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Abstract

This research suggests that there is a lack of congruence between the Iranian Institutes of Higher Education culture and the faculties desired culture. This conclusion is based on empirical data that indicate that faculties believe that they operate on a day-to-day basis in a profession whose culture is characterized by an overarching desire for stability and control, formal rules and policies, coordination and efficiency, goal and results oriented, and hard-driving competitiveness. Emphasizing this lack of cultural congruence, the respondents of this study also indicated that the faculties culture should be one that emphasizes flexibility, discretion, participation, human resource development, innovation, creativity, risk-taking, and a long-term emphasis on professional growth and the acquisition of new professional knowledge and skills, which is more aligned with the universities strategic external environment.

One of the principal reasons for the popular interest in the study of organizational culture is to determine the linkage between it and organizational performance (Berrio, 2003). This study has reviewed a previously assumed but unverified connection between organizational culture and leadership styles. It has uncovered a lack of congruence between the dominant type of organizational culture and leadership styles. This observed lack of congruence may be inhibiting performance and unconsciously perpetuating a cycle of caution and an over reliance on stability and control.
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1.Introduction

An examination of the literature in the fields of organizational culture and leadership finds that the two areas have been independently linked to organizational performance. For example, researchers have examined the links between leadership styles and performance (see Bycio et al., 1995), and also between organizational culture and performance (see Kotter and Heskett, 1992). Furthermore, numerous aspects of the organizational culture literature allude to the role of leaders in ‘creating’ and ‘maintaining’ particular types of culture (for example, Schein, 1992). Equally, the literature on leadership suggests that the ability to understand and work within a culture is a prerequisite to managerial effectiveness.

However, despite the implicit and explicit linking of culture and leadership in many parts of organization theory, little critical research attention has been devoted to understanding the links between the two concepts and the impact that such an association might have on managerial effectiveness. The absence of critical literature exploring the effectiveness implications of the links between organizational culture and leadership is surprising given the numerous references to the importance of the two concepts in the functioning of organizations (see, Schein, 1992). The aim of this paper is to provide empirical evidence of the links between different types of organizational culture, a range of leadership styles and managerial effectiveness. This is achieved through the presentation of the results of a cross sectional survey of leadership style, organizational culture, and managerial effectiveness across nine universities in Iran.

The paper begins with a brief review of the literature on organizational culture and leadership. This is followed by a discussion of the methodology adopted for the study and the presentation of the findings and analysis of responses to questionnaire exploring the links between the two concepts and managerial effectiveness. The evidence demonstrates that the relationship between leadership style and effectiveness is mediated by cultural congruence. In the final part of the paper, the conclusions and implications of the study are highlighted.

As more and more universities enter into new arrangements in 21st century, the need to assess organisational cultures becomes more important. The term ‘organisational culture’ has proved difficult to define, but several of its important components are agreed on by most researchers. These include the norms, perspectives, values, assumptions and beliefs shared by organisational members. Due to the abstract nature of these elements, there is a considerable challenge for external researchers who want to assess organisational culture. It is even difficult for members of an organization to describe their own culture. Cameron and Freeman (1991, p.31) use the old proverb “Fish discover water last” to illustrate the problem of assessing culture among those immersed in it.

The aim of this study is to provide insight into the construct of culture and its relationship with leadership styles in the context of higher education institutions and to discuss competing values framework as one of approaches to measurement of culture. The paper starts with a discussion on how the concept of organisational culture is understood in the setting of higher education institutions, and is followed by a brief introduction to the tradeoffs between qualitative and quantitative approaches to assess culture. Based on the basic psychometric requirements for measuring culture, this study concludes by identifying some of the implications of selecting or designing instruments for assess cultural differences in higher education institutions.

2.Organizational Culture and Leadership Styles

Before attempting to describe the content of organisational culture, one should first know the concept of organisational culture. Organizational culture has been criticized as being conceptually weak, since it has been defined in many ways (Jelinek et al., 1983) and each definition emphasizes a particular focus or level. Since Schein (1992) published the book Organisational Culture and Leadership, more researchers have recognized culture as a multidimensional and multilevel concept. Schein describes three levels of culture. The first level consists of visible organisational structures and actions, such as dress code, facilities and procedures. This level of culture can be easily observed. The second level consists of espoused values manifested in the public images of organisations, such as strategies, goals, and philosophies. While not as visible as the artefacts present in the first level, these values can be ascertained by norms, the way things are done in the organisation. The third level consists of basic assumptions, or unconscious beliefs, perceptions, thoughts, and feelings. These determine both behaviour norms (the way people should behave) and organisational values (the things that are highly valued).
According to Buono and Bowditch (1989, p.137-139), the visible elements created by an organization on the first level are treated as objective organizational culture, while the elements on the second and the third levels are concerned with subjective organizational culture. Most researchers agree that subjective culture is more important as a significant determinant of beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors, and it thus provides a more distinctive basis for characterizing and interpreting similarities and differences among people in different organizations. On this understanding, university culture as a particular form of organizational culture can be defined “as the collective, mutually shaping patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that guide the behavior of individuals and groups in an institute of higher education and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off campus” (Kuh & Whitt, 2000, p.162). While the term organizational culture is used as if an organization has a monolithic culture, most organizations have more than one set of beliefs influencing the behavior of their members (Morgan, 1986; Sathe, 1985). Cultural diversity appears to be more obvious in higher education institutions (Kuh & Whitt, 2000, p.161). The “small homogenous society” analogues used in anthropological studies of culture is sorely strained when applied to many contemporary institutions of higher education.

Large public, multipurpose universities are comprised of many different groups whose members may or may not share or abide by all of the institution’s norms, values, practices, beliefs, and meanings. Instead of viewing colleges and universities as monolithic entities, it is more realistic to analyze them as multicultural contexts that are host to numerous subgroups with different priorities, traditions, and values (Kuh & Whitt, 2000 p.161).

This study pays particular attention to academic staff and specifically those engaged at the departmental level. Therefore, from the perspective of this paper, the culture refers to values, beliefs, and assumptions developed within an academic department by academic staff and those who manage academics through joint experiences over long periods of time. Nevertheless, disciplinary identity is not the sole source of the culture shared by academic staff members within an academic sub-unit. It is also subject to a variety of circumstances, such as national context, professional culture and organizational character (Austin, 1992; Clark, 1983, p.75; Välimaa, 1998).

3. A Review of the CVF Model and the Study Methodology

An Overview of the Competing Values Framework (CVF) Model
The Competing Values Framework (CVF) evolved from the work of Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981, 1983) as they attempted to circumscribe the elusive definition for a generally agreed upon theoretical framework of the concept of organizational effectiveness. This framework was chosen for this study because it was experimentally derived and found to have a high degree of face and empirical validity. Additionally, the CVF was identified as having a high level of reliability matching or exceeding that of other instruments commonly used in the social and organizational sciences (Cameron and Ettington, 1988; Cameron and Quinn, 2006; Berrio, 2003).

The four quadrants of the framework, representing the four major cultural types: clan, adhocracy, market, hierarchy, provide a robust explanation of the differing orientations and competing values that characterize human behavior. The richness provided by the CVF is based on its ability to identify the basic assumptions, orientations, and values of each of the four cultural types. These three elements comprise the core of organizational culture. “The OCAI, therefore, is an instrument that allows you to diagnose the dominant orientation of your own organization based on these core culture types. It also assists you in diagnosing your organization’s cultural strength, cultural type, and cultural congruence” (Cameron and Quinn,2006, p. 33). In their research concerning organizational effectiveness, Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981, 1983) statistically analyzed 39 indicators of organizational effectiveness as identified by Campbell, et al., (1974). Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s analysis resulted in the bifurcation of the 39 effectiveness criteria between two major dimensions. The first dimension, which is labeled the “Structure” dimension, differentiates the organizational effectiveness criteria between those that emphasize flexibility, discretion, and dynamism and those that emphasize stability, order, and control.

The second dimension, which is labeled the “Focus” dimension, differentiates the organizational effectiveness criteria between those that emphasize internal orientation, integration, and unity and those effectiveness criteria that emphasize an external orientation, differentiation, and rivalry (Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1981 and 1983; Cameron and Quinn, 2006). Within each of these two dimensions there is also a third set of values, which produces an emphasis ranging from organizational processes, such as planning and goal setting at one end of the spectrum, to an emphasis on results, such as resource acquisition at the other end. Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981) labeled this third set of values as the organizational “Means – Ends” continuum. The two primary dimensions differentiating between organizational values emphasizing “Structure” and “Focus” produce four clusters of effectiveness criteria as depicted in Figure 1. The “Structure” axis is represented 100 by the “Flexibility – Control” continuum, while the “Focus” axis is represented by the “People – Organization” continuum in Figure 1. Within each of these four quadrants the relevant “Means – Ends” values are enumerated.
Cameron and Quinn state that the significance of these clusters of organizational effectiveness criteria is that they “represent what people value about an organization’s performance. They define what is seen as good right and appropriate…[and they]…define the core values on which judgments about organizations are made” (2006, p. 31).

Additionally, these quadrants represent opposite or competing values or assumptions. As you move, from left to right along the “Focus” (People – Organization) continuum or axis of the chart the emphasis shifts from an internal focus within the organization to that of an external focus outside the organization. As you move from the bottom of the chart along the “Structure” (Flexibility – Control) continuum or axis the emphasis shifts from control and stability within the organization and the environment to that of flexibility and discretion within the organization and the environment. The diagonal dimensions also produce conflicting or competing values. For example, the values in the upper right quadrant emphasize an external focus concerned with flexibility and growth, while the values in the lower left quadrant accentuate an internal focus with control and stability (Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1983). Hence, the competing or contradictory values in each quadrant form the basis for the “Competing Values Framework” name of the conceptual model upon which the present study is based. In their initial study, Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981) also provided a brief review of four competing theoretical models of organizational effectiveness (Literature discussing these four models can be found elsewhere: the rational goal model, the open systems model, the human relations model, and the internal process model, and they demonstrated how each of these four models was related to the four quadrants of their CVF model, see Figure 1.

In their analyses, Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) illustrate the importance that the human relations model places on internal flexibility, cohesion, morale, and human resource development and correlate it to the upper left-hand quadrant of their CVF model. The upper right-hand quadrant of the CVF model is correlated with the open systems model, which highlights the significance of external flexibility, readiness, growth, and resource acquisition. The lower left-hand quadrant of the CVF model is correlated with the internal process model, which underscores the significance of internal control, stability, information management, and communication. Finally, Quinn and Rohrbaugh state that the lower right-hand quadrant of their CVF model is correlated with the rational goal model, which underscores the importance of external control, planning, goal setting, productivity, and efficiency. Figure 1 provides a summary of the competing values sets and the four organizational effectiveness models. The significance of these four quadrants is that they represent how “over time, different organizational values have become associated with different forms of organization…[and that]…each quadrant represents basic assumptions, orientations, and values—the same elements that comprise an organizational culture” (Cameron and Quinn, 2006, pp. 32-33).

Using the “Competing Values Framework – CVF” (Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1983), Cameron and Quinn (2006) have developed three quantitative survey instruments. The first instrument, the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) enables researchers to identify the relative preference for four dominant CVF cultural types in any given organizational setting. The second instrument, the Management Skills Assessment Instrument (MSAI), is intended to be a tool that gives managers and leaders the ability to assess their current personal strengths, weaknesses, managerial / leadership skills, and competencies, which can then be used to guide their organization toward a preferred culture type as identified by the OCAI. Both instruments have been used in hundreds of organizational culture analyses, and their validity and reliability are well documented (Cameron and Quinn, 2006). The third instrument, Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) contains 32 statements that generically describe managerial behaviours of the eight supervisory roles. Eight statements represent each role. The respondents were asked to agree or disagree with each statement on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

3.1 Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI)

The characteristics used to classify cultural types result in an informative organizational profile based on current perceptions and desired preferences related to six “cultural subsystems” apparent at every institution. (see fig.1)

These criteria include:
(1) **Dominant organizational characteristics,** which identify whether an organization is
a) A very personal place like a family
b) Entrepreneurial and risk taking
c) Competitive and achievement oriented
d) Controlled and structured

(2) **Leadership style,** which can be described as
a) Mentoring, facilitating, or nurturing
b) Entrepreneurial, innovative, or risk taking
c) No-nonsense, aggressive, results oriented
d) Coordinating, organizing, efficiency oriented

(3) **Management of employees,** which emphasizes
a) Teamwork, consensus, and participation
b) Individual risk taking, innovation, freedom, and uniqueness
c) Competitiveness and achievement
d) Security, conformity, predictability

(4) **Organizational glue,** consisting of
a) Loyalty and mutual trust
b) Commitment to innovation and development
c) Emphasis on achievement and goal accomplishment
d) Formal rules and policies

(5) **Strategic emphasis** on
a) Human development, high trust, openness
b) Acquisition of resources and creating new challenges
c) Competitive actions and winning
d) Permanence and stability

(6) **Criteria for success,** defined as
a) Development of human resources, teamwork, and concern for people
b) Having the most unique and newest products and services
c) Winning in the marketplace and outpacing the competition
d) Dependable, efficient, and low cost

**Figure 2. The four culture of competing values framework.** Adapted from Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture: Based on the Competing Values Framework, by K. S. Cameron & R. E. Quinn, 2006,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture Type: CLAN</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A very personal place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like an extended family, mentoring, nurturing, participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture Type: ADHOCRACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic and entrepreneurial, People take risks, values, innovation, and entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture Type: HIERARCHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result oriented, getting the job done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values, competition and achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture Type: MARKET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor structure and control, coordination and efficiency is important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2-The Management Skills Assessment Instrument (MSAI)

Organizational culture is normatively defined as the deeper level basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by organizational members (Schein, 1992). A significant aspect of this definition is the emphasis on “shared.” Organizational behavior is manifested by individual behavior that reinforces and is consistent with the deep-level, basic underlying assumptions that constitute the organization’s culture (Schein, 1999). Consequently, any change in organizational culture will be inhibited if organizational members do not modify their individual behavior to be compatible with the new cultural values (Cameron and Quinn, 2006). Cameron and Quinn state that:
It is possible to identify a desired culture and to specify strategies and activities designed to produce change, but without the change process becoming personalized, without individuals being willing to engage in new behaviors, without an alteration in the managerial competencies demonstrated in the organization, the organization’s fundamental culture will not change (2006, p. 105).

Consequently, Cameron and Quinn developed the MSAI using the same framework as that of the OCAI in order to help managers and leaders identify the necessary skills and competencies that they must either develop or improve to facilitate an organizational culture change effort. The MSAI can also be used to enhance leadership abilities to improve organizational performance within the context of a current culture if a cultural change is not necessary. Based on an analysis of 15 studies, which researched the managerial leadership skills characteristic of a number of highly effective managers and organizations worldwide, Whetten and Cameron (1998) interviewed over 400 top executives to identify which skills were most important for individual leadership success (Cameron and Quinn, 1998). Cameron and Quinn consolidated the resulting list of successful leadership skills into a set of 12 competency categories which are mainly applicable to mid-level and upper-level managers (2006). See Figure 3 for the 12 competency categories and their associated primary OCAI category.

Figure 3. Critical Managerial Competencies (Cameron & Quinn, 2006, p. 120).

3.3-Leadership Styles (The eight roles of the leader)

The competing values framework points out the contradiction and dynamics of the organization; it also implies that people at the managerial level must be able to perform paradoxical and dynamic behaviours (Quinn, 1988). Quinn (1984, 1988) develops eight competing roles that should be played by supervisors. Most organizational leaders tend to emphasize some roles, while ignoring the other roles completely. In order to function effectively, managers must find a balance among the eight roles. Within the competing values framework, people who undertake leadership positions need to have various competencies in order to play effectively different roles in each of the four quadrants.

The rational goal model: director and producer roles. This leadership style is directive and goal oriented, and the primary roles are those of director and producer. As a director, the manager’s role is to provide direction. A director is expected to clarify expectations, tasks, establishes rules and procedures, and gives instructions to subordinates. A producer is the second role in the rational goal model. A producer is expected to increase production and facilitate goal accomplishment. In this role, a supervisor is goal-oriented and work focused. A producer has high energy and motivation; he or she is able to accept responsibilities, accomplish stated goals and maintain high productivity.

The internal process model: monitor and coordinator roles. This leadership style is conservative and cautious, and the manager's job is to be a monitor and a coordinator. As a monitor, a supervisor is expected to keep track of the activities in the unit, make sure that people are following the rules and procedures, and see if the unit is meeting its quotas. A monitor is good at analyzing all the facts and details. He or she must handle paperwork, review and respond to routine information, carry out inspections and tours, and review other documents.

A monitor is also expected to present information effectively through written communication. A coordinator is expected to maintain the structure and flow of the system. The person in this role is supposed to be dependable. A coordinator takes on various behaviours, such as coordinating staff efforts, scheduling task activities and handling crises in order to maintain control and stability.

The human relations model: facilitator and mentor roles. This leadership style is concerned and supportive, and the roles of the supervisor are those of facilitator and mentor. A facilitator is expected to build cohesion and teamwork, and manage interpersonal conflict. In this role the supervisor is process-oriented. Expected behaviours include intervening in interpersonal conflicts, using conflict management, increasing morale and cohesion, and facilitating group problem-solving.

As a mentor, a supervisor is expected to be supportive, considerate, sympathetic, approachable and fair. A mentor listens to people, provides support, conveys appreciation and gives credit for their accomplishment. A supervisor also helps with skill building, provides training opportunities and helps people to plan for their self-development.

The open systems model: innovator and broker roles. This leadership style is inventive and risk-taking, and the manager’s job is to be an innovator and a broker. As an innovator, a supervisor is expected to foster adaptation and change. An innovator pays close
attention to the changing environment, identifies trends, generates new ideas and implements needed changes. In this role the supervisor is expected to be a creative person, who can see the future, envision innovations and convince others that the changes are necessary.

A broker is expected to be politically astute, persuasive and influential. In this role the supervisor is concerned with spanning boundaries, maintaining external legitimacy and obtaining external resources. A broker represents the company when it is necessary to meet and negotiate with people from outside the work unit, to market the company's product or services, to act as a liaison and to acquire external resources.

Although the eight leadership roles should exist simultaneously, they do not necessarily receive equal emphasis. For example, a new organization that is concerned with establishing itself with external environment will emphasize more on the innovator and broker roles. Managers must decide which goals they want to achieve first and then emphasize certain roles to facilitate accomplishing these goals. (see fig. 4) A questionnaire was used to collect information for measuring leadership styles. This survey instrument was developed by Quinn et al. (1990) and is called the ‘Organizational Leadership Assessment’ (OLA).

Fig 4: Leadership roles in the competing Values framework. Source: Adapted from Quinn (1988, p. 86)

4. Research design and methodology

This study was based on information obtained from a survey of all full-time faculty and administrators in a statewide system of 9 big universities in Iran. Completed surveys were obtained from 562 (20%) of the 3839 full-time faculty and administrative staff of the 9 institutions, with response rates for individual campuses ranging from a low of 11% to a high of 28%. The typical respondent was a male (83.6%) with a mean of 11.21 years of professional experience at the university, and this average level of experience varied from a low of 1 year to a high of 34 years. The majority of respondents held a Ph. D degree (76.9%) as their highest academic degree. There was a fairly even distribution of respondents in terms of whether they held administrative (8.7%) or faculty (91.3%) positions at the institutions.

Prior to the examination of associations between leadership style, organizational culture, and managerial effectiveness, a phase of data reduction was necessary. The construction of meaningful indices was initiated by the use of principal components analysis with varimax rotation. Factor analysis was deemed necessary since it was considered prudent statistically to ascertain whether the adopted measures of organizational culture, managerial effectiveness and leadership style captured differing dimensions of culture and style. The principal components analysis of items pertaining to organizational culture (see Table 1) and items relating to leadership style (see Table 2) were conducted individually. In accordance with the Kaiser criterion (Kaiser, 1958), factor solutions were retained only if they exhibited an eigenvalue greater than one and if they were conceptually clear and interpretable (Churchill, 1991; Hair et al., 1998). It was not necessary to delete items from the analysis due to lack of variation or because of problems of interpretation. The identification and labeling of the seven extracted factors is discussed below. Table 1 presents the principal components analysis of measures of organizational culture adapted from the work of Deshpande et al. (1993), Campbell and Freeman (1991) and Quinn (1988). As expected, the factor analysis of these items leads to the extraction of four factors which cumulatively explain nearly 60 percent of the variance.

The first factor loads very heavily onto a vector generating an eigenvalue of over three and accounting for over 22 percent of the variance. Given that these items appear to gauge the extent to which an organizational culture is innovative, the solution is accepted and ascribed the label innovative culture. The second factor solution loads four items onto a vector generating an eigenvalue of over two and accounting for nearly 16 percent of total variance. Each of the four items appears to gauge the degree to which an organizational culture is competitive in nature. Consequently the solution is accepted and the factor labelled as competitive culture. The penultimate factor solution loads four items onto a vector generating an eigenvalue of above two. The four items within this factor solution seem to gauge the degree to which culture is bureaucratic in nature, leading to the labelling of the factor as bureaucratic culture. The final factor loads onto a vector generating an eigenvalue of over one. The four items focus on the extent which the culture of an organization is focused on the generation and maintenance of an internal community. The factor is approved and given the label community culture. It should be noted that the labels adopted for the study correspond (respectively) to the market, adhocracy, clan, and hierarchy cultures of Deshpande.
et al. (1993). However, following discussions with informed practitioners and researchers, the labels competitive, innovative, bureaucratic, and community culture are used, since they are considered more practically applicable and conceptually valid. These labels are similar or consistent with the suggestions of a number of organizational theorists (see, for example, Ouchi.)

As indicated in Table 4.2 Cronbach’s alpha was used to determine the reliability coefficients for both the OCAI “Now” and “Preferred” series of questions, and these reliability scores are listed for each cultural type in their respective column. The results of this study are very consistent with the previous data and provide strong support for Cameron and Quinn’s (2006) assertion that the OCAI is a reliable instrument that measures culture types consistently.

Table 2. OCAI Reliability Coefficients Using Cronbach’s Alpha Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture Type</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficients “Now”</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficients “Preferred”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhocracy</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. MSAI Reliability Coefficients for the 12 Competency Categories (See Table 3.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture Type</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MCI</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>MCS</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MCS</th>
<th>MC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhocracy</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, if the OCAI and MSAI are to be useful tools in an organizational culture change effort, then these instruments must be able to measure organizational culture and managerial leadership skills (validity) and they must be able to do so reliably (reliability). The evidence provided in this chapter supports the assertion that there is a high level of confidence that the OCAI is both a reliable and a valid measure of organizational culture type, strength, and congruence, and that the MSAI is a reliable and valid measure of the management skills that match the Competing Values Framework, which underscores the quadrant development behind the OCAI model. (see Tables 1 and 2)

5. Analysis of the Research Hypotheses

The principal purpose for this study was to answer the following primary research question: Is the organizational culture of Iranian Universities congruent with the leadership styles and managerial skills? In order to answer this question, four research hypotheses were outlined below, to empirically test the degree of congruence between the organizational culture and leadership styles. The three research hypotheses are:

Hypothesis 1: There is a lack of congruence between university’s desired and current culture.

Hypothesis 2: The more congruence are between organizational culture and leadership styles the more effectiveness will be in managerial skills.

Hypothesis 3: The more congruence are between organizational culture and managerial skills the more effectiveness will be in universitis.

5.1 Testing of Hypothesis 1:

We reject the null hypothesis in favour of the alternative. Only once or twice out of every 100 times we repeated this experiment (and the null hypothesis was true) would we get a t-statistic of this size. The result is significant t = -7.214, -18.710, 2.008, 12.136 for each subcultures and P values < 0.05. We therefore conclude that it is more likely to have been due to some systematic, deliberate cause.
Hypothesis 1 postulates that the current culture of universities is not consistent with desired organizational cultures. The data provided strongly suggests that the “adhocracy” culture type is the desired culture type, as identified by the Competing Values Framework (CVF) (Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1983), that is representative of organizational cultures supportive of adaptive, innovative, flexible, dynamic, and entrepreneurial behavior. Consequently, when the OCAI data values for the current culture of university are plotted on an OCAI profile chart the predominant culture type will be plotted in the Hierarchy quadrant and predominant desired culture type will be plotted in the Adhocracy quadrant. (see fig -5)

Table 3: Mean difference between current and desired culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 CLAN</td>
<td>-3.88162</td>
<td>12.23381</td>
<td>.53804</td>
<td>-4.93865 -2.82460</td>
<td>-7.214</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ADHOCRACY</td>
<td>-9.09794</td>
<td>11.05617</td>
<td>.48625</td>
<td>-10.05321 -8.14266</td>
<td>-18.710</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 MARKET</td>
<td>.97424</td>
<td>10.99104</td>
<td>.48527</td>
<td>.02088 1.92759</td>
<td>2.008</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 HIERARCHY</td>
<td>8.22590</td>
<td>15.38230</td>
<td>.67783</td>
<td>6.89425 9.55755</td>
<td>12.136</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 5-OCAI Profile Chart for the “Current” and “Desired “Organizational Culture

5.2. Hypothesis 2:

The relationship between leadership styles and managerial skills effectiveness was examined by means of a stepwise multiple regression analysis. Thus, the regression model contained only significant predictors in the order of predicting the outcome. The 8 scales of the leadership styles served as predictor variables, while the managerial skills effectiveness served as criterion variables. The overall regression was significant ($F(3, 406) = 123.086, p < 0.001$, and $R^2 = 0.51$), and 3 of the 8 coping leadership styles were significant predictors of managerial skills effectiveness. These are reported in Table 2. Together, these three variables accounted for 51% of the variance in managerial skills effectiveness. Moreover, 44.9% of the variance in the managerial skills effectiveness can be attributed to adhocracy leadership styles. Adhocracy culture is faculties desired culture (see fig-5).

5.3. Hypothesis 3:

The overview the stepping process indicate that five of the twelve candidate predictors (twelve managerial skills) included in the final model. They are entered into the equation in this order: Managing innovation, Managing the future, Managing teams, Managing interpersonal relationship and Managing continues improvement. Managing innovation and Managing the future variables is related to Adhocracy Culture and 67% of the variance in the managerial skills effectiveness can be attributed to adhocracy managerial skills. Adhocracy managerial skills explain 53% of the variance in the managerial skills effectiveness.
Table 4. Results of the Stepwise Multiple Regression of leadership styles and managerial skills effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.713</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>4.198</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>3.904</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>2.379</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Managerial Effectiveness

Table 5. Results of the Stepwise Multiple Regression of managerial skills and managerial skills effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.172</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing innovation</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>6.298</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the future</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>5.107</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing teams</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>3.981</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing interpersonal relationship</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>3.017</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing continues improvement</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>2.268</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: managerial skills effectiveness

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

The findings of this study are in agreement with the fact that almost of the universities in a nationwide study currently have a Hierarchy culture type (Current culture type). In the same study, faculties and department chairpersons perceive the Adhocracy culture as the most effective culture type for colleges and universities (desired culture type).

The adhocracy culture, as assessed in the OCAI questionnaire, is characterized by a dynamic, entrepreneurial, and creative workplace. People stick their necks out and take risks. Effective leadership is visionary, innovative, and risk oriented. The glue that holds the organization together is commitment to experimentation and innovation. The emphasis is on being at the leading edge of new knowledge, products, and/or services. Readiness for change and meeting new challenges are important. The organization’s long-term emphasis is on rapid growth and acquiring new resources. Success means producing unique and original products and services.

The strength of the culture is determined by the number of points conceded to a specific culture type. In the current situation, the Hierarchy culture type is slightly strong, while in the preferred situation the Adhocracy culture type is considered moderately strong.

The Adhocracy classification in the preferred situation is statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the Clan, Hierarchy and Market cultures in the preferred situation. This finding suggests that nine universities possesses a combination of the core characteristics of the dominant Adhocracy culture with those of the less dominant Clan culture type. In terms of the leadership style, faculties perceives its leaders and administrators as currently having a Hierarchical type of culture, wanting them to change to a preferred Adhocracy culture type.

The study demonstrates that there is a relationship between organizational culture and leadership styles; The more congruence are between organizational culture and leadership styles the more effectiveness will be in managerial skills (Hypothesis 2). There were some weak relations between culture and effectiveness. Furthermore, the significant relationships between managerial skills and effectiveness also suggest that culture may have important indirect effects on effectiveness (Hypothesis 3). Organizational culture, as
conceptualized in the competing values framework (Quinn & Rohrbaugh 1981), thus seems to have a potential for furthe
r understanding managerial skills and effectiveness.

Although the study applies to nine State Universities, it has implications for other universities on a national level. The researcher recommends that other universities perform similar studies in order to have a better understanding of the current organizational culture type, which could help universities make the necessary changes in pursuing enhanced effectiveness of its programs.
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