *Organ. Dyn. 33 (4), 379-392.*

- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: *A preliminary statement. American Sociological Review, 25, 161–178.*

- Jaramillo F, Mulki JP, Marshall GW (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational commitment and salesperson job performance: *25 years of research. J Bus Res; 58, 705–14.*

- Larson, A. (1992). Network Dyads in Entrepreneurial Settings: A Study of the Governance of Exchange Processes. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37(1), March, 76-104.*

- Laschinger H K S, Finegan J E (2004). Empowerment, interactional justice, trust and respect: A nursing recruitment and retention strategy. *Academy of Management proceedings, C1–C6.*

- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). The social psychology of procedural justice. New York: Plenum.

- Maertz Jr CP, Griffeth RW, Campbell NS, Allen DG, (2007). The effects of perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support on employee turnover. *J Organ Behav; 28(8), 1059–75.*

- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal, 43,738–748.*

- McFarlin, D.B., & Sweeney, P.D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management journal,35, 626-637.*

- Meyer JP, Herscovitch L, (2001). Commitment in the workplace: toward a general model. *Hum Resource Management Review; 11,299–326.*

- Meyer JP, Stanley D, Herscovich L, Topolnytsky L, (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: a meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *J Vocat Behav, 61, 20–52.*

- Miliman J., Czaplewski A.J. and Ferguson J. (2003). Workplace Spirituality and employee work attitudesan exploratory empirical assessment. *J Organ Change manage 16 (4), 2003, 426-447.*

- Mintzberg (1975). The Manager's Job: Folkerr & Facts. *Harvard Business Review 53, 4.*

- Moorman, C., Zaltman, G. and Deshpand, R. (1992). Relationships between providers and users of market research: the dynamics of trust within and between organizations. *Journal of Marketing Research, 29, August, 314-28.*

- Morgan, C. and Hunt, S. (1994). The commitment trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing, 58, July, 197-206. New York: McGraw-Hill.*

- Ouchi, William G. (1981). *Theory Z.* New York: Avon Books.

- Porter, L. W., Lawler, E. E., & Hackman, J. R. (1975). *Behavior in organizations.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Prasad LM (2009). *Principles and Practice of Management,* Sultan Chand & Sons: New Delhi, 66.

- Prasad LM (2010). *Organisational Behaviour,* Sultan Chand & Sons: New Delhi, 189-190.

- Prasad LM (2010). *Organisational Behaviour,* Sultan Chand & Sons: New Delhi, 191.

- Prasad LM (2010). *Organisational Behaviour,* Sultan Chand & Sons: New Delhi, 187

- Prasad LM (2010). *Organisational Behaviour,* Sultan Chand & Sons: New Delhi, 201-202.

- Prasad LM (2010).*Organisational Behaviour,* Sultan Chand & Sons, New Delhi, 266-67.

- Prasad LM (2010). *Organisational Behaviour,* Sultan Chand & Sons, New Delhi, 47.

- Rao, T. V. & Selvan Tamil S,(1992).Survey of Strengths and Weaknesses of Senior Executives as Perceived by them and their Juniors, IIMA Working Papers WP1992-01-01_01082, Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad, *Research and Publication Department.*

- Rao VSP (2010). Human Resource Management: Excel Books New Delhi, 2.

- Riketta M (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23(3), 257–266.*

- Roderick M. Kramer (June, 2009) Rethinking Trust, Harvard Business Review, p71.

- RR Gaur, R Sangal, and GP Bagaria (2009).*A foundation Course in Human Values and Professional Ethics*, Excel *Books* Private Limited, New Delhi.

- Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting Workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 89, 925–946.*

- Wayne S J, Shore L M, Bommer W H, Tetrick L E (2002). The role of fair treatment and rewards in perceptions of organizational support and leader member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(3), 590–598.*

- Sako, M. (1992). Prices, quality and trust: Inter-firm relations in Britain and Japan. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Somers MJ, (1995). Organizational commitment, turnover and absenteeism: an examination of direct and indirect effects. *J Organ Behav, 16(1), 49–58.*

- Vandenberghe C, Bentein K, Stinglhamber F, (2004). Affective commitment to the organization, supervisor, and work group: antecedents and outcomes. *J Vocat Behav, 64(1), 47–71.*

- Vandenberghe C, Tremblay M, (2008). The role of pay satisfaction and organizational commitment in turnover intentions: a two-sample study. *J Bus Psychol; 22(3), 275–86.*

- Wright T.A. and Corpanzano R., (2004). The role of psychological well being in job performance: a fresh look at an age old quest, *Organ Dyn 33(4), 338-351.*

Website:

- Wayne Hochwarter, Paul Harvey and Jason Stoner (2007): **Employees Leave Bosses, Not Jobs**, retrieved on March 23, 2015 at 0645hrs from https://www.fsu.edu/news/2006/12/04/bad.boss/