

Organisational cultural diagnosis: Merits of employing the Competing Values Framework (CVF) in conjunction with shared values profiling

Dr Noel Burchell

Unitec Business School, Unitec Institute of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand

Email: nburchell@unitec.ac.nz

Cato Saele

Unitec Business School, Unitec Institute of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand

Stream: 11

Presenter profile: Dr Burchell is Associate Head of the newly formed Unitec Business School. He completed his PhD at the University of Auckland in the area of organisational culture and change management and continues to research in these areas. He also researches in the area of competencies required of business graduates, HRM and entrepreneurship. He has been presenting papers at ANZAM since 1995.

ABSTRACT

The OCAI survey based on the Competing Values Framework (CVF) of Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) has been widely employed in cultural studies. However, it focuses on what might be termed 'macro' dimensional polar values of 'internal' versus 'external' and 'flexibility' versus 'control'. By contrast, studies of shared values in organisations focus more on establishing the impact that these values have on individual behaviour and consequent organisational functionality. These 'micro' shared values can provide useful insights into what influences the behaviour of organisational members. McDonald and Gandz (1992) identified 24-shared values associated with modern business organisations where each value is classified within one of the four quadrants of the CVF. Cultural studies based on the CVF in conjunction with shared values as instruments of analysis have not been sighted in the literature, and together may represent a means for better exploring values related aspects in an organisation. This paper reports a study employing an on-line values based survey in a New Zealand transport firm. Key results are presented and the efficacy of cultural diagnosis utilising the OCAI in conjunction with shared organisational values profiling is discussed.

Key words:

Organisational culture, Values

The CVF theoretical model was developed by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) to highlight the key variables associated with organisational effectiveness. This model underpinned the development of the Organisational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) that has been employed in over 1,000 organisations operating in a diverse range of private and public sector firms around the world (Cameron & Quinn, 1999). The OCAI is a written survey whereby members assess their current culture and also indicate a preferred culture for a future time period. Differences between the two profiles can provide a basis for undertaking cultural change efforts. The OCAI focuses on four core values as polarities on two dimensions, where each dimension consists of two competing values based on criteria associated with high levels of organisational effectiveness. These core values might be termed 'macro' values in that they focus on the organisation, represent only two dimensions and subsume a number of organisational and behavioural characteristics.

Organisational-shared values by contrast are more associated with individuals and how these influence enduring mode of individual behaviour within the firm. McDonald and Gandz (1992) contend that member shared values can support organisational effectiveness and their study identifies 24 shared values that the authors regard as a comprehensive set of dimensions relevant to modern business

organisations. These values have a 'micro' orientation by being individual-focused, quite specific in nature and more numerous than the core values of the CVF. These authors also place each of the 24 value dimensions into four distinct groups; task-oriented, relationship-oriented, change-oriented and status quo-oriented, where each group also corresponds to the four quadrants of the CVF model described by Quinn and McGrath (1985). While McDonald and Gandz (1992) made the link between shared values and the core values of the CVF, they did not investigate any empirical links between these 24 values and four cultural types in the CVF. Indeed, the authors of this paper could find no organisational study involving a cultural analysis based on the CVF in conjunction with shared values.

This paper describes a values focussed cultural study of a New Zealand transport firm referred to as Transco. Results of this study are discussed including comparisons of results derived from the OCAI and shared values analysis. Finally the efficacy of cultural analysis using the two instruments in tandem is considered.

ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE, THE CVF AND SHARED VALUES

Organisational Culture

It is generally accepted that there is no universal definition of organisational culture (e.g. Alvesson, 2002; Martin, 2002). A review by Burchell (2004) yields a definition that encapsulates many of the views, yet also acknowledges its complexity, and will be adopted for this paper.

A learnt and complex phenomenon that is inherently contradictory; ongoing and emerging; a socially constructed system of emotionally held ideas concerning meanings of organisational life; shared in varying degrees among many organisational members; present in a variety of cultural manifestations that can be interpreted for meanings; which ultimately resides as schemas in the minds of culture bearers; and tacitly influences members' perceptions, feelings, thoughts and behaviours.

These socially constructed ideas can be deemed to be the substance or content of the culture (Trice & Beyer, 1993) and viewed as "... the taken-for-granted values, underlying assumptions, expectations, collective memories, and definitions present in an organization" (Cameron & Quinn, 1999, p.14).

Cultural studies invariably investigate a particular aspect of the phenomenon, and the OCAI and shared values profiling identify characteristics at the less hidden level of organisational culture as described by Schein (1992).

The OCAI and Competing Values Framework (CVF)

Igo and Skitmore (2006, p.125) state the CVF “has been rated as one of the 50 most important models in the history of business study and has proven its worth since its conception in the mid 1980s”. It also serves as a guide and indicator in terms of cultural change, motivation of employees and development of leadership skills (Igo & Skitmore, 2006). Quinn and McGrath (1985) link the CVF to a model for profiling organisational culture. This bipolar two-dimensional model has *flexibility* versus *control* and an *internal* versus an *external* focus as key factors that best explain organisational effectiveness. Quinn and McGrath (1985) further show how the four quadrants of the CVF model reflect differing types of theoretical underpinnings, organisational forms, theories of effectiveness, environmental contexts, leadership, information processing, and cultural profiles. The CVF is also the theoretical model upon which the OCAI is based, and this instrument provides a means for diagnosing and changing an organisation’s culture, albeit with caveats (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

The CVF cultural approach as described by Quinn and McGrath (1985) and, Cameron and Quinn (1999) adopts a functionalist and managerial orientation consistent with cultural studies reflecting Martin's (2002) Integration perspective. It should also be recognised that employing such an instrument for cultural measurement has shortcomings in its ability to surface unanticipated findings (Mallak, Lyth, Olson, Ulshafer, & Sardone, 2004). These authors along with Cameron and Quinn (1999) acknowledge the need for multiple methods in cultural analysis in order to better profile the complex nature of organisational culture. Indeed, there is (so far) no one best method for diagnosing and changing organisational culture (Cameron & Quinn, 1999). A description of the four quadrant profiles associated with the OCAI is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: The OCAI cultural quadrant profile (Cameron & Quinn, 1999, p.58)

<p>The Clan Culture A very friendly place to work where people share a lot of themselves. It is like an extended family. The leaders, or the heads of the organisation, are considered to be mentors and perhaps even parent figures. The organisation is held together by loyalty and tradition. Commitment is high. The organisation emphasises the long-term benefit of human resources development and attaches great importance to cohesion and morale. Success is defined in terms of sensitivity to customers and concern for people. The organisation places a premium on teamwork, participation, and consensus.</p>	<p>The Adhocracy Culture A dynamic, entrepreneurial, and creative place to work. People stick their necks out and take risks. The leaders are considered innovators and risk takers. The glue that holds the organisation together is commitment to experimentation and innovation. The emphasis is on being on the leading edge. The organisation's long-term emphasis is on growth and acquiring new resources. Success means gaining unique and new products or services. Being a product or service leader is important. The organisation encourages individual initiative and freedom.</p>
<p>The Hierarchy Culture A very formalised and structured place to work. Procedures govern what people do. The leaders pride themselves on being good coordinators and organisers who are efficiency-minded. Maintaining a smooth-running organisation is most critical. Formal rules and policies hold the organisation together. The long-term concern is on stability and performance with efficient, smooth operations. Success is defined in terms of dependable delivery, smooth scheduling, and low cost. The management of employees is concerned with secure employment and predictability.</p>	<p>The Market Culture A results-oriented organisation whose major concerns is with getting the job done. People are competitive and goal-oriented. The leaders are hard drivers, producers, and competitors. They are tough and demanding. The glue that holds the organisation together is an emphasis on winning. Reputation and success are common concerns. The long-term focus is on competitive actions and achievement of measurable goals and targets. Success is defined in terms of market share and penetration. Competitive pricing and market leadership are important. The organisational style is hard-driving competitiveness.</p>

Organisational Values

Since the early 1980's there has been support for linking deeply embedded shared values to competitive advantage (e.g. Pascale & Athos, 1981; Peters & Waterman, 1982). Values are distinctly different to attitudes and behaviours, and can be considered the building blocks of individual behaviours and choices (Stackman, Pinder, & Connor, 2000). Meglino and Ravlin (1998) provide one of the more extensive examination of values in organisations and treat values as either behavioural 'oughts' that are seen as being important in their own right, or as being instrumental in guiding behaviours. Values can be treated as being integral to the cultural milieu (e.g. Gordon & DiTomaso, 1992; Schein, 1992; Hofstede, Bond, & Luk, 1993; Trice & Beyer, 1993). Others have not felt the need to adopt a cultural perspective and focus primarily on values in their own right as ways of influencing human behaviour (e.g. Hope & Hendry, 1995; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998; Webley, 1999).

Meglino and Ravlin (1998) were also very interested in value differences that individuals considered personal versus those that individuals' thought reflected the organisation. Congruence between organisational core values and member values is considered beneficial by those arguing the case for the necessity to emphasise shared values in the organisation (e.g. Chatman, 1991; McDonald & Gandz, 1992). Studies to surface values directed more to individual members have produced conflicting results (McDonald & Gandz, 1992). However, a study by McDonald and Gandz (1992) resulted in the development of a relatively comprehensive set of relevant shared values applicable to a modern business corporation. Asking senior managers and consultants to express their views on the importance and types of values led to the development of the list of 24 relevant shared values shown in Table 2. McDonald and Gandz (1992) advocate that these values exist to some degree in all organisations, although their relative importance will vary by industry type and context.

Table 2: Behavioural outcomes associated with the 24 shared values of (McDonald & Gandz, 1992)

Value concept	Behavioural outcomes emphasise
Adaptability	Being flexible and changing in response to new circumstances
Aggressiveness	Being aggressive and pursuing goals vigorously
Autonomy	Being independent and free to act
Awareness	Seeking commercial awareness of the environment and key stakeholders
Broad-mindedness	Accepting different viewpoints and opinions
Cautiousness	Being cautious and minimising exposure to risk
Consideration	Being caring, kind and considerate
Cooperation	Being cooperative and working well with others
Courtesy	Being polite and having respect for individual dignity
Creativity	Developing new ideas and applying innovative approaches
Development	Achieving individual growth, learning and development
Diligence	Working long and hard to achieve results
Economy	Being thrifty and careful in spending
Entrepreneurial	Seeking ways to commercialise new ideas and innovations
Experimentation	Taking a trial and error approach to problem solving
Fairness	Being even handed and providing just recognition based on merit
Forgiveness	Being forgiving and understanding when errors occur
Formality	Upholding proper ceremony and maintaining tradition
Humour	Creating fun and being light hearted
Initiative	Seizing opportunity and taking responsibility without hesitation
Logic	Being rational and thinking in terms of facts and figures
Moral integrity	Being honourable and following ethical principles
Obedience	Complying with directions and conforming to rules
Openness	Being straightforward, sincere and candid in discussions
Orderliness	Being neat, tidy and well organised
Social equality	Being equal to others and avoiding status differences

Utilising the OCAI in Conjunction With Shared Values Inquiry in Cultural Analysis

Posner, Kouzes, and Schmidt (1985) demonstrate empirically that shared values affect organisational effectiveness, which suggests links to the CVF model. A study by Lawrence (1998) utilised the 24 values from McDonald & Gandz (1992) for a comparison of individual-organisational value congruence, and the results suggest some efficacy in these values being able to highlight differences in importance between values attributed to self and their employing organisation.

Given the established efficacy of the OCAI instrument aimed at the organisational level of cultural analysis, and the 24 shared values of McDonald and Gandz (1992) aimed at the individual member level, conducting cultural studies employing both methods should enable a more comprehensive and in-depth analysis concerning values to be effected. Analysis by more than one method follows Cooke and Rousseau (1988) who recommend using more than one culture assessment instrument in order to identify behaviours associated with achieving current goals and future desired strategies. As all of the 24 values fit within the four quadrants of the CVF, it enables the results to highlight any agreement between CVF quadrant scores, and the average quadrant scores of the associated values. Inclusion of demographic questions in the combined survey permits subcultural differences to also be explored. A comparison of the results of culture studies utilising the OCAI instrument in conjunction with a shared values survey for the current and desired future period can additionally provide a more in-depth means for employing value differences as a means for undertaking cultural change.

THE STUDY

This paper reports on the quantitative phase of a single case study employing the OCAI cultural assessment instrument and a survey involving shared value reports that was completed by more senior staff in a New Zealand transport firm, for the current and a preferred future period.

The Research Method

This study was conducted in a single firm referred to as Transco that operates in a competitive market. The original study was conducted in two stages, a survey and subsequent interviews, however this

paper examines the survey employing the OCAI in conjunction with a shared values survey. A three-part survey questionnaire was sent to the more senior employees of Transco as an e-survey made available online (via www.questionpro.com) and distributed to staff via email incorporating the URL address. Part one of the questionnaire collected demographic data. Part two of the survey replicated the OCAI as published by Cameron and Quinn (1999). Part three was an instrument utilising the 24 shared values of McDonald and Gandz (1992). The OCAI consists of six dimensions. Each dimension has four alternatives where respondents divide 100 points among the four alternatives to reflect how similar each of the four is to their own firm. Each alternative, labelled A to D corresponds to a given quadrant in the CVF. The sum of each letter score is totalled and divided by six to create the mean score for each quadrant. Each of the six dimensional questions is answered twice, once for the current period and again for a preferred future period. A gap analysis between the two time periods can highlight where shifts have occurred and provide a basis for future change endeavours.

In Part three, the shared values of McDonald and Gandz (1992) were listed in their original form along with the accompanying definitions as shown in Table 2. The only modification made was in changing the value *aggressiveness* to *assertiveness* as it has less negative tones. The respondents were asked to select eight of the 24 listed values based on what they considered to be the most important values in the organisation, for the current and a preferred future. Because of the difficulties in ranking or rating all 24 values since they might all be viewed as being necessary in a firm, selecting eight would be less time consuming and likely yield a better response rate. Selecting one out of three values will generate frequency report data that can highlight relative differences in importance among the 24-shared values. The survey was made available to 200 of the more senior employees of Transco, as they were more likely to better understand questions relating to perceptions concerning organisational values.

Results

A total of 43 responses were received, of which 28 were useable representing around 14% of the sample, and 7% of the total firm size. The mean scores for the OCAI are reported in Table 3 that shows the results for the firm as a whole. Table 4 compares the OCAI results for managers versus non-

managers and is an example of how one demographic data set from the OCAI can be used to show comparisons between groups in order to enhance greater cultural understanding of the firm itself.

Table 3: Overall quadrant mean scores for the current and preferred culture of Transco using the OCAI instrument, n =28.

	Culture quadrant				Total
	Clan	Adhocracy	Market	Hierarchy	
Current culture score	28	19	26	27	100
Preferred culture score	30	23	23	24	100
Change in score	+2	+4	-3	-3	[12]

Table 4: Overall quadrant scores for the current and preferred culture of Transco using the OCAI instrument, comparing managers (n = 12) with non-managers (n =16).

	Culture quadrant				Total
	Clan	Adhocracy	Market	Hierarchy	
Current score (Management)	31	21	25	23	100
Current score (Non-management)	25	19	26	30	100
Change in score	-6	-2	1	7	[16]
Preferred score (Management)	29	24	26	21	100
Preferred score (Non-management)	32	21	22	25	100
Change in score	3	-3	-4	4	[14]

In part three of the survey, respondents selected among 24 shared values corresponding to what they perceive reflects the current firm along with what values they would most prefer to be emphasised in the future. The results are shown in Table 5 where the values are listed in rank order for the preferred future. The numbers in the current and future columns show the frequency of reports that indicates the relative differences in importance among the values. It does not mean that particular values are more or less important in themselves; rather they are more or less so compared with other shared values. The table also indicates the gap in scores between the current situation and a preferred future state.

For the future, staff would like to see more emphasis placed on behaviours associated with *broad-mindedness, development* and *fairness*, with less emphasis being placed on the values representing *logic, experimentation, obedience, consideration* and especially *diligence*. The large change in the *diligence* value score may reflect human nature and the desire of staff to work less hard in order to concentrate on other more meaningful activities. However, the majority of the values show respondents consider there is little real need to change for the future suggesting these staff are generally happy with the relative emphasis placed on the shared values as they currently stand.

Table 5: Frequency of self-selection of values to best represent the current and desired firm (n=28)

SHARED VALUES	Current	Rank	Preferred	Rank	P-C Gap
ADAPTABILITY	17	2	17	1	0
COOPERATION	18	1	16	2	-2
HUMOUR	16	3	15	3	-1
CREATIVITY	13	4=	14	4	1
BROAD-MINDEDNESS	7	16=	13	5=	6
DEVELOPMENT	7	16=	13	5=	6
ASSERTIVENESS	11	7	12	7=	1
FAIRNESS	7	16=	12	7=	5
OPENNESS	9	10=	11	9	2
INITIATIVE	8	13=	10	10	2
ECONOMY	13	4=	9	11=	-4
AUTONOMY	7	16=	9	11=	2
SOCIAL EQUALITY	10	8=	7	13=	-3
COURTESY	8	13=	7	13=	-1
CAUTIOUSNESS	7	16=	7	13=	0
MORAL INTEGRITY	4	23	7	13=	3
LOGIC	10	8=	5	17	-5
EXPERIMENTATION	9	10=	4	18=	-5
FORGIVENESS	5	21=	4	18=	-1
OBEDIENCE	9	10=	3	20=	-6
CONSIDERATION	8	13=	3	20=	-5
FORMALITY	5	21=	3	20=	-2
DILIGENCE	12	6	2	23=	-10
ORDERLINESS	3	24	2	24=	-1

Placing the shared values results from Table 5 into the four quadrants of the CVF as proposed by McDonald and Gandz (1992) provides a basis for identifying patterns among the values, and is shown in Table 6. The Clan quadrant has the largest number of values and likely reflects values being more usually associated with humanistic themes. The descriptions employed in Table 6 for quadrants 1-4 are from McDonald and Gandz (1992), but these are consistent with the descriptions of the CVF quadrants. The numbers shown in brackets by each value represents the frequency report scores for the current and preferred periods respectively. The numbers shown in bold in the ranking columns indicate where a change of ten or more rank places has occurred suggesting staff wish to see a major change in emphasis. Table 6 shows that the values scores for the current and preferred periods differ quite widely for any given quadrant, although in this study the five highest ranked values are associated with the Clan and Adhocracy quadrants. The lowly value rankings in the Hierarchy quadrant suggest that these values are perceived as being relatively less important in the future compared with values in the other three quadrants.

Table 6: Placing shared value into the four quadrants of the CVF via McDonald and Gadnz (1992)

CLAN Culture	Current	Preferred	ADHOCRACY Culture	Current	Preferred
Quadrant 1: The Consensual Culture Purpose: Group Cohesion Relationship-oriented values			Quadrant 2: The Developmental Culture Purpose: Broad Purposes Change-related values		
Salient values:	Rank	Rank	Salient Values:	Rank	rank
Broad-mindedness (7,13)	16 ^{th=}	5 ^{th=}	Adaptability (17, 17)	2 nd	1 st
Consideration (8,3)	13 ^{th=}	20 ^{th=}	Autonomy (7,9)	16 ^{th=}	11 ^{th=}
Cooperation (18,16)	1 st	2 nd	Creativity (16,15)	4 ^{th=}	4 th
Courtesy (8,7)	13 ^{th=}	13 ^{th=}	Development (7,13)	16 ^{th=}	5 ^{th=}
Fairness (7,12)	16 ^{th=}	7 ^{th=}	Experimentation (9,4)	10 ^{th=}	18 ^{th=}
Forgiveness (5,4)	21 ^{st=}	18 ^{th=}			
Humour (16,15)	3 rd	3 rd			
Moral Integrity (4,7)	23 rd	13 ^{th=}			
Openness (9,11)	10 ^{th=}	9 th			
Social Equality (10,7)	8 ^{th=}	13 ^{th=}			
HIERARCHY Culture	Now	Future	MARKET Culture	Now	Future
Quadrant 3: The Hierarchical Culture Purpose: Execution of Regulations Status quo values			Quadrant 4: The Rational Culture Purpose: Pursuit of Objectives Task-oriented values		
Salient values:	Rank	Rank	Salient values:	Rank	Rank
Cautiousness (7,7)	16 ^{th=}	13 ^{th=}	Assertiveness (11,12)	7 th	7 ^{th=}
Economy (13,9)	4 ^{th=}	11 ^{th=}	Diligence (12,2)	6 th	23 ^{rd=}
Formality (5,3)	21 ^{st=}	20 ^{th=}	Initiative (8,10)	13 ^{th=}	10 th
Logic (10,5)	8 ^{th=}	17 th			
Obedience (9,3)	10 ^{th=}	20 ^{th=}			
Orderliness (3,2)	24 th	24 ^{th=}			

If the 24 values shown in Table 6 are all associated with a given quadrant of the CVF, then any overall score for the values in a given quadrant might show some relationship with the OCAI quadrant mean scores shown in Table 3. By taking the sum of the frequency of reports for the values in each quadrant and dividing it by the number of values in that quadrant, an overall scores for each value set for both the Current and Preferred future time period can be calculated. The results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Comparison of rankings of overall scores for the OCAI and values in the four quadrants

	Clan	Adhocracy	Market	Hierarchy
OCAI Current	28	19	26	27
Rank	1	4	3	2
Values Current	9.2	11.2	10.3	7.8
Rank	3	1	2	4
OCAI Preferred	30	23	23	24
Rank	1	3=	3=	2
Values Preferred	9.5	9.6	8.0	4.8
Rank	2	1	3	4

Overall, comparisons of the rankings show some agreement between the overall results of the OCAI and the shared values surveys. The Clan scores show some consistency between the two surveys, with both showing little real change between Current and the Preferred periods, and the small increase in scores between the Current and Preferred for both surveys was in the same direction (28 to 30 and 9.2 to 9.5 respectively). In the Adhocracy culture the OCAI shows an increase for the Preferred future, whereas scores for shared values drop from 11.2 to 9.6 albeit that the ranking is number 1 for the two periods. In the Market culture, the mean scores via both instruments drop from the Current to the Preferred period (26 to 23 and 10.3 to 8.0), and the rankings are relatively consistent. In the Hierarchy culture the mean scores for both instruments drop from the Current to the Preferred periods, but much more so for the shared values (27 to 24 and 7.8 to 4.8). There is also greater consistency between the OCAI as well as the shared values rankings for the Current and Preferred periods, but less consistency between the results of the two instruments.

Discussion

Due to space limitations, the discussion will be limited to the approach of utilising the OCAI in conjunction with a shared values survey within a single cultural study. The OCAI has been employed in numerous cultural studies found to produce reliable, valid and plausible results and the underpinning CVF is widely accepted (Cameron & Quinn, 1999). While the OCAI produces overall scores among the four cultural quadrants, profiles can also be generated for the dimensions associated with the six questions of the instrument, and as an example see Berrio (2003). One study was found employing the McDonald and Gandz (1992) list of relevant organisational-shared values, although the study by Lawrence (1998) suggests the list is appropriate for the study of organisational value perceptions. It was proposed earlier in this paper that the CVF employed 'macro' dimensions at the organisational level, while shared values aimed at the individual behavioural level such as those by McDonald and Gandz (1992), have a 'micro' orientation and likely measure different aspects within the cultural concept. Indeed the large variation in ranking scores for the shared values in Quadrants 1 and 2 in Table 6 suggests there is merit in exploring a range of relevant shared values. The differences also in the rankings in Table 7 between the OCAI and shared values results indicate that the two

methods are producing some similar trends, but also highlighting differences. It is quite likely that the two methods represent complementary approaches in cultural analysis and can better explain organisational culture from a values perspective. McDonald and Gandz, (1992, p.70) note “Some share values are ‘pivotal’ (ignore at your peril) whereas others are peripheral (nice to share but adherence is not critical).” In the case of the *diligence* value, respondents clearly perceive this to be much less pivotal in the future.

The study has clear limitations by virtue of the small sample size, relatively low response rate and exploratory nature of the study. A much larger sample is necessary to compare the results of the OCAI with the shared values survey. While the OCAI has substantial empirical support, more studies are needed to establish the salience of the list of 24-shared values in organisations. Instructing respondents to select a set of values based on whether these are considered to be important, allows each respondent to leave out values considered to be of relatively less importance to the organisation. However, there is also a risk of social bias; the respondent may select values that sound desirable to have in an organisation, rather than selecting them based on his/her actual beliefs of importance.

Conclusions

This paper presents the results of a culture survey focusing on values as a basis for comparing two research instruments. Being an exploratory study and with a small sample size, the findings are somewhat preliminary in nature. Certainly employing the two values based research methods of the OCAI with an organisational emphasis, and the 24 listed shared values at a more individual level, provides a much wider scope and depth in organisational culture analysis from a values based perspective. The importance of undertaking the two methods together is that they seem complementary and potentially can provide a more comprehensive examination of organisational values within a cultural context. The range of possible comparisons of results derived from the two instruments, particularly through the inclusion of analysis based on differing demographic data suggests further studies are warranted in order to test the efficacy of utilising these two instruments in tandem as a means for undertaking more in-depth values based cultural analysis.

References

- Alvesson, M. (2002). *Understanding organizational culture*. London: Sage.
- Burchell, R. N. (2004). *Patterns of stability and change orientations in organisational culture: a case study*. The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Berrio, A. A. (2003). An organizational culture assessment using the competing values framework: A profile of Ohio State University extension. *Journal of Extension*, 41(2), 11 pages. Located (www.joe.org/extension/joe/2003april/a3.shtml).
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture*. Reading: Addison - Wesley.
- Chatman, J. A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socializing in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 459-484.
- Cooke, R. A., & Rousseau, D. M. (1988). Behavioral norms and expectations: A quantitative approach to the assessment of organizational culture. *Group & Organization Studies*, 13(3), 245-273.
- Gordon, G. G., & DiTomaso, N. (1992). Predicting corporate performance from organizational culture. *Journal of Management Studies*, 29(6), 783-798.
- Hofstede, G., Bond, M. H., & Luk, C. (1993). Individual perceptions of organizational cultures: A methodological treatise on levels of analysis. *Organization Studies*, 14(4), 483-503.
- Hooijberg, R., & Petrock, F. (1993). On cultural change: Using the competing values framework to help leaders execute a transformational strategy. *Human Resource Management*, 32(1), 29-50.
- Hope, V., & Hendry, J. (1995). Corporate culture change - Is it relevant for the organisations of the 1990's? *Human Resource Management Journal*, 5(4), 61-73.
- Igo, T., & Skitmore, M. (2006). Diagnosing the organizational culture of an Australian engineering consultancy using the competing values framework. *Construction Innovation*, 6(2), 121-139.
- Lawrence, A. (1998). Individual-organisational value congruence in human resource practitioners. In G. Griffin (Ed.), *Management Theory and Practice* (pp. 158-174). Melbourne: McMillan.
- Mallak, L. A., Lyth, D. M., Olson, S. D., Ulshafer, S. M., & Sardone, F. J. (2004). Diagnosing culture in health-care organizations using critical incidents. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 16(4), 180-190.
- Martin, J. (2002). *Organizational culture: Mapping the terrain*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- McDonald, P., & Gandz, J. (1992). Getting value from shared values. *Organizational Dynamics*, 20(3), 64-67.
- Meglino, B. M., & Ravlin, E. C. (1998). Individual values in organizations: Concepts, controversies and research. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 351-389.
- Pascale, R., & Athos, A. (1981). *The art of Japanese management: Applications for American executives*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lesson's from America's best run companies*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Posner, B. Z., Kouzes, J. M., & Schmidt, W. H. (1985). Shared values make a difference: An empirical test of corporate culture. *Human Resource Management*, 24(3), 293-310.
- Quinn, R. E., & McGrath, M. R. (1985). The transformation of organizational cultures: A competing values perspective. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg & J. Martin (Eds.), *Organizational Culture* (pp. 315-334). Newbury park, Ca: Sage.
- Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organizational effectiveness. *Management Science*, 29, 363-377.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey - Bass.
- Stackman, R. W., Pinder, C. C., & Connor, P. E. (2000). Values lost: Redirecting research on values in the workplace. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. P. M. Wilderom & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate* (pp. 37-54). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1993). *The cultures of work organizations* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Webley, S. (1999). Sources of corporate values. *Long Range Planning*, 32(2), 173-178.