

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Volume 2018 | Issue 5

Print ISSN: 2052-6393

Ph.D. Res. Hanin A. Kreishan

Mohammad K. S. Azzouqa, MBA, EFQM, CIPT, CPC

Abstract

One of the most regular words combined with business is “Organizational Culture or Corporate Culture”. Usually organizations defined with “strong” or “innovative” or even a “toxic” culture. Hence culture is not easy to be changed, because it involves many behavioral aspects. Thus five basic questions need to be addressed: what does that really means? What does it mean to be a member of an organization? Who draw the organizational culture? What marks that out? And to what extent it affects the effectiveness and efficiency “SUCCESS” of an organization?

Much has been written on this subject. What makes this paper different is that it looks closely at the interaction of the technological developments in improving the organizational (or corporate) culture and make changes more acceptable within the organization. This paper will highlight on the newest trends of organizational culture drawn from the electronic mind and whether that lead to progress

Therefore, this paper attempts to do the following: address the organizational culture, the reciprocal effect of the leadership and the technological innovation, what is the role of the stakeholders, have the changes been effective, and what are the future developments.

Key Words: Culture, Employee Resourcing, Career, Capability and Competency, Organizational culture/ Corporate culture, Strong, Toxic, Leadership, Total Quality Management, Change management, Technological developments, Innovation.

Culture is defined as the ideas, customs, and social behavior of a particular people or society (Oxford living dictionary, 2017).One of the original writers on culture defined it as “*the solution to external and internal problems that has worked consistently for a group and that is therefore taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think about, and feel in relation to these problems*”(Pinto, 2013: 76).

Culture learned norms based on the values, attitudes, and beliefs of a group of people, and it is an integral part of a nation’s operation environment. Therefore, culture usually is an elusive topic because people belong to different groups based on nationality, ethnicity, religion, gender, work organization, profession, age, political party membership, and income level, for that each group comprises a culture (Daniels, et al., 2015:92).Developmental psychologists believe that most people acquire their basic value systems as children, including such concepts as evil versus good, dirty versus clean, ugly versus beautiful , unnatural versus natural, abnormal versus normal, paradoxical versus logical, and irrational versus rational that inherited from parents to child, teacher to student, social leader to follower, peer to peer. These values are not easily changed later on (Daniels, et al., 2015:95). Thus, culture is learned behavior so it’s not a by-product of operations and not an overlay(Whitehurst, Oct. 13th, 2016).

Culture shapes the employee careers within the organization and it considered part of the human resources policy in the employee resourcing. Such a human resource policy, employee resourcing aims to supply organizations with the right quality and number of people to achieve its strategy (Pinnington, & Edwards, 2000:92). Resourcing influences the performance of the organization and has major social consequences for the individual as well as society.

Employee resourcing affects employees' skill development, their commitment to the organization, and their careers, as well as it has potential for positive and negative consequences on individuals' well being (Pinnington, & Edwards, 2000:92).

Career can be a short-term or a long-term and many people will change careers several times during their working life. It is closely connected with individual's experience of home and work life, and change in either of these two critical areas can cause people to alter their role expectations and career goals. An employee's sense of career is something that develops over time and has varying psychological meaning as career aspirations and expectations are modified. Career defined by Everett Hughes in 1937, as having both subjective and objective components. Subjectively, individuals experience a sense of continuity of purpose and progression in skill or responsibility as they move through their careers. Thus, most people who feel their careers have been frustrated perceive that there could have been more development or change. Subjective sense of identity can be gained from "having a career"; there is objective view that one can plot the movement of the individual within the social order of the organization; such as from shopfloor to worker to supervisor to middle manager (Pinnington, & Edwards, 2000:93-95).

Most of the two common terms that combined with the human ability and mentioned in careeras well as job communications in the most of human resources materials are "competency" and "capability". Capability is the term that describes the quality of being skilled. It is the main factor that authorizes an individual to obtain the power and ability to learn and do something within their capacity (Deference between net, 2014). Capability is known as implied skills, or underdeveloped skills. Thus, capabilities add value to the person

who has the potential to acquire a specific ability or skill and improve the functions of a person, which lead to more productivity. The new skills and abilities make a person more capable to complete a certain task, which in turn makes them a more suitable candidate (fit) for certain jobs and increase quality of work or performance (Deference between net, 2014).

With time and practice capabilities gradually develop into “competence” and the person work can be evaluated as competent if the performance is considered “satisfactory” but not “outstanding.” Competence applies to the improvement or development of one’s abilities and skills for the benefit of the person and the group or institution they represent. That means competence is the proven abilities and improved capabilities. Competence includes a combination of knowledge, basic requirements -capabilities- skills, abilities, behavior, and attitude. In other words, competency is sufficiency to deal with a situation or task (Deference between net, 2014). In return, the work and performance will produce more satisfying and favorable results from other parties like clients, bosses, and other relevant individuals to achieve the goal of identifying and developing the hard-to- imitate organizational capabilities that distinguish a company from its competitors in the eyes of customers (Stalk, et al., 1992: 43).

Hence, most of employees spend 40 or more hours at their work, culture obviously reflects on their work lives and their personal lives (Lowe, 2017). Thus, the culture within the organization or corporate refers to the unwritten rules of behavior, or norms that are used to shape and guide behavior, that are shared by some subset of organizational members, and that are taught to all new members of the company (Pinto, 2013: 76). This organizational culture is a determining factor in which organization can be succeeded or failed (Lowe, 2017).

Organizational Culture/ Corporate Culture:

“Organizational culture is defined by how people inside the organization interact with each other... We create our organizational culture by the actions we take; not the other way around” (Whitehurst, Oct. 13th, 2016).

One of the unrivaled features of organizations is the way in which everyone develops its own outlook, operating policies and procedures, patterns of thinking, attitudes, and norms of behavior. These features are unique as an individual's fingerprints or DNA signature, there is no two organizations similar as no matter how similar they have the same size, products, operating environment, or profitability. Everyone has developed its own unparalleled method for indoctrinating its employees, responding to environmental threats and opportunities, and supporting or discouraging operating behaviors. Culture embedded in the concept of organizational culture; by the collective or shared learning of a group, and it influences how that group is likely to respond in different situations (Pinto, 2013: 76).

The academic research about organizations focuses on examining the organization as a complete entity and viewing the way people responded to their own organization a more subjective view of organizations began to emerge. Some would differentiate between the term organizational culture and that of corporate culture, the latter sometimes being associated with specific management initiatives to achieve corporate ends. Increasingly, however, the two terms are used interchangeably, and this text is no exception (Needle, 1989: 37).

The main difference between the two treatments is more specific context of the approach refer to Deal & Kennedy in 1982, is typified by the work of where organizational culture has the function of establishing values and creating a cohesive unit. While corporate culture

appears to concentrate on the modern management of best-seller lists, by concentrating on Total Quality Management (TQM), which is a technique espouses a culture change approach to quality improvement (Needle, 1989: 39).

The organizational culture defined as a system of shared meaning held by members that distinguishes one organization from others (Robbins & Judge, 2015: 497). As well as it is a pattern of shared and stable beliefs and values that are developed within a company across time (Gordan and Ditomaso, 1992: 784). Thus, the importance of the organizational culture is guiding best practice by sets the scene for the determination of strategy and hence the operational aspects of organizational life (Needle, 1989: 37).

Organizational culture establishes norms and expectations of how people should be treated and serves the needs of the organization. Culture affects employee resourcing by influencing the values and beliefs of owners, management, and other employees about which flow policies are appropriate. In 1993, Charles Handy, offered a framework for understanding cultural diversity in business cultures of explaining the influence of organizational culture on employee resourcing and he explained the creation of the four distinct corporate cultures from the cultural diversity: (Management Study Guide, 2017)(Pinnington, & Edwards, 2000:99)

Power culture; it is typified by an absence of bureaucracy and control is exercised from a central power base through key individuals. Where the power remains in the hands of only few people, who are the decision makers and they are the only ones who enjoy special privileges at the workplace. Such cultures are found in small entrepreneurial firms and certain smaller financial institutions. In such a culture the subordinates have no option but to strictly follow their superior's instructions. The employees do not have the liberty to express their views or

share their ideas in an open forum and have to follow what their superior says. The managers in such a type of culture sometimes can be partial to someone or the other leading to major unrest among others. Power cultures are threatened by the increasing size of the firm and the death or departure of the central figure (Management Study Guide, 2017), (Needle, 1989: 40).

Role culture; Handy sees it as a representative of a classic bureaucracy that acquires its strength through functions, specialties, rules and procedure, where every employee hands over roles and responsibilities concord to his specialization, educational qualification and interest to pull the best out of him. In such a culture employees decide what best they can do and willingly accept the challenge. Every individual is responsible for something or the other and has to take ownership of the work assigned to him. It is found in many organizations, more especially when economic of scale are important. Power comes with responsibility in such a work culture. The main drawback is its slowness in responding to change. And it operates in most national cultures, but with different degree of formality (Management Study Guide, 2017), (Needle, 1989: 40).

Task culture; where teams are formed to achieve the targets or solve critical problems follow the task culture. In such organizations individuals with common interests and specializations come together to form a team. As it is typified by matrix organizations where there are generally four to five members in each team and every team member has to contribute equally and accomplish tasks in the most innovative way. It is focused on getting the job done and such cultures are appropriate when flexibility and responsiveness to market changes are needed. The difficulties with task cultures are the same as those with matrix structures(Management Study Guide, 2017), (Needle, 1989: 40). The internal complexity is the first disadvantage of the matrix structure that can result in internal complexity. Some

employees may become confused as to whom their direct supervisor is; e.g. an employee may receive diverse directions relating to the same thing from supervisors in different departments (Johnson, 2017). The dual authority and communication problems may cause division among employees and managers. Miscommunication and ineffective managing can result in employee dissatisfaction and low morale. Lengthened issues may cause an organization to experience high employee turnover. The second concern is the expensive to maintain and internal conflict when a company's overhead cost typically increases because of the need for double management. The extra salaries an organization must pay can put a strain on its resources. The sharing of employees may cause unhealthy competition between managers within a company. The expertise that employees bring to the table makes them valuable, which causes managers to seek their assistance. The competition for scarce resources may cause hostility within the workplace and hinder production (Johnson, 2017).

Person culture; Handy viewed such cultures as clusters that focus on individuals. The main goal of the corporation is to satisfy the needs of individuals and the corporate itself is secondary to individual self-fulfillment. Such a culture is attractive to many people who would like to operate as freeholders within the security of a corporate. This is not always possible and conflict often arises when individual attempt to operate according to a person culture within a corporate that is essentially a role culture. Employees just come to the office for the sake of money and never get attached to it. They are seldom loyal towards the management and never decide in favor of the organization. One should always remember that organization comes first and everything else later (Management Study Guide, 2017), (Needle, 1989:41).

Leadership Shaping Organizational Culture:

Leadership is often known by its accomplishments. And it is a difficult concept to be examined because each one has his/her own definition of leadership, examples of leaders in actions, and his/her own beliefs about what makes leaders work. One of the useful definitions of the leadership is “*the ability to inspire confidence and support among the people who are needed to achieve organization goals*”(Pinto, 2013:129).

The leader’s role composed of three overlapping areas of responsibility according to Adair (1983); achieving the task by defining the objectives to achieve the task to focus and coordinate team effort, building and maintaining the team involves fostering constructive relationships between team members, and developing the individual includes assigning personal goals that suit the strengths and skills of the individual and ensuring that each member feels that his or her contribution to the team’s overall task is valued (Lane,2004:49).

There is distinguished between leadership and management roles in different ways. A manager is an individual, who has received a title within the organization that permits her/his to plan, organize, direct, and control the behavior of others within her / his department or area of oversight. Even though, leadership may be a part of the manager’s job, the other management roles are more administrative in nature. Leadership is less about administration and more about interpersonal relationships. Leaderships involve inspiring, motivating, influencing, and changing behaviors of others in pursuit of a common goal. Leaders embrace change; managers support the status quo. Leaders aim for effectiveness; managers aim for efficiency. Though, leaders need to recognize the importance of managerial duties, it is often difficult for managers to recognize the nonstandard, interpersonal nature of leadership. However, leadership behaviors can be taught and leaned (Pinto, 2013:130).

Therefore, leading is one of the basic management functions that getting employees to do the things leader's want them to do, by means of communicating with, motivating, and disciplining them, by the ability of the leaders in having leadership to influence others to strive to attain goals or objectives of a corporate and exercising effective leadership (Byrd, & Megginson, 2009: 294-295).

Communicating with employees and others; Communication is the process of transferring meaning of the idea and information from one person to another. Speaking pleasantly and persuasive makes people want to do good work, as a Japanese proverb says "*one kind word can warm three winter months*". On other hands, In January 2004, a survey conducted that 63% of respondents claimed that misleading communication has undermined their trust in companies. Therefore, communication is so important because people need and want to know what is going on so they can do their jobs properly. Owners, employees, customers, vendors, and others need to coordinate their work so communication must be clear and complete (Byrd, & Megginson, 2009: 295).

Leaders and managers should be aware about the employees' cultural differentiation since people are different and each one is a unique; no one had exactly the same life experiences, stands, or / and perceives like others, which might reflect on the organization and corporate. Being aware of people differentiation and contextualizing the situation will make it easier to understand the reason behind other people (e.g. employees) of seeing the world as they do. This can make it much easier to understand and work with some kinds of clashes and conflicts and help to figure out the strengths and weaknesses for each one in addition to solve problems and improve situations (Keynes, 1999:15).

The problem solving is set in the wider, entirely practical, context of the management of diversity (including the diversity of styles) and of change. In this wider setting, problem-solving leadership depends less on the technical expertise of a select few and more upon the selection of appropriate groups that can collectively solve critical, complex problems, in challenging environments, aided by problem-solving leaders. To meet the demands made of managers in today's climate, these leaders require not only the technical expertise to hold the respect of their teams but also knowledge of the problem-solving process and of problem solvers. This notion is reliance on the charismatic superstar. *"When a company is struggling {its directors} will not be satisfied with an executive who is merely talented and experienced. Companies now want leaders"* (Kirton, 2003:1).

Psychologists working on tests to solve problems considered the people differentiation based on personality and personal style. Michael Kirton in 1960s, explore a dimension of thinking style by developed a calibrated questionnaire called Kirton Adaption-Innovation Inventory (KAI) that makes it possible to measure where an individual's thinking style is located on this dimension and helped to explain some of the different way in which people approach decision making, problem solving and creativity, as well as their reactions to different working environment (Kirton, 2003:47-48).

Adaptors end prefer stable and well-structured working environments. They value themselves for "being efficient". They tend to focus on one task at a time, and they tend to work by making incremental changes that improve present methods and practices *"doing things better"*, suggesting small numbers of well-thought-through options which can be accommodated without upsetting existing situations. As a result, getting others to accept ideas is often fairly straightforward. Adaptors tend to see themselves as supportive, practical, stable,

consistent, methodical, co-operative, sound, safe, etc. People towards adaptor style have weaknesses include a tendency to jump to a conclusion prematurely, or to set the boundaries too narrowly, and a reluctance to take risks (Keynes, 1999:16-17).

While innovators, prefer an unstructured and often changing working environment, and may not place much value on established procedures and conventions. They prefer to reframe problems “*doing things differently*” and their approach is to re-assess and re-define problems and the context within which they have arisen. As a result, they may well offer a proliferation of ideas, many of which may seem unexpected, and may, at first, sight be difficult to accept. They may have difficulty in selling their ideas to others. They may have many projects on the go at once, because some other possibility has emerged. Innovators tend to see themselves as full of ideas, energetic, challenging, open to change, intuitive, not hanging on the past, daring, and risky. There is also an intriguing piece of research by Grysiewicz that suggests innovators tend to be more aware of their personal faults than adaptors. People towards innovators style have weaknesses include not thinking through the consequences of action, and lack of attention to detail (Keynes, 1999:17).

Motivating Employees

Motivation is the inner state that activates a person, including drives, desires, and / or motives. Leaders use motivation to bring out the best in their employees by giving them reasons to perform better, but it's not easy as motivation is a complex and it is so difficult to motivate some employees (Byrd, & Megginson, 2009:297). Since motivate employees either positively (to perform) or negatively (to withhold performance), which usually leaders are not conscious of doing so. Thus, when a leader gives employees a reason to perform better, then he

/ she creates positive motivation; on the other hand, if a leader says or do something that annoys, frustrates, or antagonizes employees, they will react negatively and either withhold production or actually sabotage operations (Byrd, & Megginson, 2009:298).

The best way for leaders to succeed in business is to increase employee productivity and efficiency. As there is a limit to improve in employee productivity, effective motivation can have a positive effect. However, because many factors affect productivity, motivation alone is not enough. Most employees go to work for a company expecting to do a good job, receive a satisfactory income, and gain satisfaction from doing a good job. If the employees are not performing as leaders asked them to do, they may be unsuited for the job, inadequately trained or unmotivated. If they are unsuited, move them to a more suitable job, and if untrained, train them, if they are both suited and trained try harder to motivate them (Byrd, & Megginson, 2009:298).

The leaders have style of management to motivate employees; the rational-economic, or “theory X” view assumes that people are motivated by self-interest and that the effectiveness of an organization is wholly the responsibility of management, who must provide adequate control and incentives in a rational-economic manner. Theory X assumptions; people are inherently lazy and must be motivated to work by extrinsic incentives, that is, incentives outside their work. Because of this dislike of work, people must be coerced, controlled, directed or threatened with punishment to persuade them to work for organizational goal, the average of human being prefer to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, and above all wants security (McGregor, 1960:12).

The social or human relations, approach assumes that people are primarily motivated by social needs and that work itself is largely meaningless, so that the function of management is to facilitate the satisfaction of social needs and harness these to the organization's goals. Harvard University, directed by Elton Mayo and his researchers team proposed an alternative to the rational-economic view of human nature, which emphasized the social needs of people as following; social needs are the prime motivator of human behavior, and interpersonal relationships the prime shaper of sense of identity. As a result of mechanization, work has lost much of its intrinsic meaning, which now must be sought in social relationships on the job. Employees are more responsive to the social forces of their peer group than to the incentives and control of management. Employees are responsive to a leader to the extent that he or she can meet their needs for belonging, acceptance and a sense of identity (Keynes, 1999:37).

The self-actualizing approach assumes that people need meaning and challenge in their lives and that given the opportunity they will behave responsibly and integrate their own goals with those of the organization. The idea of satisfying various needs was central to the theory of human motivation proposed by Maslow who suggested that human needs could be assembled into a hierarchy with five broad categories “*start from the bottom with; physiology needs; food, drink, shelter...etc., raise to the second category; safety needs; security, psychological safety...etc., third category; social needs; acceptance, affection...etc., fourth category; self-esteem needs; approval, recognition...etc., the top category in the pyramid is self-actualization; achieving one's potential*” in a pyramid shape the most basic needs shown at the bottom of the pyramid had to be met before each succeeding category could become a priority. As he assumed that the exception was self-actualization, the need to fulfill the person

self-potential in order to become the kind of person that ideally envisages him / herto be (Olson, Aug. 13, 2013).

Maslow argued that many jobs in modern industry had become so fragmented and specialized that they neither permitted workers to use their capacities, nor enable them to see the relationship between what they were doing and total organizational mission. Douglas McGregor referred to the newer views of motivation as “theory Y” with the following assumptions; people are not by nature passive or resistant to organizational needs. They have become so as a result of experience in organizations. People present the motivation, the potential for development, the capacity to assume responsibility, the readiness to direct behavior towards organizational goals. It is a responsibility of management leadership to make it possible for people to reorganize and develop the human characteristic for themselves. Management and leadership is responsible for organization the elements of productive enterprise in the interest of economic ends, but their essential task is to arrange the conditions and methods of operation so that people can achieve their own goals best by directing their own efforts towards organizational objectives. Therefore, leadership’s job is to enable this to happen (Keynes, 1999:38-40).

The complex or contingency approach regards people as inherently complex, with needs and motivations which change with time, context, and learning. The role of managers is to be able to respond appropriately to the variety of people in different contexts (Keynes, 1999: 43).

Edgar Schein summarized the main features of theory of the “*complex human*” in the following assumptions that human needs can be arranged in hierarchy but the content and ordering of this hierarchy depends upon culture, situation, experience and a person’s

circumstances in life. Because needs, motivates, and contexts interact to produce a complex pattern of values and goals, one must make a conscious decision about the level at which one wishes to understand human motivation. Simple theories produce simple answers that are of limited applicability. Employees' motives changes as they develop and learn through organizational experiences. A given person may display different needs and motivations in different organizations and groups. People can become productively involved in an organization for a wide range of motives. Therefore, there is no one correct managerial strategy for all people in all situations (Schein, 2004:203-204).

Successful motivation of employees is based more on a managerial philosophy than on using a given technique. Therefore, leaders should try to create an environment in the organization in which employees can apply themselves willingly and wholehearted to the task of increasing productivity and quality, as motivation usually attracts potential employees and improve performance as well as retain good employees (Byrd, & Megginson, 2009: 299).

One of the most important process to evaluate workers' actual output and see how well they are performing based on quantity and quality factors is known as performance appraisal, employee evaluation, or merit rating, which usually answer the question of "how well are employees performing?" under such system each employee's performance and progress are evaluated, and rewards are given for above-average performance. Since it is determining merit salary increases, special merit raises, training decisions, layoffs, or promotions or transfers. Appraisals should be based on the employee's job description. Measuring performance needs requirements. Such as; the job description gives enough information to measure employee performance by simply checking off the requirements one by one as either accomplished or

not, because appraisal also can be used for disciplinary actions such as reprimands, suspensions, demotions, or discharged (Byrd, & Megginson, 2009: 301).

Appraisals are usually done by the employee's immediate manager, or they may also be done by the affected employees, his or her peers, or subordinates, or by the use of electronic device that eventually will reflect on the employees' motivations and performance. How that impactson the organizational culture; strong, excellent, or toxic? And to which extent the technological developments and innovations are needed to improve the organizational (or corporate) culture?

Strong Organizational Culture:

Starting with Jim Whitehurst article titled "*Leaders can shape company culture through their behaviours*". October 13, 2016.

Strong culture is a culture in which the core values are intensely held and widely shared. In which connected with an organization where the guiding value of top management is clear and consistent as well as is widely shared by the employees (Robbins, & Judge, 2015:499). Strong culture typified by set of strong values passed down by senior management. These values are strengthened by rituals which emphasize and reward appropriate behavior and a cultural network, comprising a system of communication to spread the values and create corporate heroes. A feature of strong cultures is their association with hero figures who exemplify the key values; some examples of corporate heroes are Ray Kroc of McDonal's, and Anita Roddick of the Body Shop (Needle, 1989:41).

The culture is strengthened by more formal procedures such as training induction and the design of the organization structure. Having effective organization not only depends on owners but also on the inherent abilities of its employees that depends on effective recruiting and selection, their development through training that resulting from personal development, education, and experience, as well as their motivation which result from the manager's leadership abilities. Important to notice that not only the new employees who must be trained but also the current ones must be retrained and upgraded if they are to adjust to rapidly changing job requirements. Some results of training and developing workers increased productivity, reduced turnover, increased earnings for employees, decreased costs of materials and equipment due to errors, less supervision required, and improved employee's satisfaction (Byrd, & Megginson, 2009: 271).

The processes of creating positive organizational culture appeared to operate as; senior management of a corporate set goals and issue guidelines which promote strongly held shared values; there is normally an emphasis upon enthusiasm, diligence, loyalty and service to the customer. In order to ensure passing the guidelines on all employees there is usually a high investment in the procedures of communication and integration. The strong culture in a corporate is seen as having replaced organized religion and the family as the most important focus in a person's life, e.g.; in a TV documentary about the establishment of the Japanese firm Komatsu in Britain, one of its senior Japanese employees listed his priorities in order as firm, the state, and eventually his family. Not surprisingly the Japanese firm is often held the prime example of a strong corporate culture (Ray, 1986: 289-297).

Excellent Organizational Culture:

Peters and Waterman (1982) stressed the importance of excellent companies socializing and integrating individuals into a clearly defined by (Peters, & Waterman, 1982:323);

- Bias for action, being typified by clear objectives and marked absences of committee procedures.
- Closeness to the customer, typified by processes and procedures aimed at identifying and serving the customers' needs;
- Autonomy and entrepreneurship, which are best achieved through the creation of small cohesive teams.
- Productivity through people, with workforce involvement at all times.
- Hands on; value driven, involving the fostering of a strong corporate culture by top management who are seen to be in touch with all employees.
- Stick to knitting; which involve limiting activities to what the firm does best and avoiding diversification into unknown territory.
- Simple form, lean staff; avoiding complex hierarchies and large administration sections;
- Simultaneous loose-tight properties that mean organization structure should display a combination of strong central direction with work-group autonomy.

Throughout the eight attributes of excellence that were identified, Peters and Waterman's own terminology showed that firm becomes much more than a place of work by offering meaning as well as money, the excellent companies give their employees a mission as well as a sense of feeling great (Peters, & Waterman, 1982:323).In this way the concept of excellent

organizational culture becomes a much more normative and prescriptive tool that can create and fashion increased productivity, profitability and compliance (Needle, 1989: 39).

Technology is one of the most important aspects that forming organizational cultures. No matter the size of the enterprise. The technology has both tangible and intangible benefits which help to make money and produce the results that customers demand. Technological infrastructure affects the culture, efficiency and relationships of a corporate. It also affects the security of confidential information and trade advantages (SBDC, 2015).

Most of the stable strong and excellent organizational cultures mainly concentrate on the importance of technological development and usage of electronic minds (computers and its programs) to keep progress and continue their expansion in order to survive and achieve their benefits and goals. Most of time, they face difficult and hard time to change their organizational culture in order to keep pace with evolutions. Therefore, they are highly recommended the technological developments in order to improve the organizational culture and make changes more acceptable.

Organizational (corporate) culture counting on key factors that affect the development of a culture; technology, environment, geographical location, reward system, rules and procedures, key organizational members, and critical incidents to survive, progress, and achieve their benefits and goals (Pinto, 2013:77).

- Corporate technology returns to its conversion process whereby it transforms inputs into outputs (Pinto, 2013:77).
 - Communication with customers;

One of the most important issues leads to success any corporate is their customer's satisfaction whether by their services or/and goods. Technology mainly boosts the firm's ability to communicate with customers. It is needed for employees to interact with clients hastily and clearly. Websites allow customers to find answers to their questions. The options of the fast shipment allow businesses to move products over a large geographic area. When customers use technology to interact with a business, the business benefits because better communication creates a stronger public image(SBDC, 2015).

- Efficiency of operations;

Corporate technology also helps to understand the organizational cash flow that needs and preserve precious resources such as time and physical space. With proper technology in place, executives can save time and money by holding meetings over the Internet instead of at corporate headquarters. As well as the warehouse inventory technologies let business owners understand how best to manage the storage costs of holding a product (SBDC, 2015).

- Organizational culture and class relations;

Technology creates a team dynamic in any stable strong and excellent organizational culture because employees at different locations have better interactions. If factory managers can communicate with shipment coordinators at a different location, tensions and distrust are less likely to evolve. Technology often helps workers to put their different backgrounds aside, since cliques and social tensions can become a nightmare for any corporate environment which usually known within the organizational toxic culture (SBDC, 2015).

- Security;

Technology can be used to protect corporate financial data, confidential executive decisions and other proprietary information that leads to competitive advantages. Thus, technology helps organizations to keep their ideas away from their competition. By having computers

(electronic minds) with passwords, a corporate can ensure none of its forthcoming projects will be copied by the competition (SBDC, 2015).

- Research capacity;

A corporate that has the technological capacity to research new opportunities will stay a step ahead of its competition. For a corporate to survive, it must grow and acquire new opportunities. The Internet allows corporate to virtually travel into new markets without the cost of an executive jet or the risks of creating a factory abroad(SBDC, 2015).

- Environment of organizations operate under distinct environmental pressures. A corporate environment may be complex rapidly changing, or it may remain relatively simple and stable. Some corporate are global, because of their competition is literally worldwide, while other companies focus on regional completion. Despite of the specific circumstances, a company's environment affects the culture of the firm. As example, companies with simple and slow-changing environments may develop cultures that reinforce low risk taking, stability, and efficiency. Corporate in highly complex environments often develop cultures aimed at promoting rapid response, external scanning for opportunities and threats, and risk taking. Thus, the company's operating environment affects the formation of the culture and the behaviors that are considered acceptable within it (Pinto, 2013:78).
- Different geographical locations develop their own cultural mores and attitudes. In business world, culturally based attitudes often coordinate with the geographical regions of firms or subsidiaries. Different geographical locations certainly can result in cultural disconnects, particularly in cases where organizations have developed a

number of dispersed locations, both within and outside of their country of origin, but it is important not to overstate the effect that geography can play(Pinto, 2013:78).

- The type of reward systems that a firm offers to employees go a long way toward demonstrating the beliefs and action its top management truly values, regardless of what official company policies might be. Reward systems support the view, in effect; a company gets what it pays for. An organization that publicly espouses environmental awareness and customer service but routinely promotes leaders who violate these principles sends a loud message about its real interests. As a result, the culture quickly forms around acts that lead to pollution, dishonesty, or obfuscation(Pinto, 2013:78). Reward systems based on employee's performance evolution have improved within new technological development using the electronic minds (computers) software. New software tools for monitoring employee productivity in order to achieve subjectivity and help organizations to have employees' performance appraisal programs within a short duration to know how productive their employees are. And here are some of these software tools for monitoring employee productivity; (Kc Agu, May 24, 2016)

- 1- Time Doctor; is time management software of real time following up tasks and barring wasted time. It is useful for tracking remote team's time management and overall productivity. It records employee internet use and provides a simple report of website visited and application used, as well as it takes screenshots every 3 minutes as away to confirm that employees are working and it has multiple features for improving employees' productivity as removing multi-tasking, getting staff to focus on top priority and also making sure leaders are aware of top priorities of employees (Kc Agu, May 24, 2016).

2- WorkiQ; is another software that follows employees' computer behavior and provides reports on their time spent on productive and non-productive applications. As it can easily categorize which employees are actively engaged with their work and which are continuously distracted by track processes across all applications, and compare how different users process similar units of work. It reflects many benefits on organization (Kc Agu, May 24, 2016);

- Identify unproductive behaviors when/where they occur for “in-the-moment” coaching.
- Spot and reward productive behavior.
- Compare true employee productivity, including the mix and complexity of the work employees handle.
- Manage remote workers according to the same standards as their in-office compatriots.
- Identify your top performers so you can help replicate their processes across teams.
- Improve distribution of work by identifying underutilized skill sets or overworked employees.

- A method that influencing an organizational culture is to create a rulebook or system of procedures for employees to clarify acceptable behavior in order to signal companywide standards of behavior to new employees. The problem arises when public or formal rules conflict with informal rules of behavior. For example; a company formal rule is all management staff works a standard 40-hour per week. The informal rule is each member

of the company is really expected to work at least 45-hour per week, or working nine hours per day divided as follow; eight hours are from the formal rule and extra an hour for the informal expected rule. Most of organizational culture emphasizing on formally codify expectations in order to alter dysfunctional culture and improve patterns behavior. Thus, rules and procedures represent a good starting point for developing a strong organizational culture(Pinto, 2013:78).

- Key organizational members including the founder of the organization have a strong impact on organizational culture. When the founder is a traditional entrepreneur who encourages free expression or flexibility, this attitude become ingrained in the organization's culture in a powerful way (Pinto, 2013:78).
- Critical incidents express culture; since critical incidents demonstrate for all workers exactly what it takes to succeed in a corporate and they are a public expression of what rules really operate, regardless of what the company formally espouses. Thus, usually critical incidents take the form of stories that are related to others, including new employees, illustrating the type of actions that are valued. They become part of corporate lore, either for good or ill (Pinto, 2013:79).

Toxic Organizational Culture:

Toxic is defined as "*Poisonous, very bad, unpleasant, harmful, relating or caused by poison...etc.*" (Oxford Dictionary, 2017).

Toxic organizational culture, in other words, poisoning corporate culture (a broken culture) will make everything at the workplace harder, from organizing the work to getting critical approvals to move work forward. Too many competent and capable people will end up

in leaving their works not because of the job itself or the compensation plan, but because of the company's toxic culture based-blaming and being exhausted of pushing a rock uphill every working day. Such unhealthy organizational culture will poison the whole environment of the workplace, which raised the issue of wasting opportunities and eventually impact the corporate surviving (Ryan, Oct. 19, 2016).

Liz Ryan argued "*You can only push so hard for so long before you stop and ask yourself "Why am I killing myself for this job? No one appreciates what I am doing. What am I trying to prove? This is too hard, and I see no signs that things will get any easier any time soon. I can't do this anymore.*" (Ryan, Oct. 19, 2016).

With such corporate unhealthy broken culture CEO becomes afraid and leaders as well because of missing goals, so they start to bluster and threaten to chop heads. Therefore, leaders face hard time in acknowledging problems at their company culture and realized that they have personally contributed to create such a toxic workplace culture. Thus, most of them will feel afraid of looking stupid in front of their direct reports, so they concentrate on speech instead of sharing and brainstorm ideas and concepts that might help with their brilliant colleagues. They are afraid of hearing bad news that might threaten their self-confidant, so they create a force field around themselves that keeps bad news while they should tell that "*I actually don't know what we should do. What do you guys think?*" (Ryan, Oct. 19, 2016).

When the question of the toxic culture came to the surface "Why doesn't anyone say something about the corporate toxic culture?" Throwing weight on the other shoulders becomes a skill for everyone and having an excuse to let them away of accountability. The low-level employees can say "I can't speak up! I might get fired." Mid-level managers can say "What can I do to change the culture? I'm just a first-level manager." Vice presidents can say "I can't jeopardize my position! My CEO doesn't want to hear the truth." Even the CEO can say "My

team doesn't tell me anything. What am I supposed to do if people won't communicate?"(Ryan, Oct. 19, 2016).

Such a critical situation evokes the corporate stakeholders to two ways in dealing with it; even to improve the situation (organizational toxic culture) and get out of the trap to make the corporate survive again and continue, or to stay in the trap until everybody abandon the corporate and eventually end. The idea of "trap" has been linked to the metaphor of the "lobster pot". The lobster gets stuck in the lobster pot because of the lobster's shape. Leaders who are capable of managing, aware, contextualizing, and engaging with the complexity by having good experiences allow them to "change shape" enough to escape from some of the traps that he or she gets into it. (Armson, 2005: 8)

Necessity is the mother of invention;

Most of time, when the toxic culture strike an organization and the problems came to surface, stakeholders need to work and figure out a rapid change in order to survive and continue. Such a broken culture will easily accept changes and adapt to it, since changes become a necessity more than being a difficult leadership challenge as in the strong and/ or excellent corporate culture. Therefore, starting changes within the organization's culture will comprise a set of goals, roles, processes, values, communications practices, attitudes and assumptions. Many changes should be taken in consideration.

Organizational Culture Change:

Most of time, it has often been said that only when a dramatic change occurs in the external environment do companies become motivated to undertake large-scale organizational change (Pinnington, & Edwards, 2000: 219)

In general, the most fruitful success plan in change organizational culture is to embark with leadership tools, as well as a vision or story of developing the future, bolster the change in place with management tools, such as role definitions, measurement and control systems, and use the pure power tools of coercion and punishments as a last resort, when all else fails (Denning, Jul. 23, 2011).

Edgar H. Schein, in 1980s, goes on to say that his concept of culture involves understanding how groups socialize new members into the group, identifying the behaviors that groups nurture and reward, and appreciating that large organizations will have a corporate culture and subcultures. Schein believes that leaders can create group culture, as did Terrence Deal and Allan Kennedy when they advice on changing organizational culture met a clear need amongst senior executive when many companies, at that time, in the developed countries were suffering and facing crisis of business confidence in their traditional home markets (Deal, & Kennedy, 1982:61).

Deal and Kennedy proposed a new challenge to management and employees, asking them to think about their organizations as “strong” and “weak” cultures. They said the high performers were strong culture companies. Deal and Kennedy said the high performing companies owe their success to the development of a strong culture and listed five situations when change is necessary and the culture needs reshaping; the first two concentrate on environment, as the following; (Deal, & Kennedy, 1982: 159)

- 1- When the environment is undergoing fundamental change, and the company has always been highly value-driven;
- 2- When the industry is highly competitive and the environment changes quickly;
- 3- When the company is mediocre, or worse;
- 4- When the company is truly at the threshold of becoming a large corporation- a fortune 1000-scale corporate giant;
- 5- When the company is growing very rapidly.

Thus, concentrating on management and leadership capable within the organization is one of the main major as it is the foundation stone that draw the stakeholders for acceptance and adaptation to the new organizational change culture.

Change Management:

In any case the first question will rise “What should we change?” usually, others view to changes as negative. Thus, Resistance may be formidable. Knowing how to deal with the resistance is the heart of organizational change (Dessler, 2015:274).

Faced with situation like that; managers can change one or more of five aspects of their companies; their strategy, culture, structure, technology, or the attitudes and skills of the employees. Consequently, toxic organizational culture that facing collapse will immediately start to think in changing managers and replace them with more capable ones. Changing management culture by having new capable management team will change the firm's stakeholder culture. However, cultural, strategic, structural, and technological changes, no matter how logical, will fail without the employees' active support. Therefore, organizational

change involves changes in the employees themselves and in their attitudes, skills, and behaviors (Gotsill, & Natchez, Nov. 2007:24-26).

Psychologist Kurt Lewin created a model summarize the basic process for implementing a change with minimal resistance. To Lewin, all behavior in organizations was a product of two kinds of forces: those striving to maintain the status quo and those pushing for change. Implementation change means reducing the forces for the status quo or building up the forces for change. Lewin's process contains three steps: (Pinnington, & Edwards, 2000: 223-225)

1- Unfreezing which is reducing the forces that are striving to maintain the status quo, usually, by presenting a provocative problem or event to get people to recognize the need for change and to search for new solutions.

- Establish a since of urgency; most managers start by creating a sense of urgency.
- Mobilize commitment through joint diagnosis of problems. Having established sense urgency, the leader may then create one or more task forces to diagnose the problems facing the company. Such teams can produce a shared understanding of what they can and must improve, and thereby mobilize commitment.

2- Moving is developing new behaviors, values and attitudes. The manager may accomplish this through organizational structure changes, through conventional training and development activities and sometimes through the other organizational development techniques (for example; the team building).

- Create a guiding coalition, since no one can really implement major organizational change alone. Most of CEOs create a guiding coalition of

influential people they work together as a team to act as missionaries and implementers.

- Develop and communicate a shared vision. Vision guidelines are to keep it simple *“such as; we are going to become faster than anyone else in our industry at satisfying customer needs.”* (Kotter, 2012 :85)
- Help employees to make the change with questioning the following; are there impediments to change? Do policies, procedures, or the firm's organization make it difficult to act? Do intransigent managers discourage employees from acting?
- Consolidate gains and produce more change and that aims for attainable short-term accomplishments. Use the credibility from these to change the remaining systems, structures, and policies that do not fit well with the company's new vision.

3- Refreezing is building in the reinforcement to make sure the organization does not slide back into its former ways of doing- for instance, change the incentive system.

- Reinforce the new ways of doing things with changes to the company's systems and procedures.
- Eventually, the leader must monitor and assess progress.

Leadership style is a critical issue in keeping and maintaining the wheel of organizational success moving. Transformational leaders those who motivate their followers to transcend their personal interests, to enable their followers to identify with collective goal, to articulate an obvious as well as attainable vision- are far more likely to achieve organizational change (Dessler, 2015: 275).

Organizational Development & Innovation:

There are many ways to reduce any corporate stakeholder's resistance to change. Managers can impose rewards or sanctions that guide employee behaviors, explain why the change is needed, negotiate with employees give inspirational speeches, or ask employees to help design the change. Organizational Development (OD) "*is a change process through which employees formulate the change that's required and implement it, often with the assistance of trained consultants*" (Dessler, 2015: 276).

OD contains several characteristics:

- It usually involves action research that means collecting data about a group, department, or corporate, and feeding the information back to the stakeholders so they can analyze it and develop hypotheses about what the problem might be.
- It applies behavioral science knowledge to improve the organization's effectiveness.
- It changes the corporate in a particular direction-toward empowerment, improved problem solving, responsiveness, quality of work, and effectiveness(Dessler, 2015: 276).

Organizational development has four basic categories within its applications:

- Human process applications; human process organizational development techniques aim to give employees the insight and skills required to analyze their own and others' behavior more effectively, so they can conflict among employees. Such as; sensitivity, laboratory or the training group (t-group); training's basic aim is to increase the participant's insight into his or her own behavior by encouraging and open expression of feelings in the trainer-guided

t-group. Typically, 10 to 15 people meet, usually away from the job, with no specific agenda (French, & et al., 1978: 171-193). Instead, the focus is on the feelings and emotions in the group at the meeting. The facilitator encourages participants to portray themselves as they feel within the group rather than in terms of past behaviors. The training group's success depend on the feedback each person gets from the others, and on the participations' willingness to be candid. T-group training's personal nature suggests that participation should be voluntary. Some view it as unethical because it can't be considered participation "suggested" by one's superior as voluntary. Other argue that it can be dangerous if led by and incompetent trainer. According to experts Wendell French and Cecil Bell, the typical team building meeting begins with the consultant interviewing each of the group members and the leader before the meeting. Asking about the problems, the functions of the group, and the obstacles that keeping the group away from performing better. Then the consultant categorizes the interview data into themes (such as; inadequate communications") and presents the themes to the group at the start of the meeting. The group ranks the themes in terms of importance, and the most important ones become the agenda for the meeting. The group then explores and discusses the issue, examines the underlying causes of the problems, and begins devising solutions (French, & et al., 1978: 171-193).

Survey research requires that employees throughout the organization complete attitude surveys. The facilitator then uses those data as a basis for problem analysis and action planning. Surveys are a convenient way to unfreeze a

company's management and employees. They provide a comparative, graphic illustration of the fact that the organization does have problems to solve(Schneider, et al., Sep. 1996: 695-705)

Eventually, Human process includes; t-group, process consultation, third-party intervention, team building, organizational confrontation meeting, and survey research.

Innovation: Technology interferes with OD human process. Microsoft found software that help to Communicate in the moment and keep everyone at the workplace in the know. With features of staying connected with chat, calls, and meetings within the teamwork and in private or small group conversations. These software programs give stakeholders built in access to everything they need right in office. With managing all conversations, files, and tools, and keeping the teamwork in the loop with email integration. These programs provide intelligence searching across people, files and chats by Microsoft Graph. Such communication programs are gathering concepts for all stakeholders and help to share it within a close corporate group or department. Creating custom channels based on work streams or topics. Pin commonly used files and websites for easy reference. Build custom integrations to the existing business processes with the team's developer platform. For example; Hootsuite program, Wrike program, Trello. (Microsoft, 2017)

- Technostructural interventions organizational development managers and leaders also help to change firms' structures, methods, and job designs, using

an assortment of technostuctural interventions. Such as; in a formal structural change program, the employees collect data on the company's existing organizational structure; then they jointly redesign and implement a new one (Dessler, 2015: 277).

- Human resource management applications organizational development leaders and managers use action research to allow employees to analyze and change their firm's human resources practices. Targets of change here may have the performance appraisal and reward systems, as well as installing diversity programs (Dessler, 2015:277). Such technological software including performance appraisals were discussed before in this paper.
- Strategic organizational development applications; strategic interventions intend to use action research to improve a company's strategic management. Integrated strategic management is one example, which contains four steps of managers and employees; first analyze current strategy and organizational structure, second choose a desired strategy and organizational structure, third design a strategic change plan which is an action plan for moving the corporate from its current strategy and corporate design to the desired future strategy and design, at the end, the fourth step is the team oversees implementing the strategic change and reviewing the results (Dessler, 2015: 277)

Technological software also finds a way to interfere strategy and design plans to make it easier for corporate. One of these software programs is OnStrategy program. This software provide a dedicated expert strategist to help building,

implementing, and rolling-out the business strategic plan with working with their clients wherever they are in planning process (OnStrategy, 2017).

Organizational development is connected to innovations, as using technological software programs in order to reduce the resistance to change, without neglect the importance of leaders, managers, and employees' interactions.

Conclusion& Recommendations:

Culture affects the employee career in the organization and it considered within the human resources policy in the employee resourcing. Employee resourcing affects employees' skill development, their commitment to the organization, and their careers, as well as it has potential for positive and negative consequences on individuals' well being. Therefore, being a fit for a position is a hard process for corporate that should be considered when they want to fill any vacancy, especially, leadership or management one. Human resources policy within any healthy organizational environment will focus on having capable and competent leaders and active employees that reflect on the organizational culture form and being stable to continue and survive.

Leaders' values, attitudes, and believes that gained from their social environment and experiences reflect on their span of control. Leading is one of the basic management functions that getting employees to do the things leader's want them to do, by means of communicating with, motivating, and disciplining them, via ability of leaders in having leadership to influence others to strive to attain goals or objectives of a corporate and exercising effective leadership. Leaders use motivation to bring out the best in their employees by giving them reasons to perform better, but it's not easy as motivation is a complex and it is so difficult to motivate

some employees. Thus, leadership is inspiring, motivating, influencing, and changing behaviors of others in pursuit of a common goal. However, leadership behaviors can be taught and learned.

Effective leaders' careers; capable and competent are the foundation stones for having strong and excellent organizational culture. Otherwise; organizational toxic culture will be dominant. In the strong culture, organization is typified by set of strong values. These values are strengthened by rituals which emphasize and reward appropriate behavior and a cultural network, comprising a system of communication to spread the values and create corporate heroes. The excellent organizational culture owns terminology showed that firm becomes much more than a place of work by offering meaning as well as money, the excellent companies give their employees a mission as well as a sense of feeling great. The toxic organizational culture; the poisoning corporate culture or the broken one, is the vice versa of the strong and the excellent cultures, but all have gathered in having leaders who shape the corporate environment and culture at that frame. Toxic organizational culture is making everything at the workplace harder, from organizing the work to getting critical approvals to move work forward. Too many competent and capable people will end up in leaving their works not because of the job itself or the compensation plan, but because of the company's toxic culture based-blaming and being exhausted of pushing a rock uphill every working day.

Most of time, when a dramatic change occurs in the external environment, strong and excellent companies become motivated to undertake large-scale organizational change, on the other hand, the unhealthy organizational culture will accept any rapid organizational change as they lost the corporate stability and will seek for rapid changes at the corporate, managers can change one or more of five aspects of their companies; their strategy, culture, structure,

technology, or the attitudes and skills of the employees. The toxic organizational culture immediately will start to think in changing managers and replace them with more capable ones. However, all these changes will not be useful without the employees' active support. Most fruitful success plan in change organizational culture is to embark with leadership tools, as well as a vision or story of developing the future, bolster the change in place with management tools, such as role definitions, measurement and control systems, and use the pure power tools of coercion and punishments as a last resort, when all else fails.

Changes usually raise resistance. The way to deal with the resistance is the Organizational Development (OD), which is the way to reduce any corporate stakeholder's resistance to change. Technology also interferes with OD human process. Managers can impose rewards or sanctions that guide employee behaviors, explain why the change is needed, negotiate with employees give inspirational speeches, or ask employees to help design the change.

Recommendations:

It is clear by all the evidence presented in this paper that changes within organizations in their strategy, culture, structure, technology, or the attitudes and skills of the employees are facing resistance, which cannot only rely on leadership and management role to be solved or improved. Many improvements have been done, but until now changes still a dramatic solution. Although, technological innovation is still improved the situation, but it would go a long way to increase adaptation and acceptance to change within organization so that would increase progress and success to continue and survive, without abandon of stakeholders intervene.

Innovation technology can expand organizations market to compete on a global stage by using the Internet; social media...etc. innovation also can help organization's shareholders to keep costs to a minimum and centralize their work, which increase controlling their workplace and reduce problems that might be raised with the organizational changes via using automation. And can also help to simplify the production process, and eliminating costly waste.

There has to be more done to reduce the resistance changes at the workplace and not wait until the necessity of changes rise up to start searching for a solution to improve the situation. With the rapid global changes, customer's demand change and technological innovation becomes a necessity to convey progress and keep continuity. In the strong, excellent and toxic organizational culture, organizational changes become a necessity.

Stakeholders still a dynamic factor. Without a capable and competent leadership and employees, organizations cannot neither expand nor continue. Therefore, Organizational Development (OD) also helps in reduce the effect and impact of changes in order to achieve the final organizational vision and goals.

Eventually, the importance of organizational changes, leadership, and innovation need to be addressed in a more effective manner, which will reduce the resistance which can be done more effectively to keep organizations survive and continue.

References:

Books:

- Arsmson, R. (2005) “*Managing Complexity: A Systems Approach – Block 5 – The Systemic Practitioner: Being Reflective, Becoming Aware*”. Second edition. UK. Open University.
- Byrd, J., M., & Megginson, C., L. (2009) “*Small Business Management: An Entrepreneur’s Guidebook*”. Sixth Edition. NY. McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Daniels, D., J., Radebaugh, H., L., Sullivan, P., D. (2015) “*International Business Environments and operations*”. Fifteenth Edition. Pearson Education Limited.
- Deal, T., E., and Kennedy, A., A. (1982) “*Corporate Culture-the Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life*”. London. Penguin.
- Dessler, G. (2015) “*Human Resource Management*”. Fourteen edition. England. Person Education Limted.
- Gordan, G., G., &Ditomaso, N.(1992) “*Predicting Corporate performance from Organizational culture*”. Journal of Management Studies. New Jersey. Rutgers University.
- Keynes, M. (1999) “Creativity, Innovation and Change”. Block 1. In: Martin, N., J. (2004) “Systems Thinking Principles and Practice – Concept File 2: The Individual: Workplace and Self-Deelopment”.UK. Open University.
- Kirton, J., M. (2003) “*Adaption – Innovation In the Context of Diversity and Change*”. NY. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Kotter, P., J. (2012) “*Leading Change*”. Boston, Massachusetts. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Lane, A. (2004) “*System Thinking: Principles and Practice- Concept file 3 Groups and Team at work*”. UK. Open University.
- McGregor, D. (1960) “*The Human Side of Enterprise*”.Londen . McGraw Hill.

- Needle, D. (1989) “*Business in Context*, International Thompson Business Press”. In Salaman, G. (2002) “*Understanding Business: Organization*”. UK. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group in association with The Open University.
- Peters, T., J., & Waterman, R., H. (1982) “*In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America’s Best Run Companies*”. London. Harper & Row.
- Pinnington, A., & Edwards, T. (2000) “*Introduction to Human Resource Management*”. New York. Oxford University Press Inc.
- Pinto, K., J. (2013) “*Project Management Achieving Competitive Advantage*”. Third Edition. UK. Pearson Education Limited.
- Robbins, P., S. & Judge, A., T. (2015) “*organizational Behavior*”. Sixteenth edition. England. Pearson Education Limited.
- Stalk, G., Evans, P., & Shulman, L. (1992) “*Competing on Capabilities*”. Harvard Business Review. In Barnes, D. (2002) “*Understanding Business: Process*”. UK. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group in association with The Open University.
- Schein, H., E. (2004) “*Organizational Culture and Leadership*”. Third Edition. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass.

Academic Journals:

- French, W., Bell, C., Jr., & Zawacki Dallas, A., R. (1978) “*Organization Development: Theory, Practice, and Research*”. SAGE journals. Available: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/105960117800300318> Accessed: Dec. 29, 2017.
- Ray, C., A. (1986) “*Corporate Culture: the last frontier of control*”. Journal of Management Studies. Available: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1986.tb00955.x/abstract> . Accessed: Nov. 30, 2017.
- Schneider, B., Ashworth, D., S., Higgs, C., A., Carr, L. (Sep. 1996) “*Design, Validity, And Use Of Strategically Focused Employee Attitude Surveys*”. Personnel Psychology. Available: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01591.x/abstract> . Accessed: Dec. 29, 2017.

Website & Articles:

- Denning, S. (Jul. 23, 2011) “*How Do You Change An Organizational Culture?*”. Available: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/stevedenning/2011/07/23/how-do-you-change-an-organizational-culture/#2b3aef7439dc> . Accessed: Dec. 29, 2017
- Difference between net (2014) “*Deference Between Capability and Competency* ”. Available: <http://www.differencebetween.net/language/words-language/difference-between-capability-and-competency/> Accessed: Oct. 2017.
- Johnson, R. (2017) “*Advantages & Disadvantages of Matrix Organizational Structures in Business Organizations* ”. Available: <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/advantages-disadvantages-matrix-organizational-structures-business-organizations-26350.html> Accessed: Nov. 3rd, 2017
- Gotsill, G., & Natchez, M. (Nov. 2007) “*From Resistance to Acceptance: How to Implement Change Management* ”. Training and Development. Available: http://www.ginagotsill.com/uploads/1/1/5/2/11527788/t_d_change_management_1107.pdf Accessed: Dec. 29, 2017
- Kc Agu (May 24, 2016) “*6 Software Tools for Monitoring Employee Productivity* ”. Huffpost. U.S. available: https://www.huffingtonpost.com/kc-agu/post_11966_b_10099296.html . Accessed: Dec. 11, 2017.
- Lowe, K. (2017) “*The Importance of Culture in Organizations* ”. Chron Small Business. Available: <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/importance-culture-organizations-22203.html> Accessed: Oct. 13, 2017
- Management Study Guide (2017) “*Charles Handy Model of Organization Culture* ”. Available: <http://www.managementstudyguide.com/charles-handy-model.htm> . Accessed: Nov. 9th, 2017.
- Microsoft (2017) available: <https://products.office.com/en-us/microsoft-teams/group-chat-software> Accessed: Dec. 29, 2017.

- Olson, A. Psy.D. (Aug. 13, 2013) “*The Theory of Self-Actualization Mental illness, creativity and art*”. Available: <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/theory-and-psychopathology/201308/the-theory-self-actualization> Accessed: Nov. 15th, 2017
- OnStrategy (2017) Available: <https://onstrategyhq.com/strategic-planning-software/> Accessed: Dec. 30, 2017.
- Oxford living dictionary (2017) available: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/culture> Accessed: Oct. 1st, 2017.
- Oxford Dictionary, 2017 “*Definition of Toxic in English*”. Available: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/toxic> Accessed: Dec. 24, 2017.
- Ryan, L. (Oct. 19, 2016) “*Ten Unmistakable Signs Of A Toxic Culture*”. Available: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/lizryan/2016/10/19/ten-unmistakable-signs-of-a-toxic-culture/#396472c0115f> . Accessed Dec. 24, 2017.
- SBDC (2015), “*WHY IS TECHNOLOGY IMPORTANT IN BUSINESS?*”. Oklahoma. Available:<https://www.oksbdc.org/why-is-technology-important-in-business/> . Accessed: Nov. 30, 2017.
- Whitehurst, J. (Oct. 13th, 2016) “*Leaders can Shape Company Culture Through Their Behaviors*”. Harvard Business Review. Available: <https://hbr.org/2016/10/leaders-can-shape-company-culture-through-their-behaviors> . Accessed: Oct. 2nd, 2017.