

Module Assignment Submission

Student Name:	Emma Nightingale
Student Number:	2008693
Module Code:	BMSK5009
Module Title:	Developing a High-Performance Culture

Statement of Confirmation of Authenticity

By the act of making this submission, the student declares that this is the work of the student named above. The work has not, in whole or in part, been knowingly presented elsewhere for assessment, or where assessment has been built on a previous assessment, this has been identified. Where materials have been used from other sources it has been properly acknowledged. If this statement is untrue, the student acknowledges that an assessment offence has been committed.

Attention is drawn to the plagiarism and unfair practice policies of the University.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
What is Culture?.....	3
Organisational Culture.....	3
Types of Organisational Cultures.....	4
Elements that can affect Organisational Culture.....	8
Conclusion.....	15
References.....	16
Appendix 1.....	19

Introduction

The purpose of this assignment is to explore culture and in particular organisational culture. It will look at different theories and frameworks relating to organisational culture and how this may affect the culture within. It will explore how cultures are viewed externally and internally. It will investigate Corporate Social Responsibility and its impact to Organisations.

What is Culture?

Cohen (2009) suggests culture can be defined as a group of individuals who hold common beliefs, attitudes and values. Shared values can consist of personal morals, dress code and manners, language and religious beliefs. Elements such as upbringing and society can affect an individual's cultural norms.

Organisational Culture

According to Woffindin (2023) organisational culture consists of several elements such as values, expectations and practices. It helps create the desired employees' behaviours and attitude by ensuring the organisation and the employees' values are shared and employees understand what the organisation expects from them. Davies, Nutley and Mannion (2000) define organisational culture as a “way things are done around here” which is embedded deep within an organisation. Organisational culture helps encourage employees to share the same values within the organisation and can lead to a united approach. According to Sokro (2012) organisational culture can have a direct impact on an employee's motivation levels and loyalty by creating healthy competition. It states that when organisational culture and employees' beliefs and values are aligned it increases performance and job satisfaction and this can have an impact on the organisational culture within the workplace.

CIPD argues whilst understanding organisational culture is important it can be flawed and complex, particularly when attempted to shape inclusion. It suggests that understanding organisational climate could be more beneficial as organisational climate can be easier to understand and interpret. Organisational climate can help organisations focus on individuals' behaviours and specific areas and can result in organisations becoming more successful in focusing and encouraging positive change in areas such as safety, innovation, ethical and inclusion. There are elements that can support a positive organisational climate such as correct management, make up of teams, design of job, policies and procedures. Wallace, Hunt and Richards (1999) highlighted organisational climate is based on internal factors within an organisation unlike organisational culture which takes into account both internal and external factors. Whilst organisational culture and climate are interlinked it suggests organisational climate could be defined as shared perceptions whereby organisational culture is defined as a shared assumption.

Types of Organisational Cultures

Heinz reports there are 4 types of organisational culture: clan, adhocracy, market and hierarchy culture. Clan cultures often have a family-like feel to the organisation which focuses on open and honest feedback and a feeling of togetherness. Clan culture-based organisations are often open to change however can be difficult to manage in large organisations. Adhocracy culture encourages employees to take risks and be innovative and creative. It often focuses on the external appearance and encourages professional growth for individuals however can create high pressure and stressful environments to work. Market culture similarly to adhocracy are risk diverse and can create competitive environments. Market culture organisations are results focused with individuals contributing to the organisations overall goal. However, it can lead to low levels of job satisfaction for individuals as organisations focus on external factors rather than internal factors. Hierarchy cultures are defined as stable and well-structured organisations which focus on internal elements with individuals having a

clear and defined role within the organisation and they are risk averse. Hierarchy culture based organisations will have a clear management structure however due to procedures and structure changes can be slow to implement and lack in encouraging creativity. According to Oh and Han (2020) there is no specific type of organisational culture that is more successful; however organisations should use the correct style that best serves the needs of their organisation.

Whilst working for SWP as an Incident Risk and Resolution Officer (IRRO) I would consider the culture a hierarchy culture. The role and responsibilities of an IRRO is very clearly defined and it is essential the threat risk and harm are accurately identified at the first point of contact with the public to eliminate the potential risk and grade the response accordingly. There is a clear line of management with various levels of authority and there are strong structures in place to reduce the risk to the public. However, it can be difficult to implement changes as changes can have impact on a several departments within the organisations so a lot of elements need to be considered before changes can be rolled out throughout the force. There is often a pilot scheme that will test the changes in the first instance and thorough and meticulous auditing checks will be conducted to ensure changes are safe to implement initially.

Hall (1976) developed the iceberg model of culture. It highlights that 90% of an organisational culture is deep rooted and is not visible from outside the organisation. It indicates that only 10% is visible on the surface of the organisation. Element that are below surface level of an organisation and are deep rooted include:-

- Level of trust.
- Feeling of safety.
- Core values.
- Opportunities for further learning and development.
- Biases.
- Discipline.

- Levels of flexibility.
- Level of expectation.
- Openness

Elements that are visual from an organisation include:-

- Location of business.
- Environment and amenities offered.
- Dress Code.
- Staff.
- Engagement.

It is reported that all elements can have a direct impact on the behaviour, values and belief held within the organisation.

Shein (1991) created a pyramid called level of organisational culture which is broken down as follows:-

- Artefacts
- Values
- Underlying Assumption

At the top of the pyramid are artefacts which are visual to all and can include policies and structures within the organisation which all stakeholders are able to see however are not always clearly understood by all stakeholders. The next stage is values which shows the goal and beliefs held by the organisation which includes strategies which highlight the reason why these values are important to the organisation. The final stage is underlying assumptions which consist of unconscious assumptions, beliefs and feelings towards the organisational values. Schein states the final stage may well be in the most time consuming and context part of the pyramid and it is directly affected by the understanding and delivery of the first and second stages. Similarly, to Hall's theory Shein final stage highlights there are elements of culture that are not always visible within an organisation but have a significant effect on the culture held within an organisation.

Handy (2007) highlights there are 4 power cultures within an Organisation.

Power Culture ~ It is often referred to as a “web” and power will remain at the centre of the web with a specific individual within the organisation the effects of the power will then have a ripple effect down the web to individuals. It can be effective for fast decision making.

Role Culture ~ This culture will have many levels of leadership who all have very defined roles to play in the success of the organisation. It promotes individual responsibility and accountability and can result in motivation particularly for individuals who are motivated by rewards.

Task culture ~ Teams come together with a clear goal to achieve the Organisation's goals and objectives. They are often like minded individuals who have authority for the day to day running of the teams' objectives with the leadership still retaining overall power of important decisions. This type of power is often referred to as a “net” as many of the tasks will interact in some way to get the objectives and tasks completed.

Persons Culture ~ This is when an individual needs are the main objectives of the organisation. Individuals who are often experts and specialise in a particular area such as Consultants would be part of a person's culture however this an unusual culture for organisations to be part of.

Much like Handys theory Trompenaars (1993) also identified Four Cultures which supports Handys theory, the Family Culture, the Eiffel Tower, the Guided Missile and the Incubator. The family culture sets out the relationship between leaders and employees are the father and children. The father is the individual with the power within an organisation and the children are seeking approval. This is a very similar dynamic to Handys Power culture. Whilst the Eiffel tower element is defined as Handys Role Culture. Eiffel tower culture is very structured, and individuals are expected to contribute to the organisation as defined in their job description. Guided Missile Culture

is task based individuals are encouraged to be creative to fulfil the organisations' ultimate goal. There are often many sub-teams which are focused on their area of expertise. The final type of power is Incubator Culture which is like Handys Person's Culture individual based. The organisations' main purpose is the development of the individual and allows individuals to demand power and authority due to their expertise.

Janićijević (2012) warns a power or family culture can fail if the leadership with the power making decisions for the organisation are adequate or the employees are not flexible to accept changes, or the decisions made. Role cultures can develop difficulties if barriers are crossed and communication is lacking amongst teams.

When working at my previous role as Officer Supervisor the culture was Power Culture/Power Culture. The Headteacher had overall power of all decisions and whilst it was successful majority of the time there were difficulties if the Headteacher was already engaged or committed and was not able to evaluate and give authority in an ever-changing fast-paced environment. The Headteacher did not allow other senior management any authority to give permission and this sometimes caused frustration amongst colleagues.

My current employee could be defined as an Eiffel tower/role culture but also has elements of Guided Missile/Task Culture. Teams are very structured with a clear line of command for decision making. There are many layers of authority all with different expertise and different levels of authority.

Elements that can affect Organisational Culture

Understanding informal and formal relationships can have an impact on organisational culture. It can define how employees interact and engage with each other. According to Ali (2016) it can help shape and define organisational culture. It can encourage and promote engagement and shared values.

Cantos Galindo (2016) define informal and formal relationship as follows:-

Informal relationships are spontaneous relationships that are created between work colleagues who often have common interests and outlooks. They encourage social communications between individuals between different teams.

Formal relationships are often formed between leadership and employees, and it promotes clear instructions and directness amongst colleagues. There is a level of professionalism and respect form during this form of relationship. It helps individuals feel valued and defines their role within the organisation.

Pyöriä(2007) suggests organisations that encourage and promote positive and meaningful relationships within the organisations help establish a united culture leading to improved communication skills, increased job satisfaction, higher levels of productivity and overall success for the Organisation.

Spencer Oatey & Franklin (2012) states there are several layers of culture that an individual will hold, and it is important to recognise and understand as it can have a bearing on the beliefs and values. These include National Levels, Regional levels, Gender levels, social class and corporate level.

Hofstede's (2001) theory of cultural dimensions theory appears to support multicultural beliefs by highlighting different cultures. This theory focuses on five dimensions that can help us analyse and comprehend the differences in cultural behaviour, beliefs, and values across different societies. They can be broken down as follows:-

Power Distance v Low Power Distance. This dimension measures how the individual with less power within the Organisation accepts the unequal distribution of power within the organisation. In high power cultures there is a high level of hierarchy acceptance and decisions made from leaders are respected and adhered to. Low power distance cultures have a more equally distributed level of power and allows all individuals to take on decision making tasks. Eastern and Latin Countries are more accepting power

cultures in comparison to Western European Countries who are more likely to have low power organisations. Eylon and Au (1999) warn employees from a power distance organisation often have less job satisfaction and an overall feeling of empowerment unlike employees from lower power organisations. It suggests high employees power culture may have difficulty adapting to change when additional responsibilities are expected from as they will lack the knowledge as they would not have been part of any decision making previous,

The uncertainty avoidance dimension relates to the extent to which organisations are willing to accept uncertainty and change. Organisations with high uncertainty seek out structure and certainty. They have procedures and plans in place to avoid situations viewed as high risk. Whilst low uncertainty avoidance organisations are viewed as risk takers and accepting of change and unpredicted situations. Çakar & Ertürk (2010) states countries such as Japan and France have high uncertainty avoidance whilst regions such as the United states of America and Netherlands have lower level of uncertainty avoidance. They warn unless employees are committed, and organisations values are understood, and accepted uncertainty avoidance can have an adverse impact on innovation.

Masculinity vs. Femininity highlights the dimension refers to the divide in organisations between genders. Masculine cultures can be extremely competitive, and goal driven. Whilst in feminine cultures they are less ambitious based and promote quality of life and work life balance. They often have roles that overlap in gender and are more nurturing and equality-based organisations. United States of America, Mexico and Japan are considered countries with high masculinity dimensions in comparison to Norway and Sweden which is considered a higher Femininity Countries

Long-term vs. Short-term dimension refers to how different cultures value specific goals and results. Long term focused cultures value long term goals and are focused on future achievements and adapting accordingly. Whereby Organisations that are short-term value-based focus on the past and present achievements and values, they tend to focus

on immediate results and prioritise accordingly. Hofstede indicated China and Japan are long term-based cultures whilst the United States of America and Australia are short term focused.

Indulgence v Restraint dimension indicates the difference in how cultures prioritised individuals needs and values. Indulgence focuses on cultures with greater emphasis on individual wellbeing and needs. They value individuals' happiness and understand the importance of personal freedom. Whilst restraint-based cultures believe stricter regulations should be adhered to comply with social norms. The United States of America and Western Europe are believed to be indulgence cultures whereby Asian cultures are considered restraint focused.

McSweeney (2002) warns Hofstede Culture Dimensions are outdated and is based on data collected from one Organisation in a Country and the result of the data collected is then be used to represent all organisations within the Country is not a true reflection. Eringa et al (2015) conducted a study of 1033 students which included 5 nationalities which appear to support McSweeney's belief. The findings (Appendix 1) highlighted that there are differentiating results in all areas of the dimensions within the Hofstede framework with long term and power dimensions having more significant conflicting results. As the results are from a younger generation it supports McSweeney's assumption that Hofstede's framework is outdated and not an accurate representation of the cultural difference in the modern world.

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) refers to organisations that are socially responsible when making decisions that are considerate of ethical, environmental and economic issues. This could be done in several ways such as only doing business transactions with other organisations that value ethical labour practices and/or are environmentally considerate. Du & Sen (2010) organisations that prioritise CSR can increase profitability and reputation as it can increase customer loyalty and retention and help build the organisation brand. Dubbink, Graafland & Vsan Liedekerke (2008) warn there are disadvantages to Organisations as it can incur more costs as organisations

and customers can become impatient as organisations will be more focused on their social responsibility rather than speed and delivery of a product. Bachmann & Ingenhoff (2016) believes the advantages to organisations outweigh all disadvantages by increasing organisations' reputation and will open investment opportunities in the long term.

Organisations such as Body Shop have built their whole organisations on being CSR. According to Body Shop (n.d.) they were one of the first Organisations to stand up against Animal testing and working towards a greener planet for the past 40 years. Body Shop has a whole team that is dictated to environmental and ethical responsibility and empowerment. According to Misukami-Mia-Kanda (2023) the organisation known as Shein were highlighted for their lack of CSR due to working hours of their employees being over the legal limit and employees were given only 1 day off a month. Shein has since issued a CSR campaign promoting fairtrade and good working environments with The CSR Journal (2019) reporting Shein has given a large donation to the wish foundation by way of giving back to communities. Shein (2021) report profusely denies allegations of not acting with CSR values and warn that they will not work with supplies who fail to comply with CSR. They report they understand the importance and impact of CSR on economy and environment and operate with this in mind at all times.

The Organisations I work for have put things in place to be CSR. They have electric vehicles, a recycle policy and recycling bins in the workplace and the organisation promotes paperless communications as much as possible by encouraging teams to communicate via skype or email. The main CSR is positively engaging with communities, and we have a dedicated team of Community Engagement Officers to provide this service.

I conducted Pestle Analysis to highlight the external factors that could cause a threat to the Public Sector where I work as below.

P	Government appointed Nationally and Locally. Terrorist threats locally and internationally. College of Policing Policies. Funding received. Covid restrictions implemented.
E	Available Resources. Overtime demand required. Budget restraints. Credit crunch.
S	Diversity. Increase in Mental Health demands. Crime levels increasing or decreasing. Leadership styles. Increase in vulnerability and safeguarding concerns of the public. Public perception of Organisations. Regularly callers & Prank callers. Demand due to Bank holidays and holiday seasons. Organised crime and County lines.
T	Online crime reporting. Social Media. BT phone lines. Radio airway failure. Mapping system failure. Phone tracker default. Risk of Security breaches of database.
L	GDPR breach. College of Policing guidelines.

	Changes in the legislation of the Law. Review and changes in Standard of Procedures (SOPS).
E	Crime increases in certain areas. Events/concerts in certain areas. Security breach at Headquarters. Critical data not provided to officers when attending incidents. Weather conditions such as floods and dangerous driving conditions. Increase in services due to the full moon. Areas that are more highly populated than others

To assess the internal factors that could affect the organisation I am employed for I completed a SWOT analysis as below:-

<u>Strengths</u>	<u>Weakness</u>
High level of job satisfaction from a feeling of making a difference. Competitive Salary. Supportive team members.	High stress levels and dealing with high-pressured situations. Dealing with difficult and distressing incidents. Employees missing out on family time and celebrations. Working bank holidays.
<u>Opportunities</u>	<u>Threats</u>
Ability to progress and upskill. Willingness to change different shifts pattern long term or short term.	Poor morale of the team. Lack of Communication. Employees' mental health being affected.

Conclusion

Organisational culture is a feeling of the organisation that can be felt by all stakeholders. Internal factors can shape an organisations culture along with external levels such as National and Regional and Gender and Social elements. Understanding and embracing an organisations culture can be beneficial to employees as it can improve job satisfaction and a feeling of fulfilment. Organisations who understand the importance of CSR can improve reputation and trading opportunities.

References

- Ali, I. M. (2016). Doing the organizational tango: Symbiotic relationship between formal and informal organizational structures for an agile organization. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management*, 11, 55.
- Bachmann, P., & Ingenhoff, D. (2016). Legitimacy through CSR disclosures? The advantage outweighs the disadvantages. *Public Relations Review*, 42(3), 386-394.
- The Body Shop. (n.d.). The Body Shop.
<https://www.thebodyshop.com/en-gb/about-us/activism/a/a00015>
- Çakar, N. D., & Ertürk, A. (2010). Comparing innovation capability of small and medium-sized enterprises: examining the effects of organizational culture and empowerment. *Journal of small business management*, 48(3), 325-359.
- CIPD. (n.d.). Organisational Climate and Culture.
<https://www.cipd.org/uk/knowledge/factsheets/organisation-culture-change-factsheet/>
- Cohen, A. B. (2009). Many forms of culture. *American psychologist*, 64(3), 194.
- Davies, H. T., Nutley, S. M., & Mannion, R. (2000). Organisational culture and quality of health care. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 9(2), 111-119.
- Du, S., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2010). Maximizing business returns to corporate social responsibility (CSR): The role of CSR communication. *International journal of management reviews*, 12(1), 8-19.
- Dubbink, W., Graafland, J., & Van Liedekerke, L. (2008). CSR, transparency and the role of intermediate organisations. *Journal of business ethics*, 82, 391-406.
- Eringa, K., Caudron, L. N., Rieck, K., Xie, F., & Gerhardt, T. (2015). How relevant are Hofstede's dimensions for inter-cultural studies? A replication of Hofstede's research among current international business students. *Research in Hospitality Management*, 5(2), 187-198.
- Eylon, D., & Au, K. Y. (1999). Exploring empowerment cross-cultural differences along the power distance dimension. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23(3), 373-385.

Handy, C. (2007). *Understanding organizations*. Penguin Uk.

Hall, E.T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. New York: Anchor Books

Heinz, K. (n.d.). *The 4 types of organizational culture and their benefits*. Built In. <https://builtin.com/company-culture/types-of-organizational-culture>

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Sage.

Janićijević, N. (2012). The influence of organizational culture on organizational preferences towards the choice of organizational change strategy. *Economic annals*, 57(193), 25-51.

McSweeney, B., (2002). The essentials of scholarship: A reply to Geert Hofstede. *Human Relations*, 55(11), 1363–1372.

Misukami-Mia-Kanda, C. (2023). How do slow fashion brands manage to guarantee good working conditions?: The case of shoe manufacturing in remote countries.

Oh, S. Y., & Han, H. S. (2020). Facilitating organisational learning activities: Types of organisational culture and their influence on organisational learning and performance. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 18(1), 1-15.

Pyöriä, P. (2007). Informal organizational culture: The foundation of knowledge workers' performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 11(3), 16-30.

Schein, E. H. (1991). What is culture. *Newbury Park, CA: Sage*, 243-253.

Shein. (2021). Sustainability and Social Impact Report.

Sokro, E. (2012). Analysis of the relationship that exists between organisational culture, motivation and performance. *Problems of Management in the 21st Century*, 3(1), 106-119.

Spencer-Oatey, H., & Franklin, P. (2012). What is culture. *A compilation of quotations. GlobalPAD Core Concepts*, 1, 22.

Trompenaars, F. (1993). *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business*. London, UK: Economist Books.

The CSR Journal. (2019). Shein India Collaborates with Make a Wish Foundation Making Kids Wishes Come True

<https://thecsrjournal.in/shein-india-collaborates-with-make-a-wish-foundation-making-kids-wishes-come-true/>

Wallace, J., Hunt, J., & Richards, C. (1999). The relationship between organisational culture, organisational climate and managerial values. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 12(7), 548-564.

Woffindin, L. (2023). What is organisational culture? Retrieved from <https://cpdonline.co.uk/knowledge-base/business/organisational-culture/>

Appendix 1

Table 3: Comparing scores Hofstede (H) versus Stenden research (S)

	N	PDI		IDV		MAS		UAI		LTO	
		H	S	H	S	H	S	H	S	H	S
Dutch	588	38	49	80	76	14	44	53	27	44	61
German	168	35	55	67	67	66	51	65	31	31	83
Chinese	117	80	66	20	49	66	60	30	63	118	68
South African	54	49	63	65	47	63	57	49	54	34	75
Qatari/ Arabic world	106	80	58	38	39	52	49	68	64	36	58

Table 4: Statistical comparison of Hofstede and Stenden scores

Nationality	PDI	IDV	MAS	UAI	LTO
Dutch	0.000***	0.152	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***
German	0.000***	0.926	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***
China	0.003**	0.000***	0.246	0.000***	0.000***
South African	0.034*	0.002**	0.394	0.532	0.000***
Qatari	0.000***	0.831	0.613	0.522	0.002**

#

Table 5: Differences in scores between males and females for all dimensions

Country	Label	N	PDI	IDV	MAS	UAI	LTO
Dutch M	1	218	52	74	48	24	53
Dutch F	1	368	47	78	42	30	65
Sig.			0.212	0.426	0.133	0.284	0.022*
German M	2	48	61	81	39	32	91
German F	2	118	51	62	55	31	80
Sig.			0.24	0.079	0.081	0.941	0.342
China M	3	40	67	53	58	72	55
China F	3	76	65	47	61	59	78
Sig.			0.874	0.566	0.829	0.275	0.083
South Africa M	4	17	66	48	61	35	75
South Africa F	4	36	62	46	55	63	75
Sig.			0.795	0.870	0.727	0.105	0.987
Qatar M	5	37	63	58	53	59	59
Qatar F	5	67	57	26	48	68	56
Sig.			0.449	0.009**	0.672	0.436	0.864
South Africa M	4	17	66	48	61	35	75
South Africa F	4	36	62	46	55	63	75
Sig.			0.795	0.870	0.727	0.105	0.987