

## An Assessment of the Dominant Organizational Culture among Faculty Members at the Hashemite University in Jordan

Ziad Altahayneh\*, Abdullah Abu-Tineh\*\*, and Samer Khasawneh\*\*

Received Date: Jan. 5, 2005

Accepted Date: Feb. 16, 2006

**Abstract:** The main purpose of this study was to determine the dominant organizational culture type as perceived by faculty members at the Hashemite University. A total of 110 faculty members participated in the study by completing the Organizational Culture Assessment Questionnaire (OCAQ). The results showed that respondents moderately practiced the four functions of the organizational culture combined (managing change, achieving goals, cultural strength, and coordinating teamwork). Cultural strength was the most perceived organizational cultural function practiced followed by achieving goals and coordinated teamwork. Managing change was the least perceived cultural function practiced by the participants. Furthermore, the relationship between academic rank and the function of managing change revealed a difference between full professors and assistant professors in the favor of assistant professors. (**Key words:** Culture, Organizational culture, managing change, achieving goals, cultural strength, and team work).

### دراسة تقييمية للثقافة التنظيمية السائدة بين أعضاء هيئة التدريس في الجامعة الهاشمية في الأردن

زياد الطحاينة، كلية التربية البدنية وعلوم الرياضة، الجامعة الهاشمية.  
عبدالله أبو تينة و سامر خصاونة، كلية العلوم التربوية،  
الجامعة الهاشمية.

ملخص: هدفت الدراسة الحالية إلى تعرف الثقافة المنظمة السائدة في الجامعة الهاشمية من وجهة نظر أعضاء هيئة التدريس فيها. وقد شارك في الدراسة 110 من أعضاء هيئة التدريس من خلال الإجابة عن فقرات الاستبانة أداة الدراسة. وقد توصلت الدراسة إلى تحديد الدرجة المتوسطة لممارسة أعضاء هيئة التدريس للوظائف الثقافية مجتمعة ولكل من إدارة التغيير، وتحقيق الأهداف، وتنسيق عمل الفرق كل على حده باستثناء القوة الثقافية، إذ حصلت على درجة ممارسة عالية جداً. يضاف إلى ذلك عدم توصل نتائج الدراسة إلى وجود فروقات دالة بين ممارسة أعضاء هيئة التدريس للوظائف الثقافية مجتمعة ومنفردة، وكل من جنس عضو هيئة التدريس، ونوع كليته، ورتبته الأكاديمية، وبلد تخرجه، وسنوات خبرته في الجامعة الهاشمية. إلا أن الدراسة أشارت إلى وجود فروق دالة إحصائية بين أعضاء هيئة التدريس من رتبة أستاذ وأستاذ مساعد في إدارة التغيير ولصالح أعضاء هيئة التدريس من رتبة أستاذ مساعد. (الكلمات المفتاحية: الثقافة، الثقافة التنظيمية، العمل الجماعي)

### Study Background and Literature Review

The 1980s witnessed an increase in the attention paid to organizational culture as an important determinant of organizational success and effectiveness. Many experts began to argue that developing a strong organizational culture is essential for success. While the link between organizational culture and organizational effectiveness is far from certain, there is no denying that each organization has a unique social structure and that these social structures drive much of the individual behavior observed in the organization (Scholl, 2003).

Researchers from different disciplines, such as management, sociology, social psychology, and psychology, have used organizational culture as a variable that measures an organization's structure, performance, and control (Schein, 1992; Schnier, 2004).

They often view culture as a new management approach that will not only cure a variety of organizational ills but will serve to explain virtually every event that occurs within an organization (Tierney, 1988).

Organizational culture studies have been adapted to higher education since 1970. A number of scholars and researchers have applied the organizational frames and the cultural context developed by management and behavioral sciences to the unique organization of higher education. Resources and time to understand the cultural values of higher education institutions are well spent (Austin, 1990). However, our lack of understanding about the role of organizational culture in improving management and institutional performance inhibits our ability to address the challenges that face higher education. As these challenges mount, our need to understand organizational culture only intensifies (Chaffee & Tierney, 1988). Culture is what makes an institution distinct and influences decisions and behaviors. Tierney and Rhoads (1988, p.7) stated "the

\* Faculty of Physical Education and Sport Science, The Hashemite University, Jordan

\*\* Faculty of Educational Sciences, The Hashemite University, Jordan

© 2006 by Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.

most fundamental construct of an organization, as of a society, is its culture. An organization's culture is reflected in what is done, how it is done, and who is involved in doing it. It concerns decisions, actions, and communication both on an instrumental and symbolic level". In other words, culture provides a fundamental direction for an institution and influences the institution's effectiveness (Skerl, 2002).

### **Defining Organizational Culture**

The definition of organizational culture is as complex and varied as the disciplines studying the phenomenon. The difficulty lies in the fact that culture is usually so ingrained within an organization that even the members are not conscious of it (Davis, 2003). Ogbonna and Harris (2000) stated that organizational culture is currently one of the most popular concepts in the field of management and organizational theory. However, there is no consensus on the meaning and relevance of the concept, but there is widespread disagreement on the definition and the scope of organizational culture concept (Ogbonna & Harris, 2000). This argument implies that there exists a variety of ways to define organizational culture.

Robins (2000) defined culture as "a system of shared meaning held by members that distinguishes the organization from other organizations" (p. 235). Similarly, Covell, Wallker, Siciliano, and Hess (2003, p.358) stated "the term used to describe the set of beliefs, norms, and values that are shared by the members of an organization. These beliefs, norms, and values have to do with the way the organization operates and what is important in that organization". Schein (1992, p.12), one of the most quoted and recognizable authority of organizational culture, has provided one of the most detailed definitions of organizational culture. He defined organizational culture as "a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems". With regard to Schein's (1992) definition, Moran and Volkwein (1992, p.36 ) added that "because the assumptions of the group have worked repeatedly, they are likely to be taken for granted and to have dropped out of awareness". Thus the definition of organizational culture appears to emphasize the taken for granted assumptions, expectations, and outlooks that govern social interaction (Song, 2002).

### **Components of Organizational Culture**

Researchers have frequently questioned what components comprise organizational culture. Deal and Kennedy (1982) identified five elements of organizational culture, which included business environment, values, heroes, rites and rituals, and cultural network. Research has also found several other elements of organizational cultures: a determination of who makes important organizational decisions, the

degree of risk taking, the attention to details in the organization, the degree to which management focuses on outcomes rather than processes, and the meaning of success in the organizations (Hawk, 1995). Moreover, Robins (1996) suggested ten elements of organizational culture. These include member identity, group emphasis, people focus, unit integration, control, risk tolerance, reward criteria, conflict tolerance, means-ends orientations, and open-system focus.

Schein (1992) identified three levels of organizational culture: artifacts, values, and basic underlying assumptions. Artifacts, the first level, are the observable forms and structures of the organization. Everything a researcher can see or witness is considered an artifact: behavior patterns, physical environment, dress codes, company records annual reports, etc. According to Schnier (2004), the concern with studying only artifacts is that they are easy to observe, but hard to translate and decipher. The second level is values. This level consists of the beliefs, norms, and ideologies of the organization. This level describes, "Why certain observed phenomena happen the way they do" (Schein, 1990, p. 112). The third level of culture is the basic underlying assumptions throughout the organization. These are somewhat more difficult to define and examine. Basic assumptions comprise "the invisible but identifiable reason why group members perceive, think, and feel the way they do about external survival and internal operational issues such as a mission, means of problem solving, relationships, time and space" (Young, 2000, p. 19). According to Schein (1992), these basic assumptions have become the most ingrained in the organization and they are more difficult to identify in an organization because members of the organization take them for granted.

Sashkin's (1990) efforts to frame organizational culture into mechanism that can be quantified originated from the theory of action in social systems developed by Parsons (1960). Parsons revealed that to survive for any substantial length of time, all organizations have to contain four crucial functions: adaptation, goal-attainment, integration, and latent pattern maintenance. Sashkin (1990) developed the Organizational Cultural Assessment Questionnaire (OCAQ), which measures the beliefs held by members of the organization, and relabeled those four functions as managing change, achieving goals, coordinating teamwork, and building a strong culture. Additionally, Sashkin included customer orientation as a fifth scale. He argued that these functions are the elements that play a role in cultural development.

Managing change is equivalent to Parsons' adaptation function and assesses the degree to which members of the organization see the organization as effective in adapting to and dealing with changes in its environment. Achieving goals measures the extent to which an organization is effective in achieving goals, the extent that there are coherent and aligned goals and the degree which shared values support organizational

improvement (Sashkin, 1990). All organizations have goals to achieve and having strong explicit goal is a huge contributor to success (Song, 2002). Also, goal achievement is facilitated when an organization's members are 'in line' or aligned with one another and with the overall goals of the organization (Sashkin 1990). What motivates the members to achieve goals is the shared belief that it is important to reach not only their goals, but organizations as well. Coordinated teamwork pertains to Parsons' integration function since it assesses the extent to which the organization is effective in coordinating the work of individuals and groups and the extent to which collaboration is present (Stevens, 1997). According to Sashkin (1990), coordinated teamwork is an essential factor for the long-term survival of an organization. As the work environment is becoming more and more complex, workers need to know how to quickly adjust to unpredictable circumstances. Therefore, the belief that all members constitute a whole, the idea that one-event affects all, is an important factor (Song, 2002).

Customer orientation assesses the extent to which organizational activities are directed toward identifying and meeting the needs and goals of clients and customers (Sashkin, 1990). Cultural strength relates to Parsons' values characteristic (Stevens, 1997). It is a measure of the extent to which members of the organization agree on the values and the extent to which certain core values are present. All organizations have a culture of values and beliefs by its members that contribute to the stability of the organization. A strong culture is important because it provides greater stability of organizational functions which helps to ensure the survival of the organization. However, there is a difference between stability and effectiveness. It is important to notice that strong culture, in which every member of an organization strongly holds on to a clear set of common values and beliefs, will not inevitably help an organization to survive and be effective. When strong values work against effective performance, a strong culture may hamper organizational survival (Song, 2002).

### **Organizational Culture in Higher Education**

There has been some disagreement about whether an institution of higher education can have one culture. Researchers have approached the concept of organizational culture in higher education from different perspectives. Clark (1987) examined culture from the faculty perspective and from the system point of view. Others have viewed the institutional culture from an academic perspective and examined faculty culture (e.g., Burroughs, 2000; Johnson, 2001; Schnier, 2004). Others have related it to leadership (e.g., Davis, 2003; Howard, 2004).

Researchers have also identified the factors that affect the institutional culture. Kuh and Whitt (1988) combined much of the research into seven factors that they believed affect culture. The history of the institution and external factors such as being a state or

private, religious affiliation, and social attitudes are important to culture formation. The academic program must also support the culture, as must a core group of personnel, usually faculty and administrators. The campus social environment will attract a particular type of student that will influence the institutional culture. Campus artifacts, observable manifestations of campus values and beliefs, are also important factors of the culture. These include both the physical environment and symbolic artifacts such as rites, rituals, and ceremonies. Institutions also have distinctive themes that make them unique, even though they may be a similar type of institution. The last factor Kuh and Whitt identified was the importance of individual actors on the institutional culture. Typically these individuals were presidents who had a profound impact on shaping the culture of an institution or managing it.

Bergquist (1992) conducted an in-depth study about institutional cultures. The study revealed four types of cultures: (a) the "collegiate culture" described institutions that are directed toward disciplinary scholarship and research the collegiate culture also values faculty autonomy, academic freedom, and leaders who possess a vision and are politically intelligent. (b) the "managerial culture" which values systematic and efficient methods of teaching and managing, formal lines of authority, and employs techniques adopted from the corporate world. (c) the "developmental culture" combined some elements of the previously mentioned cultures but is more closely aligned with the managerial culture. A developmental culture values teaching and developing its students, faculty, and staff, although is also emphasizing planning, goal setting, and evaluation. This culture is viewed by some as having institutional values that are idealistic and politically native (Stevens, 1997). (d) the "negotiating culture" evolved from unions and collective bargaining when other cultures could not meet the needs of their employees. The negotiating culture values equity and social equality and more authority are given mid-level managers through the collective bargaining agreement. These four cultures examined the role of faculty, the educational program, the institution's structure and decision-making process, and institutional values in determining an institution's culture (Stevens, 1997).

Sckerl (2002) studied the connections between institutional culture type, congruence, and strength and institutional effectiveness and change efforts at a Midwest university. The results indicated that the hierarchy and clan culture types were dominant at both the institutional and college and subunit levels. There was little congruence for the attributes assessed, and the culture was not particularly strong.

Schnier (2004) used a quantitative survey to determine the organizational culture of faculty members at regionally accredited proprietary institutions. She found that the dominant organizational culture was a constructive culture with a primary cultural style of

humanistic-encouraging. Additionally, all subgroups defined the constructive culture as their dominant organizational culture; however, only passive-defensive and aggressive-defensive cultures exhibited significant results.

### Significance of the Problem

Organizational culture has been studied since the 1980s and much progress has been made on the empirical as well as on the conceptual level. However, much work remains to be done. There is still a need for research that is theory-driven and includes other than self-report measures. Moreover, valid tools for individual assessment have to be developed as well as specific-organizational-interventions (Schaufeli & Bunnk, 1996).

With higher education experiencing a decline of resources and an environment that is turbulent, an understanding of culture is needed to deal with the strains. Having a typology or framework facilitates this process. The culture should be analyzed during prosperous times so that when a crisis or conflict precipitates, an understanding will already be in place. This will aid higher education leaders in the decision making process and the implementation of strategy. Strategic planners following their mission and goals can look at what type of culture best matches the area that they want to be most effective, which in turn can aid in the planning process.

Defining the organizational culture of university faculty members may assist higher education constituents in a variety of ways. First, a new type of faculty may create a new type of organizational culture within higher education. Thus, defining the organizational culture may assist in areas such as faculty development, faculty recruitment, academic freedom, and management practices. Second, without an understanding of this new emerging faculty within higher education, policy-makers and college leaders may find themselves in a reactive role rather than a proactive one. To effectively create change, leaders of any organization must understand the existing values and beliefs that make up the attitudes and actions of their constituents – the culture of the organization (Schnier, 2004).

Through the exploration of the faculty's organizational culture at the Hashemite University (HU), the results of the study can offer not only a better understanding of organizational culture at HU but those same results can also contribute a "mirror" to other higher institutions in Jordan. The study adds to the existing, though minimal, body of literature related to the organizational culture of faculty members. The knowledge gained from the findings of this study may be useful in creating environments in which faculty members can role model empowered action and facilitate empowered behaviors for future graduates of their programs.

### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the dominant organizational culture of faculty members at the Hashemite University in Jordan. Academic researchers have argued that organizational culture among faculty members affects numerous educational effectiveness outcomes such as student satisfaction, student progress, academic integrity, and faculty behavior. Specifically, the following research questions guided the investigation.

1. What is the type of organizational culture practiced by faculty members at the Hashemite University?
2. Does organizational culture practice differ based on selected faculty variables, specifically, gender, type of college, country of graduation, years of work experience, and academic rank?

### Instrumentation

A modified version of the Organizational Culture Assessment Questionnaire (OCAQ) developed by Sashkin (1990) was utilized to assess the organizational culture type of the Hashemite University as perceived by its faculty members. The OCAQ was designed to measure the way people within an organization think and act (Sashkin, 1990).

The QCAQ measures five functions of organizational culture: managing change, achieving goals, coordinating teamwork, customer orientation, and building a strong culture. The questionnaire asks six questions in each of the five cultural elements for a total of thirty questions. The customer orientation function was eliminated from the current study because it was beyond its scope. Accordingly, the modified OCAQ used in the present study consisted of a total of 24 questions with six questions in each of the four functions.

Using a 5-point Likert-type scale, response options for the subscales ranged from 1 (not true) to 5 (completely true). Therefore, the combined scores of each scale can range from a low of 6 to a high of 30, and the OCAQ total score as modified for this study can range from a minimum of 24 to a maximum of 120. Sashkin (1990) suggested that an organization that obtained a high combined score is considered to have an effective organizational culture. Table 1 shows ranges of the cultural functions.

**Table 1:** Organizational Culture Assessment Questionnaire Norms

	Managing Change	Achieving Goals	Coordinated Teamwork	Cultural Strength	Total
Very High	24	22-24	22-24	21-24	95 +
High	21-23	18-22	19-22	18-20	86-94
Average	15-20	13-18	14-18	14-17	70-85
Low	12-14	9-12	11-14	10-13	61-69
Very Low	5-11	5-8	5-10	5-10	24-60

Validity and reliability for the OCAQ have been demonstrated through different studies (e.g., Giese, 1995; Hall, 1999; Song, 2002; Uzzo, 2002). For instance, Uzzo (2002) reported internal consistency estimates (Cronbach's alpha) for the OCAQ of .66, .84, .76, .74, and .84 for managing change, achieving goals,

coordinated teamwork, customer orientation, and cultural strength, respectively. Giese (1995) modified the OCAQ statements to reflect culture in higher education institutions. The modified instrument showed a reliability correlation coefficient of .89, using the Person Product Moment Correlation (PPMC).

To assure the psychometric properties of the questionnaire in our organizational context (the Hashemite University), an expert review of the content validity from three experts in the field educational administration was conducted. Internal consistency measures for all dimensions were computed by calculating Cronbach's alpha coefficients. The results of the analyses were .86 for managing change, .78 for achieving goals, .87 for coordinating teamwork, .82 for cultural strength, and .84 for the total scale. All of the reliabilities were judged to be acceptable based upon Nunnally and Bernstein's (1994) recommendations of alpha being greater than .70.

#### Population and Sample

The population of interest for this study was faculty members working at the Hashemite University in Jordan (N = 251). A total of 160 questionnaires were administered to a randomly selected sample during the summer semester 2003/2004. Of these, 110 were completed and returned, yielding a response rate of 68.75%. Out of the 110 participants, 82 were males (74.5%) and 28 were females (25.5%). Eighty percent of the faculty members who responded were assistant professors, 10.9% were associate professors, and 9.1% were full professors. Sixty of the faculty members (54.5%) taught in scientific colleges, while 50 (45.5%) came from colleges of humanities and social sciences. Table (2) illustrates the demographic characteristics of the participants.

**Table 2:** Division of Faculty Members by Gender, Type of College, Academic Rank, and Experience in Teaching.

Variable		Number	Percentage
Gender	Male	82	74.5%
	Female	28	25.5%
Type of College	Scientific	60	54.5%
	Humanities	50	45.5%
Academic Rank	Full professor	10	9.1%
	Associate professor	12	10.9%
	Assistant professor	88	80.0%
Country of Graduation	USA	36	32.7%
	Europe & Australia	37	33.6%
	Arab countries	37	33.6%
Experience	1-3 years	38	34.5%
	4-6 years	42	38.2%
	7-9 years	30	27.3%

#### Data Analysis

All statistical analyses were carried out using the SPSS computer package, version 12.1. Initially, the internal consistency of each scale was examined to

ensure the instrument used in this study was reliable for the present sample. Means and standard deviations were calculated to describe the sample as a whole. T-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and Scheffe test were also used to answer the research questions.

#### Results

To answer the first research question, that is to determine the dominant organizational culture type as perceived by faculty members in the Hashemite University, means and standard deviations were computed. The results, displayed in Table 3, show that respondents moderately practiced the four functions of the organizational culture combined ( $M=76.86$ ) according to the OCAQ standard scores suggested by Sashkin (1990; see Table 1). Among the four cultural functions, Cultural Strength ( $M=22$ ) was the most perceived organizational cultural function practiced followed by achieving goals ( $M=19.6$ ), and coordinated teamwork ( $M=18.3$ ). Managing change was the least perceived cultural function practiced by the participants ( $M=15.8$ ).

**Table 3:** Means and Standard Deviations of the Organizational Culture Functions as Perceived by Faculty Members

	Means	Std. Deviations
Cultural Strength	22.0	2.84
Achieving Goals	19.6	3.46
Coordinated Teamwork	18.3	3.52
Managing Change	15.8	3.01
Total	76.86	8.91

To answer the second research question, that is, to investigate the relationship between the demographic characteristics of faculty members and practicing the four functions of organizational culture combined and separated, t-test for independent samples and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were utilized. Table 4 showed that there were no significant relationships between males and females in practicing the four functions of organizational culture. Similar results were found with regard to the type of college (scientific or humanities). The results, presented in Table 5, showed that there were no significant differences between faculty members working at scientific colleges and those working at colleges of humanities in practicing the four functions of organizational culture.

**Table 4:** Differences between Faculty Members' Males and Females in Practicing Functions of Organizational Culture Combined and Separated

	Gender	N	Means	Std. Deviations	t	p
Managing Change	M	82	15.59	3.01	-1.28	.20
	F	28	16.41	2.79		
Achieving Goals	M	82	19.65	3.46	-.04	.96
	F	28	19.68	3.90		
Coordinated Teamwork	M	82	18.34	3.52	.08	.93
	F	28	18.27	3.97		
Cultural Strength	M	82	22.07	2.84	-.89	.37
	F	28	22.62	2.71		
Total	M	82	76.70	8.91	-.30	.76
	F	28	77.31	10.16		

**Table 5:** Differences between Faculty Members in Scientific Colleges (Sc.) and Faculty Members in humanities Colleges (Hu.) in Practicing Functions of Organizational Culture Combined and Separated

	College	N	Means	Std. Deviations	t	p
Managing Change	Sc.	60	15.82	3.02	.03	.97
	Hu.	50	15.80	2.94		
Achieving Goals	Sc.	60	19.40	3.76	-.70	.48
	Hu.	50	19.88	3.40		
Coordinated Teamwork	Sc.	60	18.32	4.01	-.02	.98
	Hu.	50	18.33	3.30		
Cultural Strength	Sc.	60	22.00	3.09	-.74	.46
	Hu.	50	22.40	2.56		
Total	Sc.	60	76.22	10.08	-.66	.50
	Hu.	50	77.40	8.48		

ANOVA was conducted to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between country of graduation, years of experience, and academic rank and practicing the four functions of OC. The results presented in Table 6 showed that there were no significant differences among faculty members in practicing the four functions of organizational culture combined or separated that were attributed to their country of graduation. Similarly, no significant differences were found regarding years of experience (see Table 7).

**Table 6:** Differences among the Three Level Groups of Country of Graduation (American, European and Australian, or Arab Universities) in Practicing Functions of Organizational Culture Combined and Separated

	Sum of Squares		df	F	p
Managing Change	Between Groups	2.836	2	.159	.853
	Within Groups	956.155	107		
	Total	958.991	109		
Achieving Goals	Between Groups	9.168	2	.356	.701
	Within Groups	1377.387	107		
	Total	1386.555	109		
Coordinated Teamwork	Between Groups	13.759	2	.517	.598
	Within Groups	1422.559	107		
	Total	1436.218	109		
Cultural Strength	Between Groups	13.379	2	.845	.433
	Within Groups	847.384	107		
	Total	860.764	109		
Total	Between Groups	13.036	2	.075	.927
	Within Groups	9251.919	107		
	Total	9264.955	109		

**Table 7:** Differences among the Three Experience Level Groups (1-3Y, 4-6Y, or 7-9Y) in Practicing Functions of Organizational Culture Combined and Separated

	Sum of Squares		df	F	p
Managing Change	Between Groups	3.285	3	.121	.947
	Within Groups	955.706	106		
	Total	958.991	109		
Achieving Goals	Between Groups	24.157	3	.627	.599
	Within Groups	1362.397	106		
	Total	1386.555	109		
Coordinated Teamwork	Between Groups	2.227	3	.055	.983
	Within Groups	1433.491	106		
	Total	1436.218	109		

	Sum of Squares		df	F	p
Cultural Strength	Between Groups	60.200	3	2.657	.052
	Within Groups	800.564	106		
	Total	860.764	109		
Total	Between Groups	156.459	3	.607	.612
	Within Groups	9108.496	106		
	Total	9264.955	109		

With regard to the relationship between academic rank and practicing the four functions of organizational culture, the results presented in Table 8 revealed that there were no significant differences in practicing the four functions of organizational culture combined, achieving goals, coordinated teamwork, and cultural strength, but has a significant difference in practicing managing change (see Table 8). Using Scheffe comparison test revealed that the difference was between full professors and assistant professors in the favor of assistant professors (see Table 9).

**Table 8:** Differences among the Three Rank Level Groups (Full, Associate, or Assistant Professor) in Practicing Functions of Organizational Culture Combined and Separated

	Sum of Squares		df	F	p
Managing Change	Between Groups	85.686	2	5.249	.007
	Within Groups	873.305	107		
	Total	958.991	109		
Achieving Goals	Between Groups	1.857	2	.072	.930
	Within Groups	1384.680	107		
	Total	1386.555	109		
Coordinated Teamwork	Between Groups	1.913	2	.071	.931
	Within Groups	1434.305	107		
	Total	1436.218	109		
Cultural Strength	Between Groups	25.550	2	1.637	.199
	Within Groups	835.214	107		
	Total	860.764	109		
Total	Between Groups	38.191	2	.221	.802
	Within Groups	9226.764	107		
	Total	9264.955	109		

**Table 9:** Scheffe Test for the Differences among the Three Level Groups of Academic Rank in Practicing Managing Change

	Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
Full Professor	-	-1.97	-3.95**
Associate Professor		-	1.97
Assistant Professor			-

\*\* Significant at the  $p < .05$  level.

## Discussion and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine the dominant organizational culture at the Hashemite University. This study also determined the relationship between type of organizational culture and selected demographic variables (gender, type of college, country of graduation, work experience, and academic rank).

The findings of the present study showed that the functions of organizational culture combined were moderately practiced by the faculty members at the Hashemite University. Based on the Organizational Cultural Assessment Questionnaire (OCAQ) norms (see Table 1), the perception of the collective organizational

culture overall ( $M=76.86$ ) was above the average level. Sashkin (1990) suggested that an organization that obtained a high combined score might be considered to have an effective organizational culture. Therefore, the results indicated that the Hashemite University has effective organizational culture, which may contribute to achieving its goals.

The findings revealed that "managing change" was perceived as the least cultural function practiced by faculty members ( $M=15.8$ ). This result was consistent with the educational literature, in that, change in institutions of higher education is difficult and encounters resistance and maintaining the status quo (Barzun, 1993; Conner, 1992; Lick & Kaufman, 2001; Smith, 2002; Trader-Leigh, 2002). In contrast, building a strong culture (cultural strength) at the Hashemite University had the highest mean scores and was interpreted very high according to the OCAQ Norms. This result was consistent with literature on cultural change where "strong cultures may be more resistant to change while weak cultures may be more susceptible to change" (ODR., 1991, p.10). Strong culture is important because it provides greater stability of organizational functions which helps to ensure the survival of the organization. This result suggests that the faculty members at the Hashemite University had a culture of values and beliefs that contribute to the stability of their organization. In short, assessing the degree of consistency between the existing culture and the kind of culture needed to implement the change is critical to the success of any new organization (Conner, 1992).

With regard to the demographic variables investigated in this study, all variables (i.e., gender, type of college, country of graduation, work experience, and academic rank) had no effect on practicing the four functions of organizational culture combined and separated except for managing change. Assistant professors at the Hashemite University perceived themselves to be more able to adapt to and deal with changes in their environment than full professors. This result could be justified by the assumption that full professors have deeply held and taken for granted beliefs and generalizations about how things should be done at university and how to do their work and how that limit their acceptance to change. Therefore, full professors should develop the capacity to suspend their beliefs, assumptions, and generalizations long enough to seek out new knowledge which may cause them to revise their beliefs about what they do and why (Bamburg, 2001).

There are several limitations that must be addressed with respect to this study. The sample was limited to faculty members with ranks of assistant, associate, and full professors only working at the Hashemite University. Caution should be used when attempting to interpret and generalize the findings. Another limitation is that the data were gathered at one point in time (summer semester), thus causal effects could not be established. It would be interesting to

engage in time-series research to determine causal effects between faculty variables and organizational culture.

Given the exploratory nature of the study results, suggestions for practice are necessarily speculative and brief. First, understanding cultural elements within organizations of higher education can assist faculty members and administrative personnel to work more effectively with colleagues because they will know the values and normative behavior in their work. Knowing the norms of an organization can prevent misconceptions and misunderstandings and reduce the number of conflicts. Second, the organizational Culture Assessment Questionnaire proved to be a valid and reliable instrument for assessing cultural elements in organizations. The OCAQ could be beneficial in future research in higher education to gain information about departments and divisions. Third, more research is needed to study the effect of demographic variables and organizational culture. Forth, professionals should be cautious in generalizing these results to other institutions in higher education. To determine if the results are transferable to other institutions, it would be helpful to have this study replicated in other institutions in the country. More research directed towards administrative subculture in higher education is also needed to fill a void in the literature. Finally, organizational culture, according to Smith (2002), will be the most important factor in determining the success or failure of organizations in the next decade. Therefore, further research is needed to assess other aspects of organizational culture at the Hashemite University.

## References

- Austin, A. A. (1990). Faculty cultures, faculty values. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *Assessing academic climates and cultures* (pp.61-74). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bamburg, J. (2001) Transforming education: Learning, learning organizations, and leadership: Implications for the year 2050. Retrieved October 25, 2004 from <http://www.newhorizons.org/trans/bamburg.htm>
- Barzun, J. (1993). *The American university*. (2nd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bergquist, W. H. (1992). *The four cultures of the academy: Insights and strategies for improving leadership in collegiate organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Burroughs, L. K. (2000). Female faculty perceptions of organizational culture at a major research university. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 182. (UMI No. AAT 9980124).
- Chaffee, E. E., & Tierney, W. G. (1988). *Collegiate culture and leadership strategies*. New York: Macmillan Pub. Co.
- Clark, B. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Conner, D. (1992). *Managing at the speed of change*. New York: Villard.

- Covell, D. Wallker, S., Siciliano, J., & Hess, P. W. (2003). *Managing sports organizations: Responsibilities for performance*. Mason, Ohio: South-Western.
- Davis, N. L. (2003). *Organizational culture and leadership: Analyzing their roles in hypocrisy and workplace aggression*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate University, California.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rights and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Giese, R. J. (1995). *Assessing the organizational cultures of the California community colleges that have not implemented shared governance*. . Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne, CA.
- Hall, C. A. (1999). *The relationship between leader behavior and characteristics and school culture*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida.
- Hawk, E. (1995). Culture and rewards: A balancing act. *Personnel Journal*, 74(4), 30.
- Howard, M. P. (2004). *A study of the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational culture*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan
- Johnson, B. A. H. (2001). Organizational culture and job satisfaction as antecedents for empowerment of associate degree nursing faculty. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 137. (UMI No. AAT 3001509).
- Kuh, G. D., & Witt, E. J. (1988). *The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Lick, D. W., & Kaufman, R. (2001). Change creation: The rest of the planning story. In, J. V. Boettcher, M. M. Doyle, & R. W. Jensen (Eds.), *Technology-driven planning: Principles to practice* (pp. 24-36). SCUP: Michigan.
- Moran, E. T., & Volkwein, J. F. (1992). The cultural approach to the formation of organizational climate. *Human Relations*, 45(1): 19-47.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ogbonna, E., & Harris, L. C. (2000). Leadership style, organizational and performance: Empirical evidence from UK companies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(4): 766-788.
- Organizational Development Resources (ODR, 1991). *Culture assessment*. Unpublished Report by ODR, Inc. Atlanta, GA.
- Parsons, T. (1960). *Structure and process in modern societies*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Robins, S. P. (1996). *Organizational behavior: Concepts, controversies, and applications*. Englewood Cliffs: New Jersey
- Robbins, S. P. (2000). *Essentials of organizational behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Sashkin, M. (1990). *The organizational culture assessment questionnaire*. Seabrook, MD: Ducochon Press.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Buunk, B. P. (1996). Professional burnout. In M. J. Schabracq, J. A. M. Winnubst, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.) *Handbook of work and health psychology*. (pp. 311-346). New York: Wiley.
- Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. In W. L. French, J. A. M. Winnubst, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Organizational development and transformation* (pp. 127-141). New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Schnier, K.L. (2004). *Organizational culture of faculty members at regionally accredited, associate degree-granting, proprietary institutions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loyola University Chicago, Illinois.
- Sckerl, J. A. M. (2002). *Organizational culture in higher education effectiveness: A case study of a Midwest university in change*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of South Dakota.
- Smith, M. E. (2002). Implementing organizational change: Correlates of success and failure. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 15(1), 67-83.
- Song, S. (2002). *The relationship between transactional/ transformational leadership behaviors and organizational culture in selected South Korean sport teams*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
- Stevens, I. (1997). *A comparison of organizational culture between academic affairs administrators and student affairs administrators at selected institutions of higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida.
- Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59, 2-21.
- Trader-Leigh, K. E. (2002). Case study: Identifying resistance in change management. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 15(2), 138-155.
- Uzzo, J. P. (2002). *A comparison of organizational culture between administrative affairs administrators and academic affairs administrators at selected institutions of higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma.
- Young, D. W. (2000 Sept.-Oct.). The six levers for managing organizational culture. *Business Horizons*, 19-28.



## Appendix 1

### Organizational Culture Assessment Questionnaire

This questionnaire measures the ways people at various levels generally think and act. The 24 questions ask you to describe, as best as you can, how people in your organization typically behave, the sorts of things they generally believe about the organization, and how the organization operates.

Please circle one number for each question that reflects your opinion about the organization in which you work. Use the following key to choose your answers.

1	2	3	4	5
Not true	Slightly true	Partly true	Mostly true	Completely true

1- This organization clearly demonstrates that it can adapt to changing conditions as needed.	1 2 3 4 5
2- People have clearly defined goals.	1 2 3 4 5
3- The complexity of people's roles and task is so great that most managers have given up trying to coordinate with one another.	1 2 3 4 5
4- People believe in accepting one another as they are rather than trying to change one another.	1 2 3 4 5
5- People agree that there is no point in trying to cope with conditions imposed on us from outside.	1 2 3 4 5
6- People try to do their best, with little pressure to strive for specific goals.	1 2 3 4 5
7- People believe in letting every one do his or her own thing.	1 2 3 4 5
8- This organization has developed a stable pattern of shared values, beliefs, and norms of behavior.	1 2 3 4 5
9- When changes are necessary, everyone has a clear idea of what the sorts of activities are and are not acceptable.	1 2 3 4 5
10- Individual action is channeled into achieving the goals of the total organization rather than goals of individual managers.	1 2 3 4 5
11- Management believes in making sure that everything happens according to the plans made at higher levels.	1 2 3 4 5
12- People rely on another to understand what is really happening and why.	1 2 3 4 5
13- The pressure to maintain the status quo is so great that if major changes were required for the organization to survive, it might not	1 2 3 4 5
14- People deal effectively with problems that involve defining and attaining goals.	1 2 3 4 5
15- People clearly understand their job assignments and how these relate to the job assignments of others.	1 2 3 4 5
16- People are expected to support their views and beliefs with concrete facts.	1 2 3 4 5
17- People believe that they can influence, control, or work positively with important factors and forces in our environment.	1 2 3 4 5
18- Most people have their own goals that may or may not be compatible with others' goals.	1 2 3 4 5
19- People believe in working together collaboratively, preferring cooperation over competition.	1 2 3 4 5
20- It is accepted that people usually have their own ways of seeing and making sense of situations.	1 2 3 4 5
21- We believe in making our outside stakeholders into valued allies.	1 2 3 4 5
22- Taking action to attain new goals is valued in this organization more than maintaining the status quo.	1 2 3 4 5

23- Making sure that managers at all levels coordinate effectively is seen as the responsibility of all managers involved, not just as the responsibility of top executives.	1 2 3 4 5
24- Everyone strongly believes in a set of values about how people should work together to solve common problems and reach shared objectives.	1 2 3 4 5