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ABSTRACT

Business Process Outsourcing (BPO) sector is thriving in India but before the IteS market can really open out beyond the call centre model of business, sparks of trade unionism are now visible in the BPO and call centre industry in India. Nevertheless, there is a widely held view that important changes are occurring in the character of employee attitudes and it is argued that employees’ collectivist work orientations are in decline. This study investigates to what extent employee from BPO industries is going to get involved in unions. Drawing on data from survey of BPO industries in India, this paper explores the attitudes of employees towards union membership and identifies the determinants of this attitude. At first using Triandis (1995) framework of horizontal and vertical individualism-collectivism, the sample employees’ cultural orientation was measured. Next, consistent with some previous researches a measurement approach was employed that assessed individualism and collectivism as discrete measurements of organizational levels. Finally, test was done to detect whether the dimensions of I-C (HI, VI, HC, and VC) and organizational individualism and collectivism (OI and OC) are valid determinants of employees’ attitude towards union membership. The influence of interaction of vertical and horizontal I-C with OI and OC on attitude towards union membership was also measured. Analysis indicated that HI and VI predicted attitude with greater significance compared to HC and VC; and OC significantly predicted the attitude while OI could not. The 1st order interaction of HI with OI and OC was able to make significant influence on attitude, and so is the interaction of VC with OI, whereas 2nd order interaction of VI with OI with OC was found to be able to make an influence on employees’ attitude. Identification of influence of 1st order and 2nd order interactions of variables can help organizations diagnose their employees’ culture and identify potential levers for organizational change efforts in terms of true organizational culture change and employees’ perception change.

Author Keywords and Acronyms: Business Process Outsourcing (BPO), (trade) union, culture, individualism – collectivism (IC), horizontal individualism (HI), vertical individualism (VI), horizontal collectivism (HC), vertical collectivism (VC), organizational individualism (OI), organizational collectivism (OC).
INTRODUCTION

BPO sector in India thriving on the outsourced projects is full of carefree young employees who are enjoying money and BPO lifestyles. Of the four types of IT (Information Technology)-enabled services (IteS), i.e., in-house/captive, spin offs, Business Process Outsourcing (BPO), and broad-based service, BPO market could turn out to be the best place to have major share in it for India. However, according to the industry journal *Dataquest*, at present, the IteS market in India is substantially restricted to call centres. But before the market can really open out beyond the call centre model of business, sparks of trade unionism are now visible in the BPO and call centre industry in India. It is this interplay of the crisis and offshoring that challenges unions around the world and they are now looking at increasing the membership by spreading to countries like India, where a chunk of work is outsourced. IT Professional Forum of India (ITPFI) is one such organization which has began the process of forming outfit like Centre for BPO Professionals (CBPOP) with primary task of protecting professionals in the BPO sector from getting victimized by unfair human resource policies. Nevertheless, with the unionization of the BPO industries the threat of reducing its ‘crowning glory’ in South East Asia’s labour market becomes visibly potent as the industry analyst strongly consider that one of the reasons for which India banks on the world offshore market is its level of union organization being naught among call-centres. On the other hand the voice of NASSCOM, India contends the need for any trade unions in the BPO industry, as their argument is today, when employers are most concerned about the employees, they do not foresee the trade unions being formed in the BPO sector.

Union membership among software workers is low and declining, but the identification of this rapidly expanding, highly strategic section of workforce towards trade unions is little known. Software workers could help develop and apply IT to support workforce dispersal, which may influence prospects for employee collectivism. Putting the union-establishment dichotomy of labour vs. capital across the situation cast by this study premise, the choice for the employees of BPO industry is not between commitment to company or to union. Even both might be possible and even a neutral position is a valid option too and this presumption consider union and establishment as two separate entities, though they may not be competing. It is often argued that BPO work engenders attitudes that neutralize the potential pro-union instincts of some workers. However, in India where the unionization of workforce has yet not happen, a valid research question would be, “Shall IT and BPO industry employees be able to get involved in unions as
their predecessors from other industry segments have been doing over the past years?” Hence, this study attempts to investigate the attitudes of BPO industry employees towards union membership.

**Literature Review on Model of Union Membership (Why Workers belong to a Union?)**

The literature review classifies the reasons for union membership into following sets of explanations. The theoretical underpinning suggests that exit-voice theory is one such prevailing theory that explicate why employees become members of trade unions. Housing on Hirschman’s (1970) exit-voice (and loyalty) model, explanation given by Freeman (1976, 1978, 1980) and Freeman and Medoff (1979, 1983, 1984) have partly saturated the role of work satisfaction but they still spoke of the “two faces” of unionism, but with a new dimension. They label unionism as a *collective voice / institutional response* model. Finally, the theory expects that dissatisfied union members will use their ‘voice’ and thus will remain in jobs for a longer period compare to their non-union counterparts, whereas dissatisfied non-union workers will tend to quit (‘Exit’). However, this theory has its own limitations, as one among such inadequacies is that the theory ignores the impending influence of individual differences like value/culture on membership. Nevertheless, many studies in the past concluded that studies of personal characteristics offer little support for the contention that there is a union type. Snyder, Verderber, and Morris (1986) examined predictors of voluntary union membership in a social services work setting and underlined role of work perceptions in relation to union membership, but with limited evidence of personality differences between members–non-members.

Klandermans (1986) has suggested three partly overlapping theoretical approaches to trade union participation, namely the frustration-aggression approach, the rational-choice approach and the interactionist approach. The frustration-aggression approach explains union membership as a result of individuals’ frustration, dissatisfaction or alienation in their work situation. The rational-choice approach interprets unionization as the outcome of weighing the cost-benefit of participation where the expectations about union’s ability to realize the social/ideological motives determine the membership decision. In interactionist approach union participation is inextricably bound up with group culture, and decision to join union is influenced by person’s social context.

Ideological theories or conjecture, apparent in literature (e.g., Wheeler and McClendon, 1991; Newton and Shore, 1992) explains that employee make a decision to become a part of groups (union) because he / she shares the interest, values or beliefs of other members, be it the
specific group (union) or organization. Cartwright (1968) proposed that association with group members brings about attraction to the group itself and this may emerge from external influences (outside work life) [Huszczko, 1983] or culture [Klandermans, 1986]). Another explanation that stretches out of political ideology defined by the individualist-collectivist attitude (Deery and Walsh, 1997) has reflected enough upon the explicit effect of group cohesion and solidarity and class-consciousness (Goldthorpe, 1968). Combines and shared action of the group and its collective instrumentality is the underlying principle for the existence of trade unionism because collectivity is greater than aggregation.

White-collar union trends among professional jobs like financial/service sector could be apparently seen, but these occupations have been a challenging group for explanation of the union membership trends and tendencies (Bain 1970; Bain, Coates and Ellis, 1973). Of the two intertwining organizational dimensions of union behaviour, the first is the moral fiber of employees and their orientations/attitudes toward unionization vis-à-vis relationships with management. The second is the influences carried by the employer/government on patterns of union membership (both structural and behavioural factors). Legislative measures to govern trade unionism collectively with economic and employment policies, changing business model and organization’s policies like reducing/restricting union recognition, introducing alternative representative measures, and setting up and consolidating unitarist methods and finally the sector restructuring done with liberalization of India’s economic policies are some of structural factors which influence trend of union. Similarly the employees’ perception on social status, images of society, norms and customary practices at workplace and their orientation to collective institutions/behaviour owe to the attitudinal factors and are also associated with trend in membership decisions. “As the extent of the decline in membership raises the question of how far the weakening of trade unionism as an option viable to be accepted by the software workers given them a choice to be neutral, is an expression of broad social change, especially the shift away from class-based collectivism towards greater societal individualism” (Bradley, 2000: 155)”. Hence it is valid to enquire whether there are unconventional foci to trade unions for BPO employees in terms of their work identification/cohesiveness vis-à-vis assemblage. This study attempts to assess to what extent the broad social change especially the shift away from class-based collectivism towards greater societal individualism is expressed in terms of membership trend when the BPO employees will be given a choice to be neutral. This is much relevant in the resent research context as the BPO employees’ demographic characteristics purport such a shift.
Individualism collectivism as a conception for different socialites (or cultural syndromes)

A considerable amount of research on societal culture has been guided by the notion of “cultural syndromes.” Cultural syndromes are cognitive structures that help one organize and interpret the world by focusing attention on certain patterns or themes in the subjective elements of environment, such as values, norms, beliefs, and assumption (Triandis, 1994a). Of the numerous cultural syndromes that have been identified, individualism and collectivism have received considerable attention since the seminal work of Hofstede (1980), and have been the focus of particularly rich theoretical description (e.g., Triandis, 1995). Indeed, the constructs of individualism and collectivism were largely responsible for the explosion of cross-cultural psychology over the past three decades. Individualism and collectivism continued to be the most prominent constructs in cross-cultural psychology in the 1990s (e.g., Kashima, Y., Yamaguchi, S., Kim, U., & Choi, S., 1995; Kim, Triandis, Kagitcibasi, Choi, & Yoon, 1994; Triandis, 1995), making them “perhaps the most important dimension of cultural differences in social behaviour” (Triandis, 1998, p. 60). A second approach, which we call measuring individualism, was initiated in the late 1980s (e.g., Hui, 1988; Triandis, Leung, Villareal, & Clack, 1985; Triandis et al., 1986; Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, Gelfand, 1995). This approach focused on developing measures of individualism and collectivism that assessed individualism in the broader cultural context and at the level of individuals to examine whether within-nation variability in individualism and collectivism is related to dependent variables. Triandis characterize the cultural difference of individualism, which includes independence and self-reliance, competition, distance from in-groups, hedonism, and for collectivism which includes interdependency, sociability, and family integrity. Individualists are more likely to priorities self and are explicit in enhancing self-esteem (Triandis, 1996). They desire to emphasize their personal goals, interests and values over the society and are likely to belong to more in-groups in comparison to collectivists (Triandis, 1989). Individualists emphasize on personal autonomy and self-fulfillment (Hofstede, 1980); personal responsibility and freedom of choice (Waterman, 1984); personal success, status and competitive characteristics (Chiou, Jyhshen, 2001, Oyserman & Markus, 1993, Gugykunst, Matsumoto, Ting-Toomey, Nishida, Kim, & Heyman, 1996, Triandis, 1995, Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai & Lucca, 1988, Schwartz, 1990); distinctive personal attitudes and opinions (Oyserman & Markus, 1993; Triandis, 1995); autonomous behaviour independence of groups (Reykowski, 1994); need for detachment from others and individual autonomy (Andersen, Reznik, and Chen 1997); and functioning according to personal choices (Walsh and Banaji 1997). On the other
hand collectivists are likely to value belonging to their in-group and relating one’s self to the group (Fiske 1992; Hofstede 1980; Hsu 1983; Kim 1994; Markus & Kitayama 1991). As collectivists give more weight to norms as determinants of their social behaviour (Triandis 1996) they identify themselves as members of a group to which they belong, and thus they internalize the group’s goals and values and give these higher priorities (Hofstede, 1980; Hsu, 1983; Kim, 1994; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai & Lucca, 1988). Triandis (2000) suggested that collectivists tend to be very sensitive to other in-group members, and can be quite distant from out-group people (Oyserman 1993, Schwartz 1990), and even hostile when conflict arises from out groups. During a conflict situations when the value of keeping harmony forms the trend, the collectivists prefer to maintain relationship and deal by methods like negotiation, mediation, conciliation, etc., (Ohbuchi, Fukushima and Tedeschi, 1999), while individualist seek justice and would prefer to deal by methods like adjudication.

**Vertical and horizontal cultures**

Diener & Diener (1995) in their international student survey included the Individualism-Collectivism-Scale (ICS; Singelis et al., 1995, Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). The ICS consists of four scales with 8-items each: horizontal individualism (H-IND), vertical individualism (V-IND), horizontal collectivism (H-COL), and vertical collectivism (V-COL). Horizontal individualism reflects individual’s tendency to have an independent self-concept, to value uniqueness, and to make independent choices. Vertical individualism stresses the importance of competition. In other words, horizontal individualism implies “I am different”, whereas vertical individualism implies “I am better.” Similarly horizontal collectivism implies valuing social relations with equals, whereas vertical collectivism implies valuing social relations with superiors including parents. Oyserman, Coon et al. (2002) proposed that horizontal individualism is the core element of individualism. Nevertheless, any typology is an oversimplification as each individual is likely to use some combination of horizontal or vertical, individualistic or collectivistic cognitive elements when defining particular social situations (Triandis and Gelfand, 1998; Verma and Triandis, 1998). All individuals have access to all four kinds of cognitions and will activate them depending on the situation. In social situations in which harmony, cooperation, and having fun are accentuated, there is an emphasis on equality (horizontal relationship). Inequality creates stress, envy, and resentment. On the other hand, situations that favour competition, or require subordination of the goals of most people to the goals of an authority, result in vertical relations. Limited resources are more likely to result in vertical than in horizontal relationships.
Collectivism and trade unionization

In its more radical form, collectivism can be seen as a demonstration of class interests (Bain et al 1973: 16). One of the most widely cited perspectives on individualism-collectivism comes from cross-national cultural differences by Hofstede (1984). Hofstede’s study shows most of the western nations to be high on individualistic dimensions of work value orientation and Mosca (1939) has attributed the growth of new industrial cities, which are inhabited by floating populations as the main reason behind the decline of collectivism in western civilization. Collectivism in the form of 'social capital' refers to features of social organization such as networks, norms and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit (Putnam, 1995:67). In late 80s, a new trend of pluralistic ideology and pluralistic interpretation sees collectivism as an instrumental route for employees to pursue specific sectional interests. Purcell (1987) sees collectivism as one end of continuum of management style which at one pole embraces union representation and at the other are adopted highly individualized policies in which collective representation play no part (Deery and Walsh 1999). Conversely, Storey and Bacon (1993: 8) equate collectivism with unionism and individualism with non-unionism. But they have classified practices such as team working/participative group methods of work (Deery and Walsh, 1999: 248) as representative of a “new collectivism”. Further to this Deery and Walsh (1999: 246) added that employees’ attitude toward union membership plays a crucial role towards our understanding of union and its future role. This understanding is especially pertinent when the occupations are becoming prominent features of the economic and labour market landscape, as is undoubtedly the case with BPO workers. This leads to the first hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1: Vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism, the individual-level manifestations of individualistic and collectivistic values, will be able to significantly predict the attitude towards union membership.

Individualism–Collectivism in Industrial Relations

The argument of this paper is that individualism and collectivism also might be meaningful dimensions in the context of organization. There are numerous reasons to believe that this might be true like individualism-collectivism in industrial relations reflects upon ‘collective bargaining’ as the central concept in the collectivist model. Nevertheless, individual contracts are an antithesis of collective bargaining, but all individual contracts do not equate to ‘individual employment arrangements’ as many white collar job holders in service sector despite
of getting into individual contracts employ collective measures to settle demands across their employers.

Secondly, British researchers Storey and Bacon (1993) have identified three areas in which individualism and collectivism in employment relations’ arrangements can be assessed and these are *procedural individualization* which refers to removal of collective mechanisms for determining terms and conditions of employment (Brown et al., 1998:i) [individualism in the area of ‘industrial relations’ (Storey and Bacon, 1993)], *substantive individualization*, which is the differentiation of individual employees’ employment contracts like pay and non-pay terms and conditions of employment (Brown et al., 1998) [individualism in human resource aspects of management strategy like nature of pay system, terms and conditions and culture of work place (Storey and Bacon, 1993)] and *functional individualization*, which is individualism in work organization and focus on the technical and social organization of work that control over features of job operation and relationship to authority. Two of these correspond to a distinction drawn by Brown et al (1998) between two forms of individualization in employment contracts. Thirdly, the fact that individualism and collectivism are represented at both the individual level and at the societal level suggests that they are extremely salient themes or patterns that people use to understand, categorize, and interpret their environment and to structure their sense of self and identity. Because most people in BPO industries spend a considerable portion of their daily life and that too at different hours of a day in the workplace, it would seem unlikely that individualism and collectivism are important at the individual and societal levels, but not in organizational contexts. In addition, individualism and collectivism might be meaningful dimensions of organizational culture as a consequence of the fact that all organizations are embedded within societal cultures, which are likely to have an ambient influence on organizations embedded within them (Hofstede, 1985). Research on organizational culture has historically contained notions of multi-level effects. For example, Denison (1996) notes that a fundamental dilemma that is often faced in the literature on organizational culture is that theories tend to posit that individuals influence an organizational culture, and are also influenced by the organizational culture. Similarly, while micro-level theories might equate organizational culture with an employee’s perceptions of an organization, as assumed in this study, in order for those perceptions to be truly “organizational”, it is believed that organizational cultures develop in response to stimuli (like those generated by the human resources (HR) practices that are utilized throughout the organization, and become manifest in institutionalized structures, rules, or
standard operating procedures) are experienced in common by organizational members (Robert and Wasti, 2002). Therefore, in this study, consistent with some previous researches which have tested person-organization fit and established congruence on dimensions that are parallel at the individual and organizational levels, a measurement approach was employed that assessed individualism and collectivism as discrete measurements of organizational levels only on those dimensions which are congruent as established in previous study (Robert and Wasti, 2002). Adopting this approach, measures of organizational individualism and collectivism were developed for this research in order to test the assumption that organizational individualism and collectivism as measure of organizational culture will predict the attitude towards union membership. This leads to the second hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 2:** Organizational individualism and collectivism will be able to significantly predict the attitude towards union membership.

Although the growing body of literature has led a number of researches to suggest that the exploration of individualism and collectivism at the level of organizational culture might be fruitful (e.g., Earley & Gibson, 1998; Triandis, 1994b), we are aware of only few studies in which this has been explored explicitly. One such study as conducted by Chatman and Barsade (1995) was an experiment in which participants were randomly assigned to stimulated organizations that emphasized either collectivist or individualist values. They found that participant’s cooperative or individualistic orientation interacted with the stimulated organizational culture to predict cooperative behaviours and preferences for certain types of organizational practices, suggesting that person-organization fit along the dimensions of individualism and collectivism might be having a significant interactional effect on behaviours and attitudes. Moreover, making of ‘individual contracts’ (need not be contract of employment) is the central element of PI and this exemplifies the notion that those establishments, which operate on contract of employment, need not always follow PI. Similarly the establishment with no contractual basis of employment in practice can also act on the indicators of collectivism (Storey and Bacon, 1993) and turn the scope for PI into existence. It is by no means necessary that organisations that adopt individualism in one dimension will exhibit individualism in all three dimensions and might adopt various combinations of collectivism and individualism. Hence, if there is an individualistic 'ideology' that management seeks to promote, it is individualistic only in particular way like seeks to remove union consciousness from employees. Nevertheless, organizational culture that develops in response to stimuli generated by such
practices of management would remain unstable and inconsistent particularly among individual members of the organization whose perception is largely equated with organizational culture. Therefore, individual-level manifestations of individualistic and collectivistic values interactions with organizational individualism and collectivism are hypothesized to have implications for attitude towards union membership and this is consistent with Locke’s (1976) suggestion that job attitudes result from met expectations about what the workplace should be like. This discussion leads to the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 3:** The interaction of vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism, the individual level manifestation of individualistic and collectivistic values with organizational individualism and collectivism will be able to make a significant influence (interactional effect) on the attitude towards union membership.

**RESEARCH CONTEXT**

Employee attitude towards union membership can be influenced by a number of interlocking variables that can be summarized as (a) exogenous factors such as economic conditions and government policies (b) employer factors such as size and recency of establishment, owner ideology, policies and practices (c) employee characteristics and behaviour. With regard to employees, there is some evidence that factors such as job satisfaction and social relations within the organization have an influence. This paper takes its starting point from the orientations of employees rather than as manifestations of employer styles. Arguably, employees have received less empirical attention with little attempt to offer more sophisticated classification of employee orientations beyond the individual-collective dichotomy. This exploratory paper suggests that employees too may exhibit variations along these themes based on interaction of the individual cultural orientation with organizational culture, with possible implications for union membership. The present study will examine the following research questions in order to further understand the link between individualism-collectivism cultural orientation of employees, organizational culture and attitudes towards union membership.

1. To measure the vertical and horizontal individualism / collectivism orientation of employees
2. To measure the extent to which each of the dimensions of I/C of employee as identified from question 1 is significant in predicting the employee attitude towards union membership.
3. To measure the organizational individualism and collectivism and to see to what extent these measures of organizational individualism and collectivism are significant in predicting the employee attitude towards union membership.
4. To measure the influence of vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism (the individual level manifestation of individualistic and collectivistic values), and organizational individualism and collectivism, and finally their interaction on attitude towards union membership.

METHOD

Sample Characteristics and Procedure

Organizational contacts were initiated and a sample included respondents from three major BPO industries from the city of Mumbai (India), which varied broadly in terms of business size and service types like captive and third party outsourcing. Although the sample of organizations was not technically random, an effort was made to solicit the cooperation of a diverse sample of organization. Samples obtained from each organization ranged from 45 to 50. A total of 150 employees from different functions (based on their designation like CS Associates, Team leaders, etc..) responded to a survey that included measures of attitude towards independent representation (union membership), horizontal and vertical individualism-collectivism, and demographic and occupational variables.

With the response rate of 66% the actual data collection was completed in a month time period. The mean age was 26.7 years with 90% of the respondents below 30 years of age and 57% of the sample were female. 68% of the respondent executives held atleast a Bachelor’s degree, 30% of the respondents held Post-graduate degree and 2% held at least diploma in technical and other vocational fields. The mean tenure of job was 2 years. Respondents included low-level executives like Customer Service Associates (40%), middle-level executives like team leader, manager, coach (22.2%), and high-level executives like operation head, manager (37.8%) represent both operation (64%) and customer service or care department (36%).

Measures

The present study sought to extend the existing literature on psychological factors associated with voluntary union membership to encompass the role of value / cultural orientation known to predict other aspects of work-related behaviour. The role of attitudinal variables was also evaluated to throw further light on conflicting literature findings control for demographic and job-related variables was included in the analysis model. Data were collected from employees using a questionnaire comprising of following scales:

Demographic and specific occupational information data sheet. Eighteen odd questions were put in the first three parts of the questionnaire consisted of information related of
demographic details (like gender, age, qualification, occupational attributes – job title, department, salary) and job attributes (like hours of work, tenure, nature of job, and other characteristics, individual’s influence on job, job satisfaction), workplace attributes (like role of managers, involvement in decision making, communication), and work characteristics of the respondents.

**Dependent variables.** Employees’ orientation towards union membership (independent representation) in organization has been assessed using Union Member Survey sub-scale (adapted from Compulsory Unionization, Wallis Consulting Group, 1999) containing two subscales each containing four items. The first subscale measures feelings about any forms of union if ever it grows in organization, and the second subscale measures perception on best representative (from collectivist to individualist – association, employee representative, another employee, team-leader, somebody else, and self) in dealing with managers for pay, employee development, grievance and disciplinary actions. For the first subscale containing four items, responses were made on a three-point scale against two positive items towards one pole ranging from 3 (agree) to 1 (disagree) and from 1 (agree) to 3 (disagree) with 2 as neither agree nor disagree for two negative items towards other pole of the bipolar dimensions. The individual Score were computed by adding the weightages on all four items. For the second subscale containing four items, responses were made on a 4-point scale against all four items from 4 (association), 3 (employee representative), 2 (another employee/somebody else) and 1 (self). For all scales, higher scores represent more endorsement of the construct.

**Independent variables.** The survey completed by the employees included seven items measuring organizational culture collectivism (the “OC” subscale), and six items measuring organizational culture individualism (the “OI” subscale) (Robert and Wasti, 2002). Responses to organizational culture subscales were made on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). Vertical and horizontal individualism/collectivism were measured using the Individualism-Collectivism Scale (Singelis, & Triandis, 1995, Triandis, 1995a). This scale consists of 32 items with 8 items designed to evaluate each of the four cultural orientations (i.e., HI, HC, VI, and VC). On each of the 32 items, respondents indicated their level of agreement on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (Strongly agree) to 5 (Strongly disagree). Attempting to strike a balance between ambiguity and specificity, Singelis and Triandis (1995), borrowing on the work of Markus and Kitayama (1991), separated individualism and collectivism and then divided them into the two dimensions of verticalism and horizontalism. Further analysis done by Singelis and
RESULTS

BPO Employees views on Work, Satisfaction and Relation with Managers

Views of employees regarding their work, satisfaction and relationship with managers were obtained from two principal sources, the employee survey and from interviews. The examination of employees views confirm adherence to a mixed opinion from shop floor about work, satisfaction and relationship. While 82% of employees agreed that their job requires them to work very hard, 29% have also expressed that often they don’t have enough time to get their work done. Nevertheless, 57% of them believe that their job is secure, and this is corroborated later by 53% of the responses that have expressed satisfaction with their job security. However, only 35% of them have assertively denied the fact that they are worried about work outside the working hours. The job satisfaction sub-questionnaire score confirm adherence to satisfaction among employees with several aspects of job like sense of achievement from work (70%), scope of using own initiative in job (61%), influence over job (52%), training received (49%), and pay (only 30%). Employees view on manager’s/team leader’s role of keeping them (employees) informed about various aspects of organization also confirm adherence to satisfaction among employees in forms of being informed of changes – to the way their organization is being run (41%), the changes in staffing (40%), the way they do their job (58%), and of financial matters including budgets and profits (17%). Even if 41% of employees have confirmed that their managers are good in seeking their views and responding to their suggestions, only 20% have appreciated their managers’ role in allowing them to influence the final decisions. Overall only 41% of employees were found to be satisfied with the amount of involvement they have in decision-making at workplace. Relationship with managers was reported as to be good by 59% of the employees during the study.

Vertical and Horizontal Individualism / Collectivism Orientation of Employees

The independent variable of individualism-collectivism orientation of employees along vertical and horizontal measurement of culture was measured using 32-items Individualism-Collectivism I/C Scale (Singelis, & Triandis, 1995, Triandis, 1995a). To eliminate the effects of
possible response styles within the culture, raw scores on the I/C scale were standardized within subjects before analysis. Four separate analyses were conducted for each culture – one for each cultural orientation subscale (HI, HC, VI, and VC). To ensure internal consistency reliability tests were conducted for each of the cultural orientation indices. For the sample of the study: HI_a = 0.69, HC_a = 0.60, VI_a = 0.46, and VC_a = 0.71) and Cronbach_a for I/C scale was found to be 0.84. Correlation analyses for the four subscales revealed that VI is positively correlated with HC (r = 0.31, p<0.01) and VC (r = 0.32, p<0.01); HI is positively correlated with VC (r = 0.78, p<0.01). However, correlations between horizontal and vertical aspects of either individualism or collectivism were more modest: VC and HC were correlated at r = 0.63, p< 0.01), whereas VI and HI were uncorrelated, r = 0.20, not significant). This suggests that the vertical and horizontal subscales can be viewed as largely, although not completely, independent.

The evidence that humans sample both collectivist and individualist cognitions that can be seen in certain studies (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) is once again noticed in the present study. Statistical analysis of the individual dimension wise summated score shows 60% of employees scored higher on horizontal individualism orientation indices and 43% of them scored higher on horizontal collectivism orientation indices. Similarly, 55% of respondent employees scored higher on vertical individualism orientation indices and 48% of them scored higher on vertical collectivism orientation indices. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with age, designation, job tenure, and department as independent variables and the four cultural orientation scales (HI, HC, VI, and VC) as dependent variables and t-test was conducted with gender and four cultural orientations. Age and gender were included as variables of interest as past studies have demonstrated gender differences as well as differences in age with regard to these cultural orientation (Kurman & Sriram, 2002). The statistical descriptions are given in the table – 1. For HI, there was a statistically significant difference in the mean score across employees’ age (F = 5.61, p<.001), designation (F = 4.33, p<.01), job tenure (F = 4.27, p<.01), and department (F = 6.26, p<.01). Statistically significant difference in the mean score across employees’ age (F = 3.04, p<.05), job tenure (F = 15.52, p<.001), and department (F = 4.74, p<.01) also emerged for VI. Some suggest that collectivists tend to show longer job tenure than individualists (Gomez-Mejia and Welbourne 1991 and Parkes et al., 2001 cited in Ramamoorthy & Flood 2002:1077), particularly when working in collectivist cultures, but in this study statistically significant difference in the mean score across employees’ job tenure (F = 11.56, p<.001) emerged for VC and not for HC. No significant difference emerged for HC except across employees’ age (F =
4.44, \( p < .01 \)). Because the items tapping the HC orientation tend to focus more on collectivist than horizontal notions and are items with which all collectivists might agree, it may not be surprising that this subscale did not discriminate well between two collectivist individuals. The difference between mean score of HI, HC, VI and VC of male and female executives was overall statistically insignificant, which is not as is expected and is not in line with previous research (Kurman & Sriram, 2002).

**Organizational Individualism and Collectivism**

The second independent variable – organizational individualism and collectivism was measured using two subscales: “OC” subscale, and “OI” subscale (Robert and Wasti, 2002). To eliminate the effects of possible response styles within the culture, raw scores on the OC and OI subscales were standardized within subjects before analysis. Two separate analyses were conducted for each culture – one for each cultural orientation subscale (OC and OI). To ensure internal consistency reliability tests were conducted for each of the two cultural orientation indices. For the sample of the study: OI\( \alpha \) = 0.83, and OC\( \alpha \) = 0.81) and Cronbach\( \alpha \) for combination of OI and OC subscales was found to be 0.85. Correlation analyses for the two subscales revealed that OI is positively correlated with OC (\( r = 0.7, p < 0.01 \)). Statistical analysis of the data shows that 61% of the employees have rated their respective organization higher on organizational individualism indices and only 46% of them have rated high their respective organization on organizational collectivism indices.

**Attitude towards Union Membership**

The dependent variable of the study – employees’ attitude towards union membership (independent representation) in organization has been assessed using Union Member Survey subscale (Wallis Consulting Group, 1999) containing two subscales each containing four items; one measuring feelings about any forms of union if it ever grows in organization, and the other measuring perception on best representative in dealing with managers. To eliminate the effects of possible response styles within the organization, raw scores on the two subscales were standardized within subjects before analysis. One analysis was conducted for the entire scale comprising of two subscales. However, to ensure internal consistency reliability tests were conducted for each of the two subscales separately as well as for the scale. For the sample of the study: Representative \( \alpha \) = 0.82, and Feelings \( \alpha \) = 0.58) and Cronbach \( \alpha \) for the entire scale (combination of two subscales) measuring attitude towards union membership was found to be 0.72. Correlation analyses for the two subscales revealed that correlation between the two
subscales was modest: Representative and feelings was correlated at \( r = 0.3, p<0.05 \). Statistical analysis of the data shows that overall the sample was divided into almost two equal sized groups with the marginally bigger group (51\%) showing negative attitude towards union membership and the smaller group (49\%) showing positive attitude towards union membership. Separately on each of the subscales, the sample shows an expected different result, as 57\% of respondents showed a positive feeling about any forms of union if ever it grows in organization, while only 43\% of them have scored higher on their perception on best representative in collective form like association, and employee representative in dealing with managers for pay, employee development, grievance and disciplinary actions. This shows that though around 60\% of employees in the study have shown a positive attitude towards union as an organization in terms of their feelings about such organization, its activities, and their individual role in such organization, but still only around 40\% of them have a positive attitude towards the role of union in representing issues at work. During 1980s several studies have highlighted the importance of certain structural factors like size of the sector or organization, demographic variables of the workforce like age and tenure of service in a particular set up in determining attitude towards independent representation or union membership per se among employees. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted with age, designation, job tenure, and department as independent variables and the attitude towards union membership as dependent variables and t-test was conducted with gender and attitude is given in table – 1. The difference in attitude towards union membership across the employees’ age (\( F = 3.45, p<0.05 \)), designation (\( F = 11.67, p<0.001 \)), department (\( F = 4.40, p<0.01 \)), and job tenure (\( F = 15.39, p<0.001 \)) were highly significant. Though 51\% of female have shown positive attitude towards union membership compare to 46\% of male, the difference between attitude towards union membership of male and female employees was statistically insignificant (\( t = 0.45, \text{ns} \)). Surprisingly young employees particularly in age group of 18 to 24 years have shown more positive attitude (75\% within the age group) towards union membership compared to employees from higher age groups. This refutes some of the previous research findings which show that the tendency to unionize was more prevalent among the older rather than younger employees But not so surprisingly, 79\% of the managers within the work group have shown negative attitude towards union membership compared to 72\% of the CSAs within the work group who have shown positive attitude towards union membership. Similarly, the percentage analysis further shows that employees with longer
job tenure (73% within the job-tenure group) have shown greater positive attitude towards union membership compared to employees younger in organization.

Result of Regression Analysis (Hypotheses Testing)

Hypothesis 1 expected that vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism, the individual-level manifestations of individualistic and collectivistic values, will be able to significantly predict the attitude towards union membership. Operationally, this suggests that standardized beta coefficient (\(\beta\)) and \(R^2\) value that shows individual and joint contribution respectively of vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism in predicting the attitude towards union membership would provide a satisfactory test of this hypothesis. The joint contribution of HI, VI, HC, and VC in predicting attitude towards union membership is 20 %. (\(R=0.45\)). Results of the regression analysis are presented in table – 2. The results for the HI (\(\beta = -0.48, p<.01\)), VI (\(\beta = 0.30, p<.01\)), and VC (\(\beta = 0.40, p<.05\)) provided support for the hypothesis as HI and VI is able to predict significantly and VC is able to predict less significantly the attitude towards union membership. However, HI has negative effect (negative regression coefficients) and VI and VC have positive effects.

Hypothesis 2 suggested that organizational individualism-collectivism, will be able to significantly predict the attitude towards union membership and operationally once again standardized beta coefficient (\(\beta\)) and \(R^2\) value showing individual and joint contribution respectively of vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism was computed to test the hypothesis. The joint contribution of OI and OC in predicting attitude towards union membership is 23 %. (\(R=0.48\)). Results of the regression analysis are presented in table – 2. The result for the OC (\(\beta = -0.47, p<.001\)) provided support for the hypothesis as OC is able to predict significantly
but is not able to predict significantly the attitude towards union membership. However, OC has negative effect (negative regression coefficients).

Hypothesis 3 predicted that interaction of vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism, the individual level manifestation of individualistic and collectivistic values with organizational individualism and collectivism will be able to make a significant influence on the attitude towards union membership. Operationally, this suggests that F values in univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) that shows the interactional effect of vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism and organizational individualism and collectivism on attitude towards union membership would provide a satisfactory test of this hypothesis. The mean, standard deviations, and correlation for all independent and dependent variables are listed in table – 4. Results of the UNIANOVA are presented in table – 3. The results of UNIANOVA partially support the hypothesis as in case of interaction of some individual-level manifestations of individualistic and collectivistic values with organizational individualism and collectivism, a significant interactional effect was found on attitude towards union membership. Specifically, F value for HI (4.20), which is significant at .05 level shows that mean score of employees’ attitude towards union membership across their horizontal individualism cultural orientation differ significantly, and hence the horizontal individualism is found to be the only individual cultural orientation to effect significantly the attitude towards union membership. It is also found for interaction between HI and OI (F = 4.85, p<.05), VC and OI (F = 5.13, p<.05), and HI and OC (F = 9.76, p<.01) are significant at .05 and .01 levels. Which means the mean scores of employees’ attitude towards union membership belonging to different levels of interaction between horizontal / vertical individualism – collectivism orientation and organizational individualism / collectivism differ significantly. So, there is a significant effect of interaction between individual-level manifestations of individualistic and collectivistic values and organizational culture on employees’ attitude towards union membership in some interactions only. For attitude towards union membership, the 1st order interaction between HC and OI (F = 3.63, p<.10), HC and OC (F = 3.25, p<.10), and VI and OC (F = 2.99, p<.10) are found to make
marginally significant influence. In this context the attitude towards union membership was found to be less significantly influenced by the resultant of the interaction. Only 2nd order interaction between VI, OI and OC (F = 6.97, p<.01) was statistically significant at .01 level, which means that the mean scores of employees’ attitude towards union membership belonging to only one level of interaction in particular between vertical individualism, organizational individualism and organizational collectivism differ significantly.

**DISCUSSIONS**

The issues involved in understanding the influence of number of interlocking variables on employees’ attitude towards union membership in BPO industry segment where unionization of workforce at any level is yet to take place become particularly relevant in the increasingly global trend of declining unionization of workforce. This study was designed to investigate the extent to which two dimensions of culture established at the individual and organizational levels, individualism and collectivism, will be able to predict the attitude of employees towards union membership. This was done first by measuring the vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism, the individual-level manifestations of individualistic and collectivistic values for a sample of 150 employees from three BPO industries. Then, individualism and collectivism was measured as discrete measurements of organizational levels on dimensions that are parallel at the individual and organizational levels as established in previous study through test of person-organization fit (Robert and Wasti, 2002). Similarly, attitude towards union membership was measured. And then using the standardized beta coefficient and regression coefficient of individual and joint contribution of each of the measurement of individualism-collectivism at individual and organizational levels in predicting the attitude towards union membership was tested. The results of the regression analysis suggested that the joint contribution of vertical and horizontal individualism/collectivism in significantly predicting attitude towards union membership is low [20 %, R=0.45] with HI and VI predicting the attitude with greater significance compared to HC and VC. Surprisingly, HC that implies valuing social relations with equals, rather than with superiors failed to significantly predict the attitude (individual contribution of HC was not significant). More interestingly, both HI and HC have negative effects with negative ß coefficients, while both VI and VC had positive effects on predicting attitude towards union membership. Similarly, individual contribution of OC in predicting attitude was significant while of OI was insignificant, which, means employees’ perception of organizational culture as organizational individualism was not able to predict their attitude
towards union membership. The significant results for individual and joint contribution of each of the measurement of culture in predicting attitude towards union membership also added to the evidence for the dependent nature of the two measures of culture, as both the measures of individualism at individual and organizational level were able to predict the attitude at higher level of significance compared to both the measures of collectivism at individual and organizational levels.

Although these results are supportive of my hypotheses and suggest some intriguing directions for future research, I wish to note some of the limitations of the person-organization fit approach, and specifically, the potential implication that such fit has made on the basic measurement method of organizational culture. The values, beliefs, and assumptions that characterize an organization’s culture are likely to undergo significant changes in response to an increasing emphasis on rewarding change and adaptability to markets and technology, and as a result of the high incidence of mergers, acquisitions, and political changes in governance (This is much relevant in case of growing BPO industry in India). Such forces may change the culture itself, and are also likely to shift the emphasis of fit from one set of dimensions to another, giving the construct of fit a potentially dynamic nature (Robert and Wasti, 2002). Therefore, in this study the measurement approach that was employed to assess individualism and collectivism as discrete measurements of organizational levels on certain set of dimensions which are believed to be parallel at the individual and organizational levels established by person-organization fit as established in previous study (Robert and Wasti, 2002) may not be valid as those dimensions are not static. These issues notwithstanding, it is believed by researchers in past that given the increasingly transitory demands of specific jobs (like the ones yet to happen in BPO industry in India with outsourcing service shifting from call centre operations to broad-based service), organizational culture is likely to be a relatively stabilizing force. And hence individualism and collectivism may serve as dimensions of organization’s core values, as they appear to be represented at a deeper psychological level within individual and within societies (Robert and Wasti, 2002).

Of more practical importance, the significant results for individual and joint contribution of each of the measurement of culture at individual and organizational levels in predicting attitude towards union membership also provided support for the utility of measuring the influence of interaction of individual-level manifestations of individualistic and collectivistic values with organizational individualism and collectivism on attitude towards union membership.
I predicted that interaction of vertical and horizontal individualism/collectivism with organizational individualism and collectivism will be able to make a significant influence (interactional effect) on the attitude towards union membership. Support for the phenomenon of influence of interaction was obtained in the form of statistical interaction in univariate analysis of variance. The 1\textsuperscript{st} order interaction of HI with OI and OC was able to make significant influence on attitude, and so is the interaction of VC with OI. To illustrate this further, horizontal individualism reflects individual’s tendency to have an independent self-concept, to value uniqueness, and to make independent choices, and therefore it means that interaction of individual cultural orientation with his/her perception about organizational culture will significantly influence in developing his/her attitude towards union membership for those individual who think that they are different from others, have an independent self-concept and make independent choices. Infact such interaction with organizational collectivism will have greater influence on attitude compared to organizational individualism. Hence, interaction of organizational HR/IR practices (perceived by an employee as organizational culture) with cultural orientation of individual employee having high/low horizontal individualism is likely to significantly influence his/her attitude towards union membership, and greater if the employee perceive organizational culture as collectivist culture. Whereas, those who stress more on competition and think themselves to be better than other get their attitude towards union membership less influenced by the interaction of their perception about organizational culture with their individual cultural orientation. Similarly for those individuals who value social relations with superiors rather than equals, interaction of their individual cultural orientation with organizational individualism (as perceived by them) is likely to significantly influence their attitude towards union membership. Hence, interaction of individualist HR/IR practices (like incorporating management inspired techniques which aim to secure individual commitment to organizational goals: organizational individualism as perceived by employee) with cultural orientation of individual employee having high/low vertical collectivism is likely to significantly influence his/her attitude towards union membership. Consistent with the hypothesis, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} order interaction of VI with OI with OC was found to be able to make an influence on employees’ attitude. From a practical standpoint, the identification of influence of 1\textsuperscript{st} order and 2\textsuperscript{nd} order interactions of HI with OI and OC, and VC with OI, and VI with OI with OC can help organizations diagnose their employees’ culture and identify potential levers for organizational change efforts in terms of true organizational culture change and employees’ perception change.
LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Regardless of the encouraging support for the rigorous test of hypotheses, the study had some limitations. First of all based on review of existing literature I would like to acknowledge that researchers around the world have differ considerably in their views on use of quantitative vs. qualitative methods in trade union and culture researches. Undoubtedly, uses of qualitative methods ensure application of the distinctive research framework and context and in depth analysis of the unit under scrutiny, with lesser bias about desirable types of any factors/response. Conversely, quantitative methods are likely to underscore the clear-cut, defined, and statistically accurate identification of constructs, and makes an effort to ensure that the same phenomena are measured in altered context. On the line of the said advantages of quantitative methods, degree of theoretical uniformity and steadiness from literature on individual and organizational individualism and collectivism to theories on union and collectivity, as well as rule-based measurement within a specific theoretical system was well ensured and upheld by the quantitative measurements employed in this study. Nevertheless, in the forthcoming studies of similar nature, the use of qualitative methods to the study of dimensions of individual and organizational culture and employee attitude towards union membership as well as subjective experience of interaction of individual and organizational culture and its influence on attitude of employees may possibly do good to the strength of methodological description of the study.

Internal consistency reliability for each of the cultural orientation indices of the I/C Scale was low. In addition, the construct reliability of the scale used to measure OI and OC needs to be tested separately as the two scales used separately and independently to measure OI and OC comprises of six and seven items respectively. Furthermore, the high correlations between the OI and OC and HI, VI, HC, and VC could be due to the real correlation as result of the study organizations’ organizational cultures, which contain positive characteristics of both individualism and collectivism, or else, the items may have included a positivity or desirability basis. Specifically, scale items might have been understood as having a considerable “good vs. bad” component, in addition to their distinction between individualism and collectivism, with item agreement constituting “good”. The limitations of the data itself are few like the design of the study was not longitudinal and hence both predictor and criterion in the hypotheses were not assessed over time which might have been extend the current study. Second the data was limited due to the fact that they were collected from smaller sample size; third, the data was collected from one city of the country. However, considering that all societies possess the full distribution
of individual differences and in view of my effort to include a diversity of organizations, I feel that some concerns regarding external validity of the study were addressed. As cultural dimensions such as those identified by Hofstede (1980) and Trompenaars (1990) could also prove to be meaningful for this study, the attitude towards union membership is also influenced and predicted by number of interlocking exogenous factors and employer factors which again could also prove to be consequential. However, individualism and collectivism appear to be the most theoretically well-developed dimensions of culture in terms of its strength in predicting and influencing union behaviour and attitude. Nevertheless, I consider that future study measuring similar influence may use data from multiple organizations and societies to provide informative validation of my result and may work with other variable which can influence attitude towards union membership if developed more thoroughly and at multiple levels of analysis.
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Table – 1
Statistical description of vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism orientation of employees and attitude towards union membership by independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Horizontal Individualism</th>
<th>Horizontal Collectivism</th>
<th>Vertical Individualism</th>
<th>Vertical Collectivism</th>
<th>Attitude towards union membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age ( F value)</td>
<td>5.61**</td>
<td>4.44**</td>
<td>3.04*</td>
<td>6.33**</td>
<td>3.45 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (t-test)</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation ( F value)</td>
<td>4.33**</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>11.67 †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Tenure ( F value)</td>
<td>4.27**</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>15.52**</td>
<td>11.56**</td>
<td>15.39 †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department (F value)</td>
<td>6.26**</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>4.74**</td>
<td>7.94**</td>
<td>4.40**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01 † p < .001

Table - 2
Regression analysis: Predicting attitude towards union membership from organizational individualism and collectivism and horizontal and vertical individualism/collectivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables a</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Attitude towards union membership b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal individualism</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.48 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal collectivism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical individualism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.30 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical collectivism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational collectivism</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.47 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational individualism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Organizational culture and horizontal and vertical individualist-collectivist value dimensions were standardized prior to analysis.
b Standardized Beta Coefficients value
Table - 3
Univariate ANOVA: Interaction of organizational individualism and collectivism with horizontal and vertical individualism/collectivism and its influence on attitude towards union membership a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal individualism (HI)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>4.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal collectivism (HC)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical individualism (VI)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical collectivism (VC)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational individualism (OI)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational collectivism (OC)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2.72†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st order interaction</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI x OI</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>4.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI x OC</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>9.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC x OI</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.63†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC x OC</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>3.25†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI x OI</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI x OC</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.99†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC x OI</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>5.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC x OC</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd order interaction</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI x OI x OC</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC x OI x OC</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI x OI x OC</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>6.97**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC x OI x OC</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²                      | .574  |
Adjusted R²              | .398  |

* p<.05,
** p<.01
† p<.10
a Dependent variable: Attitude towards union membership

Table - 4
Mean, standard deviation, and intercorrelations between study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards union membership</td>
<td>21.11</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal individualism</td>
<td>18.59</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal collectivism</td>
<td>17.61</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.439**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical individualism</td>
<td>23.67</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.282**</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical collectivism</td>
<td>21.49</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.783**</td>
<td>.631**</td>
<td>.317**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational individualism</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>-.294**</td>
<td>.389**</td>
<td>.412**</td>
<td>.289**</td>
<td>.349**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Collectivism</td>
<td>35.24</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>-.446**</td>
<td>.422**</td>
<td>.318**</td>
<td>.220**</td>
<td>.381**</td>
<td>.697**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** (p<.01)
* (p<.05)