MANAGER'S ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Slavica Mitrović, Leposava Grubić-Nešić, Stevan Milisavljević, Boban Melović, Zuzana Babinková

Introduction

Transformation of totalitarian and centrally regulated society to democratic and free market one initiated, two decades ago, large changes involving all spheres of the society. In the economic area, the transformation to a more efficient market system started, following its deformations which were the result of the forty years of collective ownership and centrally planned economy that had led to lagging economic performance, efficiency and productivity behind developed countries [11]. All the transformations caused changes in organisation business and thus variation in organisation culture.

Organizational culture is considered as an internal variable, distinctive and unique feature of every organization. Therefore, many authors tried to define and explain it, and thus organizational culture is regarded as a set of assumptions [25], rituals and ceremonies [5], managerial practices [10] and shared values [18]. There is also an agreement that strong culture differentiates successful from unsuccessful organizations. They believe that strong culture facilitates coordination and communication and carries a competitive advantage when comparing with other organizations [18].

Organizational culture is a system of shared beliefs and understandings of members of organization which largely determines their mutual actions. In every organization there are values, symbols, rituals, myths, practices that gradually evolve over time [27]. These shared values and experiences largely determine what employees perceive and how they react to their world [26]. According to one of many definitions encountered in literature, culture means perception, since individuals understand organizational culture based on what they see, hear and experience within the organization itself. Second, although individuals may have different social background, different education, or work at different levels, they tend to describe organizational culture in a similar manner. Organizational culture is a descriptive term since it refers to the way its members manage the industrial system, not assuming the employees' affective attitude [22]. Organizational culture – a popular but also a very complex concept – has been identified as an influential factor affecting the successes and failures of organizational change efforts [15]. Especially the effects of organizational culture in IS implementation has brought about a body of studies (e.g. [2], [4], [16], [20], [23], [24], [29]). Recently many studies have been concerned with the part culture plays in achieving total quality through Total Quality Management (TQM) (e.g. [1], [6], [7], [12], [14], [21]).

The basic elements of culture of managerial activities include a series of questions, starting from personal culture, throughout the cultural organization of the workplace, the culture of written and oral communication, behavior towards co-workers, subordinates, illustrating thereby the importance of this matter that contributes to the process of innovation of industrial business systems. Dimensions of organizational culture will influence the process of innovation significantly only when required measures are taken. These specific measures extend the boundaries of regional innovation system in the industry. This policy is aimed at promoting the region due to its industrial sector [13].

Pareek understands the concept as a collection of several interconnected concepts, values, beliefs, norms and attitudes. The values are dispositions directed towards

objectives and activating the staff, while the dimensions are operationalized values in real conditions. According to him, a healthy organizational culture is based on eight "OCTAPACE" dimensions, i.e. **openness, confrontation, trust, authenticity, proactivity, autonomy, collaboration and experimentation** and the concept can be considered as a good and progressive way of building an organization [9].

Research questions at the outset of the study are:

- Which are the dominant values according to manager's assessment of organizational cultures?
- Do the values of organizational culture have any impact on the employees' behavior, i.e. are the dimensions of culture clearly adopted by the employees according to the managers' opinion?
- Do the dimensions of organizational culture differ depending on the type of organization?
- Is there any difference in the assessment of the impact of the dimensions of culture on the employees depending on the level of management?

The main objective of this study is to propose the directions of development of the desired culture and the desired system of organizational values, based on the results and indicators defined by them.

1. Research Methods and Instruments

Organizational culture provides the basis for the definition of desired organizational behavior, and the acceptance of certain values as measured by the dimensions of organizational culture that are the basis of a proactive and successful behavior. The aim of this study is to define the existing dimensions of organizational culture in the studied industrial systems and based on the identified indicators of managerial and organizational measures to direct the organizational culture towards the acceptance and realization of changes in behavior that would contribute to overcoming the problems of transition more quickly on one hand and to more successful business results on the other.

In the period of transition, managers have a crucial role, because by their behavior,

knowledge and skills they influence the adoption of the organization's culture and the changes imposed by the business environment. The level of management is divided into four categories:

- The first category consists of executives with the highest authority. In this study, these are the managing director, his deputy, managing director executives for certain functions, company-parts' directors, their deputies and technical directors.
- The second category consists of the heads of departments (or divisions, depending on the organizational structure of the enterprise's specific part) and branch managers.
- The third category consists of the heads of departments and/or divisions and services (depending on the organizational structure of the enterprise's specific part).
- The fourth category consists of front-line executives, who have the most direct contact with employees, i.e. the headmen.

The study sample consisted of 162 managers from eight companies of different ownership structure, activities and business functions in Serbia [17]. The study included managers of all ages. The median-measured average age of managers was 45 (the inter quartile range was 16). The youngest manager was 23, while the oldest was 67. The study included respondents that spent on the managerial position one year, as well as those with extensive knowledge in respect of this job, spending 37 years in managerial positions. The average number of years spent on a leadership position as measured by median was 19 (the inter quartile range was 17).

Considering the respondents' gender, 106 (65.4%) of them were males and 56 (65.4%) were females.

Regarding the level of the managers' position in organizations:

- 17.4% of managers were at a higher level of management (director, deputy, technical director),
- 34.8% of managers were at the intermediate level (head of a sector, branch),
- 25.5% of managers were at a lower level (head of a department, division/service),
- 22.4% of managers were on the lowest level of management (headman).

The Questionnaire on organizational culture was used as the research instrument of the study, which was taken from Pareek and adapted to the linguistic context [9]. It consisted of 40 questions, drafted in the form of statements with possible alternative responds in the form of a four-point scale (1 – not valued in the organization; 2 – fairly valued in the organization; 3 – valued in the organization, 4 – highly valued in the organization). This reduced the possibility of forced choice of respond,

enabling a more accurate determination of importance that the respondents attribute to individual claims.

The purpose of this instrument is to measure the correlation of the dimension of organizational culture with four levels of management, and eight cultural subscales which are explained below.

The psychometric properties are shown in Table 1.

| Tab. 1: | Psychometric properties of the Questionnaire of organizational culture |

	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sample adequacy	Cronbach's alpha	The 1st main component	
			Characteristic root λ	% of explained variance
Openness	.784	.785	2.701	54.017
Confrontation	.829	.824	3.006	60.116
Trust	.742	.792	2.467	61.682
Authenticity	.581	.513	1.653	41.314
Proactivity	.833	.814	2.922	58.431
Autonomy	.555	.554	1.813	36.269
Collaboration	.692	.602	2.053	41.060
Experimentation	.806	.956	2.719	54.387
The entire questionnire		.956		

Source: Data obtained within the Project no. 179052, supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of Republic of Serbia (own research)

Subscales:
1. Openness: The spontaneous expression of feelings and thoughts and their unreserved sharing.
   The reliability of the scale evaluated by means of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient is .785; the measure of sample representativeness evaluated by means of the KMO measure of sample adequacy is .784, and according to the Kaiser's interpretation it is categorized as high. Based on the amount of explained variance of the 1st principal component (54.017%, $\lambda = 2.701$) and the scree chart, this subscale is considered one-dimensional, i.e. it has one subject of measurement and it is homogeneous. Since all items have significant factorial loadings, the construct validity of individual subscales is considered appropriate.

2. Confrontation: Facing the problems, instead of avoiding them; in-depth analysis of interpersonal problems; coping with challenges.
   The reliability of the scale evaluated by means of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient is .824; the measure of sample representativeness evaluated by means of the KMO measure of sample adequacy is .829, and according to the Kaiser's interpretation it is categorized as high. Based on the amount of explained variance of the 1st principal component (60.116%, $\lambda = 3.006$) and the scree chart, this subscale is considered one-dimensional, i.e. it has one subject of measurement and it is homogeneous. Since all items have significant factorial loadings, the construct validity of individual subscales is considered appropriate.

3. <u>Confidence:</u> Confidentiality regarding the information received from others, instead of their misuse; a sense of security that others will help in case of need and that they will keep mutual obligations and promises.

The reliability of the scale evaluated by means of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient is .792; the measure of sample representativeness evaluated by means of the KMO measure of sample adequacy is .735, and according to the Kaiser's interpretation it is categorized as high. Based on the amount of explained variance of the 1st principal component (61.682%, λ = 2.467) and the scree chart, this subscale is considered one-dimensional, i.e. it has one subject of measurement and it is homogeneous. Since all items have significant factorial loadings, the construct validity of individual subscales is considered appropriate.

4. <u>Authenticity:</u> The harmony between how one feels, speaks and acts; acceptance of his/her own deeds and mistakes; unreserved sharing of feelings.

The reliability of the scale evaluated by means of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient is .513; the measure of sample representativeness evaluated by means of the KMO measure of sample adequacy is .596, and according to the Kaiser's interpretation it is categorized as low. Based on the amount of explained variance of the 1st principal component (41.314%, λ = 1.653) and the scree chart, this subscale is considered one-dimensional, i.e. it has one subject of measurement and it is homogeneous. Since all items have significant factorial loadings, the construct validity of individual subscales is considered appropriate.

5. <u>Proactivity:</u> Initiative; planning in advance and taking preventive measures; calculating trade-offs before taking actions.

The reliability of the scale evaluated by means of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient is .814; the measure of sample representativeness evaluated by means of the KMO measure of sample adequacy is .833, and according to the Kaiser's interpretation it is categorized as high. Based on the amount of explained variance of the 1st principal component (58.431%, λ = 2.922) and the scree chart, this subscale is considered one-dimensional, i.e. it has one subject of measurement and it is homogeneous. Since all items have significant factorial loadings, the construct validity of individual subscales is considered appropriate.

6. <u>Autonomy:</u> Using and giving freedom in planning and acting in the own area; encouraging and respecting individual and working autonomy.

The reliability of the scale evaluated by means of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient is .554; the measure of sample representativeness evaluated by means of the KMO measure of sample adequacy is .555, and according to the Kaiser's interpretation it can be categorized as low. Based on the amount of explained variance of the 1st principal component (36.269%, λ = 1.813) and the scree chart, this subscale is considered one-dimensional, i.e. it has one subject of measurement and it is homogeneous. Since all items have significant factorial loadings, the construct validity of individual subscales is considered appropriate.

7. <u>Collaboration:</u> Providing assistance to others and seeking help from others; team spirit; individuals and groups are working together in solving problems.

The reliability of the scale evaluated by means of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient is .602; the measure of sample representativeness evaluated by means of the KMO measure of sample adequacy is .692, and according to the Kaiser's interpretation it is categorized as average. Based on the amount of explained variance of the 1st principal component (41.060%, λ = 2.053) and the scree chart, this subscale is considered one-dimensional, i.e. it has one subject of measurement and it is homogeneous. Since all items have significant factorial loadings, the construct validity of individual subscales is considered appropriate.

8. <u>Experiment:</u> the use and promotion of innovation methods in problem solving; the use of feedback to make improvements; a new way of looking at things; encouraging creativity.

The reliability of the scale evaluated by means of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient is .789; the measure of sample representativeness evaluated by means of the KMO

measure of sample adequacy is .806, and according to the Kaiser's interpretation it is categorized as high. Based on the amount of explained variance of the 1st principal component (54.387%, λ = 2.719) and the scree chart, this subscale is considered one-dimensional, i.e. it has one subject of measurement and it is homogeneous. Since all items have significant factorial loadings, the construct validity of individual subscales is considered appropriate.

The sample was described by the use of applied statistical analyses: t-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), Kruskal-Wallis test, Spearman's rank correlation coefficient.

Research hypotheses:

H1 – There are differences between managers of different levels of management regarding their assessment of the impact of dimensions of organizational culture measured by Pareek's instrument;

H2 – There are differences between managers from manufacturing industrial systems and the service sector regarding their assessment of the impact of specific dimensions of organizational culture;

H3 – There are differences between managers of different levels of management regarding their assessment of the contents of organizational culture, and the ownership profile of the organization (state/public-owned industrial systems and systems in private ownership).

2. Results and Discussion

According to the proposed hypothesis that there are differences between managers at different levels of position regarding the perception of impact of organizational culture, the next part of this work represents the analysis of variance, as well as the Scheffe's test which both confirm these differences (Tables 2 and 3).

Tab. 2:	**Analysis of variance for differences regarding the level of positions in organizations**					
		Sum of squares	**df**	**Mean square**	**F**	**p**
openness	Among groups	108.37	3	36.12	7.93	0.00
	Within groups	246.13	54	4.56		
	Total	354.50	57			
confrontation	Among groups	60.46	3	20.15	4.15	0.01
	Within groups	272.28	56	4.86		
	Total	332.73	59			
trust	Among groups	62.36	3	20.79	6.21	0.00
	Within groups	190.79	57	3.35		
	Total	253.15	60			
authenticity	Among groups	33.22	3	11.07	3.80	0.02
	Within groups	157.40	54	2.92		
	Total	190.62	57			
proactivity	Among groups	59.50	3	19.83	4.18	0.01
	Within groups	256.43	54	4.75		
	Total	315.93	57			
autonomy	Among groups	54.51	3	18.17	8.07	0.00
	Within groups	117.05	52	2.25		
	Total	171.55	55			
collaboration	Among groups	64.81	3	21.60	6.39	0.00
	Within groups	179.33	53	3.38		
	Total	244.14	56			

Source: Data obtained within the Project no. 179052, supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of Republic of Serbia (own research)

Tab. 3:	Testing the differences between individual groups in organizations by the Scheffe's test (part 1)				
Dependent variable	**(I) level of position**	**(J) level of position**	**Differences M (I-J)**	**Standard deviation**	**p**
openness	director, deputy, technical director	head of the sector (division), branch	1.91	0.91	0.23
		head of the division, department/service	3.07	0.85	0.01
		headman	3.71	0.79	0.00
	head of the sector (division), branch	head of the division, department/service	1.16	0.85	0.60
		headman	1.81	0.79	0.17
	head of the division, department/service	headman	0.65	0.72	0.85
confrontation	director, deputy, technical director	head of the sector (division), branch	1.73	0.92	0.33
		head of the division, department/service	2.86	0.88	0.02
		headman	2.45	0.81	0.04
	head of the sector (division), branch	head of the division, department/service	1.13	0.85	0.63
		headman	0.73	0.79	0.84
	head of the division, department/service	headman	-0.41	0.74	0.96
trust	director, deputy, technical director	head of the sector (division), branch	0.94	0.76	0.68
		head of the division, department/service	2.61	0.73	0.01
		headman	2.40	0.67	0.01
	head of the sector (division), branch	head of the division, department/service	1.67	0.71	0.15
		headman	1.46	0.65	0.18
	head of the division, department/service	head of the sector (division), branch	-1.67	0.71	0.15
		headman	-0.20	0.61	0.99
authenticity	director, deputy, technical director	head of the sector (division), branch	0.67	0.71	0.83
		head of the division, department/service	1.73	0.68	0.10
		headman	1.90	0.64	0.04
	head of the sector (division), branch	head of the division, department/service	1.07	0.66	0.46
		headman	1.23	0.62	0.28
	head of the division, department/service	headman	0.17	0.58	0.99

Tab. 3:	Testing the differences between individual groups in organizations by the Scheffe's test (part 2)				
Dependent variable	(I) level of position	(J) level of position	Differences M (I-J)	Standard deviation	p
proactivity	director, deputy, technical director	head of the sector (division), branch	0.98	0.91	0.76
		head of the division, department/service	2.30	0.88	0.09
		headman	2.58	0.81	0.03
	head of the sector (division), branch	head of the division, department/service	1.32	0.86	0.50
		headman	1.61	0.79	0.26
	head of the division, department/service	headman	0.29	0.75	0.99
autonomy	director, deputy, technical director	head of the sector (division), branch	1.23	0.64	0.31
		head of the division, department/service	1.97	0.62	0.03
		headman	2.75	0.58	0.00
	head of the sector (division), branch	head of the division, department/service	0.74	0.59	0.67
		headman	1.52	0.55	0.07
	head of the division, department/service	headman	0.78	0.52	0.53
collaboration	director, deputy, technical director	head of the sector (division), branch	2.36	0.77	0.03
		head of the division, department/service	2.87	0.73	0.00
		headman	2.69	0.70	0.00
	head of the sector (division), branch	head of the division, department/service	0.52	0.71	0.91
		headman	0.34	0.68	0.97
	head of the sector (division), branch	headman	-0.18	0.64	0.99

Source: Data obtained within the Project no. 179052, supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of Republic of Serbia (own research)

Testing the differences between individual groups in organizations by the Scheffe's test has following results:

- Openness (F (3; 54) = 7.93, p ≤ 0.05) Scheffe's test showed that openness is more positively valued by managers at the first level of management (director, deputy) than by heads of the departments, divisions/services (p ≤ 0.01) and by the headmen (p ≤ 0.01);

- Confrontation (F (3; 56) = 4.15, p ≤ 0.01) Scheffe's test showed that confrontation is more positively valued by managers at the first level of management (director, deputy) than by heads of the departments, divisions/services (p ≤ 0.05) and by the headmen (p ≤ 0.05);
- Trust (F (3; 57) = 6.21, p ≤ 0.01) Scheffe's test showed that trust is more positively valued by managers at the first

level of management (director, deputy) than by heads of the departments, divisions/ /services ($p \leq 0.01$) and by the headmen ($p \leq 0.01$);

- <u>Authenticity</u> (F (3; 54) = 3.80, $p \leq 0.05$) Scheffe's test showed that authenticity is more positively valued by managers at the first level of management (director, deputy) than by the headmen ($p \leq 0.05$);
- <u>Proactivity</u> (F (3; 54) = 4.18, $p \leq 0.01$) Scheffe's test showed that proactivity is more positively valued by managers at the first level of management (director, deputy) than by the headmen ($p \leq 0.05$);
- <u>Autonomy</u> (F (3; 52) = 8.07, $p \leq 0.01$) Scheffe's test showed that autonomy is more positively valued by managers at the first level of management (director, deputy) than by heads of the departments, divisions/services ($p \leq 0.05$) and by the headmen ($p \leq 0.01$); and
- <u>Collaboration</u> (F (3, 53) = 6.39, $p \leq 0.01$) Scheffe's test showed that collaboration is more positively valued by managers at the first level of management (director, deputy) than by heads of sectors ($p \leq 0.05$), heads of the departments, divisions/services ($p \leq 0.01$) and by the headmen ($p \leq 0.01$);

The proposed hypothesis that there are differences among managers of different levels of position regarding the perception of the impact of organizational culture is fully confirmed.

Based on the overall analysis of all dimensions of cultural values in relation to the four executive levels, some variations have been observed. The results obtained from our industrial systems indicate the following conclusions:

- Openness is higher with general directors and deputy directors (the first level of management) than with service executives and headmen (managers of the third and fourth level of management).
- Confrontation is higher with general directors and deputy directors (the first level of management) than with service

executives and headmen (managers of the third and fourth level of management).
- Trust is higher with general directors and deputy directors (the first level of management) than with service executives and headmen (managers of the third and fourth level of management).
- Authenticity is higher with general directors and deputy directors (the first level of management) than with service executives and headmen (managers of the third and fourth level of management).
- Proactivity is higher with general directors and deputy directors (the first level of management) than with service executives and headmen (managers of the third and fourth level of management).
- Autonomy is higher with general directors and deputy directors (the first level of management) than with service executives and headmen (managers of the third and fourth level of management).
- Collaboration is higher with general directors and deputy directors (the first level of management) than with heads of sectors, service executives and headmen (managers of the second, third and fourth level of management).

Based on the results it can be concluded that managers at the first level of management communicate; there is interaction between them; they have confidence; they do not manipulate each other; they are proactive in business operations; they have the freedom to decide on all processes in the organization; and that they collaborate and support each other. However, lower-level managers are unable to share their problems with others, they are not proactive and confidential, not open to collaboration, and there is a lack of openness among them.

There are differences between managers dealing with service and manufacturing activities regarding the perception of the impact of organizational culture.

T-test has shown that there are statistical differences regarding the type of activity (Table 4 and 5).

Tab. 4:	Differences regarding the type of activity; Lavene's test for equality of variances and t-test for the respondents from both public and private companies

Dependent variable	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means				
	F	p	t	df	p	Differences M	Statistic deviation of difference of M
openness	.05	.82	-4.73	145	.00	-2.20	.46
confrontation	.00	.97	-5.14	148	.00	-2.43	.47
trust	.71	.40	-3.98	150	.00	-1.42	.36
authenticity	.09	.77	-3.87	145	.00	-1.25	.32
proactivity	.33	.57	-5.34	147	.00	-2.45	.46
autonomy	2.57	.11	-4.04	144	.00	-1.51	.37
collaboration	2.82	.10	-4.88	146	.00	-1.81	.37
experimentation	1.88	.17	-4.88	142	.00	-2.12	.43

Source: Data obtained within the Project no. 179052, supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of Republic of Serbia (own research)

Tab. 5:	Descriptive indicators regarding the differences in the type of activity

Dependent variable	Type of activity	N	Aritmetic mean	Standard deviation	Statistic deviation of the aritmetic mean
openness	service	89	12.79	2.57	.27
	manufacturing	58	14.98	3.02	.40
confrontation	service	89	13.04	2.77	.29
	manufacturing	61	15.48	2.95	.38
trust	service	90	10.61	1.99	.21
	manufacturing	62	12.03	2.40	.31
authenticity	service	89	10.37	1.94	.21
	manufacturing	58	11.62	1.88	.25
proactivity	service	90	12.82	2.60	.27
	manufacturing	59	15.27	2.94	.38
collaboration	service	89	13.13	1.98	.21
	manufacturing	57	14.65	2.52	.33
experimentation	service	90	13.02	1.94	.20
	manufacturing	58	14.83	2.55	.33

Source: Data obtained within the Project no. 179052, supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of Republic of Serbia (own research)

Differences regarding the type of activity; Lavene's test for equality of variances and t-test for the respondents from both public and private companies:

- Openness (t = -4.73, df = 145, p ≤ 0.01). Openness is rated more positively by respondents from the manufacturing sector (manufacturing company M = 14.98, s = 3.02) then by service sector (M = 12.79, s = 2.57).
- Confrontation (t = -5.14, df = 148, p ≤ 0.01). Confrontation is rated more positively by respondents from the manufacturing sector (manufacturing company M = 15.48, s = 2.95) then by service sector (M = 13.04, s = 2.77).
- Trust (t = -3.98, df = 141, p ≤ 0.01). Trust is rated more positively by respondents from the manufacturing sector (manufacturing company M = 12.03, s = 2.40) then by service sector (M = 10.61, s = 1.99).

- Authenticity (t = -3.87, df = 145, p ≤ 0.01). Authenticity is rated more positively by respondents from the manufacturing sector (manufacturing company M = 11.62 = 1.88) then by service sector (M = 10.37 s = 1.94).
- Proactivity (t = -5.34, df = 147, p ≤ 0.01). Proactivity is rated more positively by respondents from the manufacturing sector (manufacturing company M = 15.27, s = 2.94) then by service sector (M = 12.82, s = 2.60).
- Collaboration (t = -4.04, df = 146, p ≤ 0.01). Authenticity in the decision making process is rated more positively by respondents from the manufacturing sector (manufacturing company M = 14.65, s = 2.52) then by service sector (M = 13.13, s = 1.98).

The level of respondent's position regarding the dimensions of organizational culture is also analyzed in the research (table 6, 7 and 8).

| Tab. 6: | The level of the position of all respondents regarding the dimensions of organizational culture |

	Level of position							
	Director, deputy, technical director		Head of the sector (division), branch		Head of the division, department/service		Headman	
	Aritmetic mean	Standard deviation	Aritmetic mean	Standard deviation	Aritmetic mean	Standard deviation	Aritmetic mean	Standard deviation
openness	14.93	3.33	13.75	2.93	13.05	2.69	13.38	2.64
confrontation	15.14	3.18	13.91	3.09	13.20	3.08	14.31	2.53
trust	12.07	2.48	11.13	2.41	10.83	2.10	11.44	2.12
authenticity	11.72	2.15	10.85	2.01	10.43	1.80	10.82	1.89
proactivity	14.76	3.26	13.95	2.93	13.30	2.83	14.06	2.92
autonomy	14.32	2.64	13.86	2.23	13.20	2.37	13.75	1.83
collaboration	14.90	2.76	13.59	2.04	13.15	2.16	13.81	2.31
experimentation	14.04	2.74	13.64	2.85	13.23	2.69	14.58	2.70

Source: Data obtained within the Project no. 179052, supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of Republic of Serbia (own research)

To understand the results in our organizations, it is useful to consider the results obtained by the same questionnaire applied on the sample of employees in Indian companies as well. The study of cultural value profiles in the U.S. [9], and Pareek's research in Indian companies (Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Limited) provide the values and norms of high and low scores (Table 9). High scores indicate a strong belief in values, and hence a strong organizational culture. Low scores indicate

a weak set of cultural values. If the average or mean score of an industrial system is low, the questions regarding the profile can be used as basis for planning measures for the improvement of the organization's culture.

These profile studies show that openness, confrontation and collaboration have low score; proactivity, autencity and autonomy have average score; while trust and experimentation have high score. The total sum is 113.95.

Tab. 7: The level of the position of respondents from companies under state/public ownership regarding the dimensions of organizational culture

	Level of position							
	Director, deputy, technical director		Head of the sector (division), branch		Head of the division, department/service		Headman	
	Aritmetic mean	Standard deviation	Aritmetic mean	Standard deviation	Aritmetic mean	Standard deviation	Aritmetic mean	Standard deviation
openness	12.94	2.61	13.16	2.72	11.88	2.69	11.92	2.25
confrontation	13.41	2.67	13.33	3.05	12.23	3.15	12.69	2.21
trust	10.65	2.00	10.52	2.31	10.35	2.17	10.69	1.60
authenticity	10.82	2.19	10.44	2.00	9.92	1.80	10.38	1.33
proactivity	12.82	2.58	13.18	2.73	12.15	2.59	12.31	2.43
autonomy	12.71	2.14	13.36	2.10	12.27	2.24	13.08	1.93
collaboration	13.29	2.28	13.23	2.06	12.42	2.16	12.69	1.70
experimentation	12.94	2.68	13.05	2.79	11.75	2.25	12.42	2.43

Source: Data obtained within the Project no. 179052, supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of Republic of Serbia (own research)

Tab. 8: The level of the position of respondents from companies under private ownership regarding the dimensions of organizational culture

	Level of position							
	Director, deputy, technical director		Head of the sector (division), branch		Head of the division, department/service		Headman	
	Aritmetic mean	Standard deviation	Aritmetic mean	Standard deviation	Aritmetic mean	Standard deviation	Aritmetic mean	Standard deviation
openness	18.00	1.73	16.09	2.63	14.93	1.28	14.29	2.49
confrontation	17.73	2.10	16.00	2.30	14.87	2.17	15.27	2.23
trust	14.27	1.42	13.33	1.15	11.67	1.72	11.87	2.28
authenticity	13.00	1.41	12.33	1.23	11.27	1.49	11.10	2.17
proactivity	17.73	1.74	16.75	1.71	15.43	1.91	15.14	2.71
autonomy	16.90	.32	15.67	1.72	14.93	1.49	14.15	1.69
collaboration	17.27	1.49	14.92	1.38	14.40	1.55	14.58	2.39
experimentation	16.22	1.39	16.00	1.61	15.60	1.24	15.81	2.02

Source: Data obtained within the Project no. 179052, supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of Republic of Serbia (own research)

According to the standards defined by Pareek, the result of the organizational culture can be in the range from 90–130.

Research results indicate that, when speaking of standards of cultural values in Serbia there are clear differences between companies under state/public and private ownership, as well as those from the manufacturing and service sector. In state-owned companies the

The total sum of cultural values amounts to 97.76. In companies under private ownership The total sum of cultural values is 117.74.

The main problem identified in our study is that the second level of management fails to recognize the importance of organizational culture; it does not encourage its creation and maintenance. Also, one of the identified problems is that, contrary to the research

Tab. 9:	Average values of cultural dimensions in India

Cultural dimensions	Indian organizations [19]
	Average value
1. Openness	13.91
2. Confrontation	13.72
3. Trust	15.16
4. Autencity	14.05
5. Proactivity	14.10
6. Autonomy	14.15
7. Collaboration	13.71
8. Experimentation	15.15
Total	113.95

Source: [19]

findings in organizations in India (Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Limited, [19]) where experimentation have high score, i.e. managers seek for new, innovative problem solving methods, trust and evaluate new ideas, the research results in Serbian organizations clearly indicate that none of the four levels of management dare to introduce new problem solving methods due to risks and uncertain outcomes. Unwillingness to introduce changes is reflected through the decision-making processes, especially in the choice of the most unacceptable business solutions.

A general view on cultural values abroad and in Serbia reveals differences in cultural dimensions, as well as in standards for specific cultural values. Contrary to foreign organizations, which need to improve openness, collaboration and confrontation, organizations in Serbia need to develop all dimensions of organizational culture. Also, it should be pointed out that the dimensions of organizational culture in Serbia are more expressed in manufacturing industrial systems than in service organizations, and that privately owned organizations recognize better organizational values in comparison with the state/public owned organizations.

Conclusion

The business world today is in the process of very rapid and numerous changes (globalization of the economy, the swift growth of electronic commerce, the increasing pace of business operations, rapid obsolescence of technological novelties, the rapid expansion of new companies in the world market), which inevitably imposes the need for the development of new models and forms of leadership.

According to the obtained results it is possible to define the existing value framework of the investigated organizational cultures, as well as the difference in the evaluation of cultural dimensions according to Pareek's model, depending on the level of management, type of organization (manufacturing or service-providing systems) and regarding the ownership structure of the studied organization. Managers at the higher level of management assess the dimensions of openness, collaboration and experimentation as more immanent, while the result of lower managers is significantly lower in all assessments of dimensions of organizational culture.

Managers working in manufacturing industrial systems assess the dimensions of culture such as openness, confrontation, autonomy and cooperation as low, while managers working in service organizations assess these dimensions even worse; openness, collaboration and experimentation have the lowest score.

Likewise, managers working in privately owned organizations assess the dimensions of openness, confrontation, autonomy, collaboration and experimentation as low, while those working in state/public-owned organizations assess openness, confrontation, collaboration and experimentation as low.

According to the findings it can be concluded that managers either do not have a clear insight into the functioning of the organization, or tend to adorn the reality of the systems they manage, or do not know what they need to do, and thus, try to present the situation at least as acceptable, and thereby surely decelerate the process of transition.

Prerequisites for making culture ready for changes in the conditions of transition in Serbia need to be focused on precisely determined working processes, system of responsibility and work motivation, and primarily on changes in organizational structures which are defined hierarchically; they are dysfunctional and therefore unable for rapid changes [8]. The research has also highlighted the problem in the employees' awareness and their personal

attitude towards changes which is burdened by their unrealistic perception of reality and the lack of professional attitude towards the work. Changes in the value system towards favoring innovation, trust, openness to new knowledge contribute more flexible and successful operations. Likewise, the creation of a culture of profound trust contributes the reduction in inertia and fear of risk.

Evans points out that culture of teaching is one of the most innovative levels related to strategic changes and it is reflected at two levels in the organization: at the level of individuals and their mutual relationships [28]. The level of individual is related to the leadership style that allows his full realization through encouragement, teaching and mentoring processes, nurturing the environment where people feel motivated and receive timely constructive feedback and continuous improvement of quality of the management implementation process. The level of mutual relationships refers to the level of availability and possibility to provide assistance through programs of specific development activities, as well as the application of knowledge management tools that enable understanding of innovative information and assist people in making good decisions.

The implementation of a desired organizational culture of changes involves primarily a change in the operation of managers employed in service-providing organizations under state/public ownership in order to define organizational behavior and maintain the direction that takes into consideration the specific situation, and includes work on the development of all segments of organizational behavior related primarily to the organizational culture.

References

[1] AL-KHALIFA, K.N., ASPINWALL, E.M. Using the competing values framework to investigate the culture of Qatar industries. *Total Quality Management*. 2001, Vol. 12, Iss. 4, pp. 417-428. ISSN 0954-4127.

[2] BROWN, A.D. Managing Understandings: Politics, Symbolism, Niche Marketing and the Quest for Legitimacy in IT Implementation. *Organization Studies*. 1995, Vol. 16, Iss. 6, pp. 951-969. ISSN 0170-8406.

[3] BROWN, A.D., STARKEY, K. The Effect of Organizational Culture on Communication and Information. *Journal of Management Studies*. 1994, Vol. 31, Iss. 6, pp. 807-828. ISSN 0022-2380.

[4] CABRERA, A., CABRERA, E.F., BARAJAS, S. The key role of organizational culture in a multi-system view of technology-driven change. *International Journal of Information Management*. 2001, Vol. 21, Iss. 3, pp. 245-261. ISSN 0268-4012.

[5] DEAL, T., KENNEDY, A. *Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life*. London: Penguin, 1982. ISBN 978-0201102772.

[6] DELLANA, S.A., HAUSER, R.D. Toward Defining the Quality Culture. *Engineering Management Journal*. 1999, Vol. 11, Iss. 2, pp. 11-15. ISSN 0265-671X.

[7] FOK, L.Y., FOK, W.M., HARTMAN, S.J. Exploring the relationship between total quality management and information systems development. *Information & Management*. 2001, Vol. 38, Iss. 6, pp. 355-371. ISSN 0378-7206.

[8] GRUBIĆ-NEŠIĆ, L. *Human resources development*. Novi Sad: AB print, 2005. ISBN 86-907943-0-1.

[9] HELLRIEGEL, D.J., SLOCUM, V. *Organizational Behavior*. 11th ed. Mason (OH): Thomson Higher Education, 2007. ISBN 978-0324-37712-6.

[10] HOFSTEDE, G. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Values*. Sage Publications, 1999. 327 p. ISBN 978-0803913066.

[11] HOREHÁJ, J., KUBISOVÁ, L. Individualistic mentality and economic education. *E+M Ekonomie a Management*. 2011, Vol. 14, Iss. 4, pp. 46-54. ISSN 1212-3609.

[12] KEKÄLE, T. *The Effects of Organizational Culture on Successes and Failures in Implementation of Some Total Quality Management Approaches. Towards a Theory of Selecting a Culturally Matching Quality Approach*. Vaasa: Acta Wasaensia, 1998. 195 p. ISBN 9516837670.

[13] KIM, J. Are we transiting from an industrial policy to a technology policy era?: a theoretical and empirical analysis. *International Journal of Technology Management*. 2010, Vol. 49, Iss. 1/2/3, pp. 155-173. ISSN 0267-5730.

[14] LEWIS, M.W., BOYER, K.K. Factors Impacting AMT Implementation: An Integrative and Focused Study. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*. 2002, Vol. 19, Iss. 2, pp. 111-130. ISSN 0923-4748.

[15] LIVARI, N. The role of organizational culture in organizational change – identifying a realistic position for prospective is research. In: *Proceedings*

of the Thirteenth European Conference on Information Systems. Mendeley, 2005.

[16] MCDERMOTT, C.M., STOCK, G.N. Organizational culture and advanced manufacturing technology implementation. *Journal of Operations Management*. 1999, Vol. 17, Iss. 5, pp. 521-533. ISSN 0272-6963.

[17] MITROVIC, S. *Managerial decision-making in industrial systems in the conditions of increased uncertainty and substantial risks in business*. Doctoral thesis, 2011. Faculty of technical sciences.

[18] O'REILLY III, C.A, CHATMAN, J., CALD-WELL, D.F. People and Oragnizational Culture: A Profile Comparison Approach to Assessing Person-Organization Fit. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1999, Vol. 34, Iss. 3, pp. 487-516. ISSN 1948-0989.

[19] PAREEK, U.N. *Training Instruments for Human Resource Development*. New Delhi: McGraw Hill, 1997. 636 p. ISBN 978-0074623299.

[20] PLISKIN, N., ROMM, T., LEE, A.S., WEBER, Y. Presumed Versus Actual Organizational Culture: Managerial Implications for Implementation of Information Systems. *The Computer Journal*. 1993, Vol. 36, Iss. 2, pp. 143-152. ISSN 1460-2067.

[21] POOL, S.W. The learning organization: motivating employees by integrating TQM philosophy in a supportive organizational culture. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*. 2000, Vol. 21, Iss. 8, pp. 373-378. ISSN 0143-7739.

[22] ROBBINS, S., COULTER, M. *Management*. NJ: Pearson Education Upper Saddle River, 2005. ISBN 0-13-127272-1.

[23] ROBEY, D., RODRIGUEZ-DIAZ, A. The Organizational and Cultural Context of Systems Implementation: Case Experience from Latin America. *Information & Management*. 1989, Vol. 17, Iss. 4, pp. 229-239. ISSN 0378-7206.

[24] RUPPEL, C.P., HARRINGTON, S.J. Sharing Knowledge Through Intranets: A Study of Organizational Culture and Intranet Implementation. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*. 2001, Vol. 44, Iss. 1, pp. 37-52. ISSN 0361-1434.

[25] SCHEIN, E.H. *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995. ISBN 978-0787903626.

[26] SHADUR, K., KIENZLE, M.A., RODWELL, J.J. The Relationship Between Organizational Climate and Employee Perceptions of Involvement. *Group & Oragnization Management*. 1999, Vol. 24, Iss. 4, pp. 479-503. ISSN 1059-6011.

[27] SMIRCICH, L. Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 1983, Vol. 28, Iss. 3, pp. 339-358. ISSN 0001-8392.

[28] SOLMS, R., SOLMS, B. From policies to culture. *Computers and Security*. 2004, Vol. 23, Iss. 4, pp. 275-279. ISSN 0167-4048.

[29] TUNG, L.L., TAN, J.H., ER, J.P., LIAN, K., TURBAN, E. Adoption, implementation and use of lotus notes in Singapore. *International Journal of Information Management*. 2000, Vol. 20, Iss. 5, pp. 369-382. ISSN 0268-4012.

Slavica Mitrović, PhD
University of Novi Sad
Faculty of Technical Sciences Novi Sad
Department of Industrial engineering and engineering management
mslavica@uns.ac.rs

Leposava Grubić Nešić, PhD
University of Novi Sad
Faculty of Technical Sciences Novi Sad
Department of Industrial engineering and engineering management
nesle@uns.ac.rs

Stevan Milisavljević, PhD
University of Novi Sad
Faculty of Technical Sciences Novi Sad
Department of Industrial engineering and engineering management
steva@uns.ac.rs

Boban Melović, PhD
University of Podgorica
Faculty of Economics
bobanm@ac.me

Zuzana Babinková
dragutin@uns.ac.rs

Abstract

MANAGER'S ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Slavica Mitrović, Leposava Grubić-Nešić, Stevan Milisavljević, Boban Melović, Zuzana Babinková

This paper analyzes the dimension of organizational culture assessment by managers, in order to diagnose the results of the research directions of changes in management that contributed to the successful functioning of the organization. The research encompassed 168 managers within 8 companies of different structure and ownership type. A Pareek questionnaire was used to measure the dimensions of corporate culture. The managers have expressed their opinions on different corporate culture dimensions on a 4-level scale. In particular, the following were considered: openness, confrontation, trust, authenticity, proactivity, autonomy, cooperation and attitude towards experimenting. Determining dominant corporate culture dimensions has primarily a purpose of identifying: the current state of value dimensions of culture, differences between opinions of managers in public sector versus those in production companies, differences between opinions pertinent to different managerial levels, and opinions about possible impact of certain dimensions of corporate culture on behavior of employees within the companies encompassed in the study. Survey results indicate a clear difference in the assessment of organizational culture in relation to the level of managers, types of organizations (manufacturing or service) and ownership status of the organization (public or private). Higher levels of management rate higher the majority of dimensions of organizational culture as compared to the lower levels of management. Managers of manufacturing industrial systems rate higher the dimensions of organizational culture in comparison with the managers of the service sector.

Managers, as bearers of the culture, can contribute to establishment of desired cultural values that will promote the development of organization. In the long turbulent transition period that Serbia has been going through – and which has a negative impact on business performance of the companies – it is vital to determine the difference between the existing values and those desired that would contribute to the fastest development of the companies.