



Organisational Culture: Individual Report — Toyota Motor Corporation

Assessment Title: Component 1 Organisational Culture: Individual Report

Student Name: Xec Sikander Xeculi

Student ID: 2413387

Module: LCLM 5005 — Organisational Culture

BA (Hons) Leadership and Management Skills for the Workplace

Lecturer: Ibrahim Rufai

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. The Culture of Toyota Motor Corporation	3
3. Culture, Structure and Decision-Making	4
4. Identifying the Prevailing Culture.....	5
5. Culture and the External Environment.....	6
6. Enabler or Barrier?.....	7
7. Culture and Performance	8
8. Conclusion	9
References	9

1. Introduction

Organisational culture is among the most heavily studied ideas in management. It is usually defined as the shared values, assumptions and everyday habits that shape how people in an organisation read and respond to what is happening around them (Schein, 2017). Mullins and Christy (2016) make the case that culture is pervasive: it works its way into decision-making, structure, motivation and control, and its influence grows as organisations spread across borders and manage more varied workforces. That last point, culture as the thing that has to bind a diverse, international workforce into something coherent, is central to their argument, and it makes a global manufacturer like Toyota a natural case against which to test it.

This report examines the culture of Toyota Motor Corporation, one of the largest carmakers in the world and the source of the globally copied Toyota Production System. Toyota's culture, usually labelled "the Toyota Way," rests on continuous improvement (kaizen), respect for people and long-term thinking (Liker, 2004). For decades it has been treated as the reason behind the company's reputation for quality and resilience.

Five tasks structure what follows. The report first identifies Toyota's culture through Schein's model and asks how that culture has shaped the company's structure and decision-making. It then applies Hofstede's dimensions and Handy's cultural types to pin down the prevailing culture, and looks at how Toyota has used its culture to cope with a fast-changing environment, above all the shift to electric vehicles. It weighs whether that culture is mainly an enabler or a barrier, using the 2009–2010 recall crisis as the central case, and closes by assessing culture's effect on performance and setting out recommendations.

2. The Culture of Toyota Motor Corporation

Schein (2017) argues that culture operates on three levels: visible artefacts, espoused values, and the basic assumptions people take for granted. Toyota is a useful test case because its culture lines up fairly tightly across all three, though the fit is not perfect.

The artefacts come straight from the Toyota Production System. Work is standardised into set sequences, progress is tracked on visual management boards, and any worker on the line can pull the andon cord to stop production the moment a defect appears. Managers are expected to practise *genchi genbutsu*, meaning they go and see a problem for themselves rather than trusting a report (Sosnovskikh, 2016). Suggestion schemes and daily kaizen activity sit alongside these practices and keep improvement running as routine rather than as an occasional project.

The espoused values are set out formally in the Toyota Way, built on two pillars: continuous improvement, which covers challenge, kaizen and Genchi Genbutsu, and respect for people, which covers respect and teamwork (Liker, 2004). This is more than corporate branding. Sosnovskikh (2016) describes Toyota's style as a "family" or clan culture, marked by collectivism, tight internal rules and a long time horizon.

At the deepest level sit the assumptions that hold everything else together: that a problem is a chance to learn rather than something to hide, that the people doing the work know best where it can be improved, and that long-term health matters more than this quarter's numbers.

A tidy three-level description can flatter the company, though. Marksberry's (2011) textual analysis of Toyota's own documents found that kaizen, the principle outsiders most associate with Toyota, is actually played down internally relative to teamwork and respect for people, and that Genchi genbutsu is the real organising idea of the Toyota Way. Internally, then, Toyota emphasises different things from what the popular management literature celebrates. That gap matters for any serious reading of the company, and it is exactly what a purely descriptive account of "the Toyota Way" tends to miss.

3. Culture, Structure and Decision-Making

Toyota's structure both reflects its culture and reinforces it, but it does not fit cleanly into one box. Burns and Stalker (1961) separate mechanistic structures, with their rigid hierarchies and set procedures, from organic ones built on flexibility and lateral working. Toyota runs both at once. Its standardised production and quality procedures are plainly mechanistic, while cross-functional problem-solving, andon authority on the line and constant improvement work are organic and decentralised. Camuffo and Wilhelm (2016) argue that this is deliberate rather than muddled: standardisation, worker authority and supplier integration are designed to depend on one another, so disturbing one element throws the whole configuration out of balance. That is roughly what happened when Toyota expanded rapidly during the 2000s, a point the recall discussion returns to below.

Decisions are shaped by nemawashi, the practice of consulting everyone with a stake before a proposal is formally tabled. Instead of a manager deciding and then selling the decision, agreement is built up quietly in advance, so formal approval mostly confirms what has already been settled. The advantages fit Toyota's stated respect for people and teamwork (Liker, 2004): ownership is spread widely, resistance during implementation falls, and problems surface earlier because more people have looked at the proposal. The andon cord reinforces

the same logic from below, handing a single line worker the power to stop an entire line. That kind of delegation would be strange in a purely hierarchical firm.

The obvious cost is speed. Consensus takes longer than a decision made at the top, especially when it has to travel across departments, plants or countries. This is not just a textbook worry. It became a real problem during the 2009–2010 recall, when Toyota's usual escalation routes could not keep up with a situation deteriorating by the day (Camuffo and Wilhelm, 2016). So culture does not simply produce a fixed structure. Under stable conditions culture and structure prop each other up; once events move faster than consensus can, the same relationship starts to hold the company back.

4. Identifying the Prevailing Culture

This section runs Hofstede's dimensions and Handy's types against Toyota, while checking each framework against evidence about Toyota specifically rather than assuming national stereotypes carry over.

Hofstede's cultural dimensions

On Hofstede's (2001) reading, a Japanese firm like Toyota should score high on collectivism, high on uncertainty avoidance and strong on long-term orientation. Two of these hold up well. Toyota's standardised procedures, heavy quality control and constant monitoring point to high uncertainty avoidance, and its willingness to fund slow-payback technologies such as hybrid and hydrogen powertrains fits a long time horizon.

The collectivism assumption is shakier. Marksberry's (2011) analysis of internal documents found Toyota sitting between individualism and collectivism rather than at the collectivist end Hofstede's national data would predict, and reinforcing short-term as well as long-term orientation. This is worth pausing on, because it shows organisational culture is not just national culture scaled down, and that reading a country's scores straight onto a company oversimplifies. Jayamaha, Wagner and Grigg (2014) add a further wrinkle: across Toyota's global plants, the individualism/collectivism dimension actually changes how consistently the Toyota Way gets deployed from site to site. Toyota's culture, then, is not experienced the same way everywhere the company operates.

Handy's cultural types

Handy (1993) offers four types: power, role, task and person. Toyota's problem-solving focus, cross-functional teams and reliance on frontline expertise over rank point to a dominant task culture, where influence comes from competence rather than position. Yet its detailed

standard operating procedures and clear lines of responsibility are equally characteristic of a role culture. The honest answer is that Toyota is a hybrid, with task culture driving day-to-day problem-solving and role culture supplying the stable procedural backbone underneath it.

One limitation should be stated plainly. Handy built his typology from Western, mostly British, organisations in the 1970s. It has no real category for practices such as *nemawashi* or *genchi genbutsu*, both of which are central to how Toyota works. It is useful for a rough structural label, but it explains little about the specific mechanisms that make Toyota distinctive, and is best treated as a broad orientation.

Bringing the frameworks together

Put together, the frameworks describe a culture that is long-term-oriented, high in uncertainty avoidance, mixed on individualism and collectivism rather than sitting at either pole, and a task/role hybrid rather than any single clean type. That refusal to fit one label is itself useful, because it accounts for both Toyota's talent for disciplined, incremental change and its documented trouble reacting quickly to sudden shocks.

5. Culture and the External Environment

Carmakers now face intense external pressure: electrification, tighter emissions rules, changing buyer expectations, and competition from established rivals and new entrants alike. How Toyota has responded shows culture shaping strategy.

Rather than betting on one powertrain, Toyota has pursued what it calls a multi-pathway strategy, developing hybrid, plug-in hybrid, battery-electric and hydrogen fuel-cell vehicles side by side (Toyota Motor Europe, 2025). The logic is the same one running through the rest of this report: spread the risk and move incrementally instead of making a single decisive bet, which is what you would expect from a firm high in uncertainty avoidance and long in orientation (Hofstede, 2001). It has paid off in at least one major market. Toyota sold a record 1.217 million vehicles in Europe in 2024, a result Toyota Motor Europe (2025) puts down directly to giving customers a choice of powertrain rather than forcing one path on them.

Denison's (1990) model is a useful lens here. It identifies adaptability and mission as the two culture traits that face outward, alongside the inward-facing involvement and consistency (Irawanto, 2019). Toyota's mission, framed as a multi-decade drive to carbon neutrality, supplies the steady direction Denison links to lasting effectiveness, while the multi-pathway approach is adaptability in action: environmental pressure is turned into a diversified response rather than resisted.

The culture also favours absorbing new technology gradually rather than in leaps. Toyota has built hybrids since the 1997 Prius, and it is now stretching that expertise into battery and hydrogen platforms using the same engineering and quality disciplines that sit behind the Toyota Production System. That is kaizen applied to strategy: change taken on board steadily, not through sudden reinvention.

This strength has a matching weakness. A culture geared to incremental, consensus-based change suits an environment that moves at a manageable pace. It is less obviously suited to one demanding fast, discontinuous change, which is the tension that surfaces as faster rivals chase concentrated, single-technology electrification.

6. Enabler or Barrier?

Whether Toyota's culture helps or hinders depends heavily on how fast and how radically its environment is changing. When change is gradual, the evidence above shows culture working as an enabler, supporting quality, engagement and patient adaptation. When change is fast or disruptive, the same traits can turn into a liability.

The clearest example is the 2009–2010 recall, when Toyota called back millions of vehicles over reports of unintended acceleration. Camuffo and Wilhelm (2016) read the episode not as a one-off technical fault but as organisational "misfit". Toyota's fast global expansion had pulled in overseas suppliers who did not know its internal standards, while the in-house specialists whose job was to transmit Toyota's production culture were spread too thinly to keep up. Standardisation, supplier integration and internally trained oversight normally reinforce one another; they came apart once growth outran the company's ability to embed its culture consistently. That is a sharper diagnosis than "Toyota was too slow", and it points to a specific danger for strong cultures: they rely on an internal consistency that is hard to hold together while scaling quickly. It also connects back to the structural point made earlier. The tightly complementary elements Camuffo and Wilhelm (2016) describe are a source of strength precisely because they interlock, but that same interlocking means a failure in one part can propagate through the rest rather than staying contained.

Christensen's (1997) work on disruptive innovation offers a second angle. Well-run firms, he argues, often fail because of their strengths rather than in spite of them: companies that are excellent at improving an established technology for existing customers struggle to respond to a different, initially worse, but rapidly improving alternative. Kaizen is exactly the sort of strength Christensen ties to that vulnerability. You can see it in the contrast between Toyota's cautious multi-pathway approach and the concentrated, faster electrification strategies of

Tesla and BYD. Toyota's risk-spreading makes an expensive misstep less likely, but it may also hold back the decisive, resource-heavy commitment that quicker rivals have used to grab an early lead in battery-electric cars.

The culture, then, is not a barrier in its own right. It carries a trade-off. The same consensus-based, incremental habits that deliver quality, stability and long-run resilience also slow the company at exactly the moments, rapid scaling or a disruptive technology shift, when speed counts most. That makes the culture a conditional enabler, valuable as long as the environment changes no faster than Toyota's own decision-making can absorb.

7. Culture and Performance

Toyota's culture has produced real, sustained performance gains, though recent results also show the limits of that advantage under pressure. The Toyota Production System is still a global benchmark for quality and efficiency, and Twaissi et al. (2025) provide recent support for the mechanism behind it, finding that total quality management and benchmarking practices mediate the link between culture and performance. That is precisely the route by which Toyota's culture has historically turned into measurable output.

The latest figures capture both the strength and the ceiling. For the nine months to December 2025 (the third quarter of financial year 2026), Toyota reported consolidated net revenue up 6.8 per cent on higher sales in Japan and North America, yet operating income fell over the same period, which the company attributes largely to United States tariffs (Toyota Motor Corporation, 2026). The pressure is concentrated where the tariffs bite hardest: in North America, one of Toyota's biggest overseas markets, sales volumes rose but the region still slid into an operating loss over the nine months (Toyota Motor Corporation, 2026). The culturally embedded strengths of quality, volume and customer loyalty are intact. What the structure does not do is automatically protect operating margins against a fast-moving external shock such as a change in trade policy. That reinforces the conditional-enabler verdict.

Three recommendations follow from the analysis.

First, Toyota should separate crisis decision-making from ordinary *nemawashi*. Camuffo and Wilhelm's (2016) reading of the recall suggests a designated, pre-authorised rapid-response route, used only during acute events, would keep the benefits of consensus in normal times while closing the specific gap that consensus opens during a fast-moving crisis.

Second, it should protect the multi-pathway electrification strategy rather than collapsing it into a single technology under competitive pressure. The Denison analysis above shows the

strategy is culturally coherent with Toyota's long-term, risk-spreading instincts (Denison, 1990; Irawanto, 2019). Abandoning it for a faster but culturally alien single bet would create its own resistance and execution risk.

Third, given Jayamaha, Wagner and Grigg's (2014) finding that individualism/collectivism changes how consistently the Toyota Way lands across sites, Toyota should keep adapting its practices to local conditions rather than imposing them uniformly, backed by structured cross-cultural leadership development. This is aimed squarely at the kind of supplier and site-level inconsistency that fed the 2009–2010 crisis.

8. Conclusion

This report has read Toyota's culture through Schein's model, Hofstede's dimensions and Handy's types, and found something more nuanced than the usual account of "the Toyota Way". The culture is long-term-oriented and high in uncertainty avoidance, but mixed on individualism and collectivism, and better described as a task/role hybrid than any single type.

That culture has shaped structure and decision-making through consensus practices like *nemawashi* and delegated authority like the andon cord, and it has supported adaptation through a deliberate, culturally consistent multi-pathway strategy. But it is not a straightforward asset. The 2009–2010 recall, and the slower pace of Toyota's electrification next to more disruptive rivals, both show that the traits underpinning stability and quality can also cap the company's speed when conditions change quickly.

The overall verdict is that Toyota's culture is a conditional enabler. Its value depends on the fit between how fast the environment is changing and how fast Toyota's consensus-based processes can move. To stay competitive, Toyota should protect the culture in the areas where it works, quality, strategic patience and employee-level empowerment, while building targeted mechanisms such as a separate crisis-response route and locally adapted deployment to cover the conditions under which that same culture becomes a liability.

References

- Burns, T. and Stalker, G.M. (1961) *The Management of Innovation*. London: Tavistock.
- Camuffo, A. and Wilhelm, M. (2016) Complementarities and organizational (mis)fit: a retrospective analysis of the Toyota recall crisis. *Journal of Organization Design*, 5(4), pp.1–13.

- Christensen, C.M. (1997) *The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Denison, D.R. (1990) *Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness*. New York: Wiley.
- Handy, C. (1993) *Understanding Organizations*. 4th ed. London: Penguin.
- Hofstede, G. (2001) *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Irawanto, D.W. (2019) Analysis of organizational culture with Denison's model approach for international business competitiveness. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 17(1), pp.142–151.
- Jayamaha, N.P., Wagner, J.P. and Grigg, N.P. (2014) The moderation effect of the cultural dimension individualism/collectivism on Toyota Way deployment: a global study on Toyota facilities. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management*, Selangor, Malaysia, pp.228–232.
- Liker, J.K. (2004) *The Toyota Way: 14 Management Principles from the World's Greatest Manufacturer*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Marksberry, P. (2011) The Toyota Way – a quantitative approach. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*, 2(2), pp.132–150.
- Mullins, L. and Christy, G. (2016) *Management and Organisational Behaviour*. 11th ed. Harlow: Pearson.
- Schein, E.H. (2017) *Organisational Culture and Leadership*. 5th ed. Hoboken: Wiley.
- Sosnovskikh, S. (2016) Toyota Motor Corporation: organizational culture. *Philosophy Study*, 6(7), pp.442–454.
- Toyota Motor Corporation (2026) *TMC announces April through December 2025 financial results*. [Press release] Toyota USA Newsroom, 6 February. Available at: <https://pressroom.toyota.com> (Accessed: 1 July 2026).
- Toyota Motor Europe (2025) *Toyota reinforces its multi-pathway approach and its commitment to customer-focused innovation*. [Press release] Toyota Newsroom Europe, 12 March. Available at: <https://newsroom.toyota.eu> (Accessed: 1 July 2026).
- Twaissi, N.M., Al Zoubi, M.O., Zoubi, J.Z.A. and Alhelalat, J.A. (2025) The mediating role of TQM interventions and benchmarking in the impact of organizational culture on organizational performance. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 18(1), pp.10–32.