Introduction

Construction Sector:-

Construction sector is an integral part of a country’s infrastructure and industrial development, including establishments like hospitals, schools, townships, offices, houses and other buildings with urban infrastructure (including water supply, sewerage, drainage), highways, roads, ports, railways, airports; power systems; irrigation and agriculture systems, telecom and the like. Covering as it does such a wide spectrum, construction sector provides the basic input for socio-economic and development. Besides, the construction industry generates substantial employment and provides a growth impetus to other sector through backward and forward interactions. It is, essential therefore, that this sector is nurtured and dealt with carefully taking care of the supports of this sector which include society and culture which are affected by this water.

With the present emphasis on creating physical infrastructure, massive investment has been planned during eleventh five year plan. The construction sector is expected to play a crucial role in this regard and has to prepare itself to meet the challenges. In order to meet the intended investment targets in time, the current capacity of the domestic construction industry would need considerable strengthening.

The Indian economy had been booming for the past few years and holds great promise for the future. Our culture defines our fundamental beliefs about how the world works and forms in ways in which we interact and communicate with others and develop and maintain relationships. Doing business in a particular area require a focus on a multi-dimensional understanding of its culture and business practices. Understanding those differences and adapting to them is the key. India is complex country, and those intending to do business here at a national level discover that the path to success is often not very smooth.

With this backdrop the research will try to focus on the social and cultural issues that affect the national and international level, geographically spread across its boundaries. When it comes to India, one needs to understand that one is dealing with people from a different cultural background, which think and interact differently. As a
result, what is considered to be reasonable and feasible in one culture may not work so in other and vice-versa.

Aggressiveness can often be interpreted as a sign of disrespect by some while this may lead to a complete lack of communication and motivation on the part of others. One needs to take the time to get to know Indians and Indian culture as individuals in order to develop professional trust.

**Culture & Leadership in an organisation:-**

Indian theories start with defining leaders as the formers and developers and carriers of culture. The principal conclusion of these studies appears to be that leaders who tried implementing democratic or participative cultures were more successful. Although research into leadership has gone through periods of skepticism, recent interest has focused on the importance of the leadership role to the success of organization. The effectiveness of a leader is a major determinant of the success or failure of a group, organization, or even an entire country Fiedler (1996).

Indeed, it has been argued that one way in which organizations have sought to cope with the leaders and equipping them with the skills to cope (Darcy and Kleiner, 1991; Hennessey, 1998; Saari et al. 1988). So, leadership performance is linked on transformational role of leaders in corporate success.

It would be appear that few studies have responded to the observation of Porter and Mc Kibbin (1998) that much of the research reported as supporting this claim is either inconclusive or empirically suspect. The limited or inconclusive character of research findings in this area suggests the need to investigate further the nature of the relationship between leadership and performance. While the evidence of a leadership performance link is largely anecdotal, considerably more research has empirically examined the organizational culture and functioning relationship. Indeed, an examination of the literature would rather conclude that organizational culture is one of the most popular concepts in the fields of management and organizational theory. One reflection of the popularity of the culture concept is the increasing number of theoretical
perspective (Martin, 1992) and Organizational disciplines which utilize the concept (Harris and Ogbonna, 2000).

However, this is not inferred that there is consensus on the meaning and relevance of the concept. On the contrary, there is widespread disagreement on the definition and scope of the organizational culture concept (Ogbonna and Harris, 2000).

Consequently, it is pertinent to note three main issues. First, many researchers note that treating culture as unitary concept reduces its value as an analytic tool (Martin, 1992; Ogbonna and Harris, 2000; Pettigrew, 1979). Second, culture cannot be equated to power and politics or climate (Dension, 1996; Riley, 1983; Schein, 1986); and, third, there is disagreement on whether organizational culture can be easily changed (Legge, 1994; Ogbonna, 1993).

One of the major reasons for the widespread popularity of, and interest in organizational culture stems from argument (or assumption) that certain organizational cultures led to that the functioning of an organization is dependent on the degree to which the values of the culture are widely shared, that is, are ‘strong’ (Dension, 1990; Kotter and Heskett, 1992).

Krefting and frost (1985) suggest that the way in which organizational culture may create competitive advantage is by defining the boundaries of the organization in a manner which facilitates individuals’ interaction and/or by limiting the scope of information processing to appropriate levels. Similarly, it is argued that widely shared and strongly held values enable management to predict employee reactions to certain strategic options thereby minimizing the scope for undesired consequence (Obonna, 1993).

To this end, it is argued that the uniqueness quality of organizational culture makes it a potentially powerful source of generating advantage over competitors. Indeed, many commentators have advised organizations and researchers to exploit the multiple advantages which could be offered by culture rather than focusing on the more tangible side of the organization (Johnson, 1992; Prahalad and Bettis, 1986).

By the 1990s, researchers assessing the links between culture and performance were more cautious. For example, Gordon and Di Tomaso (1992) and Denison (1990)
both purpose that there is link between certain organizational Cultures characteristics and performance but each adds a number of provisos. In particular, they note that culture will remain linked with superiors’ performance only if the culture is able to adapt to changes in environmental conditions. Furthermore, the culture must not only be strong (widely shared), but it must also have unique qualities which cannot be imitated.