This article offers a triangulation approach to the study of organizational culture by employing reliably coded interviews to help interpret and place in context the results of statistical analyses from a standardized survey questionnaire. Subjects were 195 government employees representing every level and division in their department. All 195 subjects completed the Organizational Culture Survey and 91 subjects participated in 45-minute critical incident interviews designed to elicit subjects' interpretations of organizational events. From the analyses of these data emerges a description of the organization’s culture.

MEASURING AND INTERPRETING ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Susan R. Glaser
Sonia Zamanou
University of Oregon
Kenneth Hacker
Michigan Technological Institute

Organizational culture is receiving increased attention by many researchers (Eisenberg, 1986; Frost et al., 1985; Pacanowsky & O’Donnell-Trujillo, 1982, 1983; Pettigrew, 1979). From this attention grows a need to clarify what the term culture means and how it is to be studied. The term has been defined and applied in vastly differing ways, with researchers from a variety of perspectives and disciplines adopting a cultural metaphor.

Organizational culture is frequently described in terms of shared meaning—patterns of belief, symbols, rituals, and myths that evolve over time and function as the glue that holds the organization together (Pettigrew, 1979; Smircich, 1981, 1983). Other researchers (Schwartz & Davis, 1981; Silverzweig & Allen, 1976; Van Maanen & Barley, 1984) have adopted a normative definition of culture by emphasizing an organization’s shared expectations for consensually approved behav-
ior. Culture research focuses variously on the symbolic aspects of organizational life (Pfeffer, 1981; Putnam & Pancanowsky, 1983); on myths, stories, legends (Louis, 1980; Martin & Siehl, 1983); and on socialization and rites of passage (Beyer & Trice, 1984; Louis, 1980).

With all that has been written about organizational culture, the construct still needs to be operationalized and measured. Much work on organizational culture has been conceptual and theoretical rather than empirical in nature (Gudykunst, Stewart, & Ting-Toomey, 1985; Pancanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983). This fact is understandable given the methodological challenges of assessing culture in an organizational setting. If organizational cultures are created through symbol, ideology, belief, ritual, and myth, then categories are now needed to establish themes and patterns around which stories are told, legends are built, and beliefs are developed.

This study examines six components of organizational culture, grounded in both management and communication research: teamwork-conflict (Allender, 1984; Gudykunst, Stewart, & Ting-Toomey, 1985; Solomon, 1985; Ting-Toomey, 1985), climate-morale (Poole, 1985; Poole & McPhee, 1983), information flow (Bormann, 1983; Galbraith, 1973; McPhee, 1985), involvement (Bacas, 1985; Burton & Hewlett, 1983; Collard & Dale, 1985; Denison, 1984; Hinckley, 1985; Lawler & Mohrman, 1985; Pascarella, 1984; Sashkin, 1984; Walton, 1985), supervision (Harrison, 1985; Klein, 1984; Richardson, 1985; Schlesinger & Oshry, 1984; Schuster & Miller, 1985; Van Horn & Stinnett, 1984), and meetings (Franecki et al., 1984; Hall, 1984; Hawley, 1984).

These categories are not meant to be exclusive; additional dimensions of culture will likely emerge in subsequent research. Instead, these six categories are studied because they are central to any construction of organizational culture, around which rituals develop and stories evolve. Before researchers can approach the questions of whether organizational culture can be managed (Frost et al., 1985), or whether strong cultures contribute to or reduce organizational performance (Eisenberg, 1986), a methodology must be developed for empirically establishing what an organization's culture is at a particular point in time.

Much of the recent literature in organizational culture either explicitly or implicitly embraces the need for qualitative research and ethnographic observations and interviews (Carbaugh, 1985; Geertz, 1973; Louis, 1980; Pancanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1982, 1983). Such research has the potential to provide in-depth, textured accounts that move beyond description to interpretation and meaning. However, this type of research is often limited by its ability to resist systematic modes of assessment and the lack of precise criteria for evaluating cultural interpretations.

Triangulation, the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon (Faules, 1982), is designed to maximize a single method's benefits while neutralizing its limitations. It is used to create convergent validity from varying data sources. Triangulation in organizational research has been advocated more then employed (Glaser, 1983).

The research reported on in this article offers a triangulation approach to the study of organization culture by employing reliably coded interviews to help interpret and place in context the results of statistical analyses.

DEVELOPMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE SURVEY (OCS)

The original version of the Organizational Culture Survey was a 62-item questionnaire with five subscales: climate, involvement, communication, supervision, and meetings (Glaser, 1983). The initial items were developed from a literature review and a series of open-ended critical incident interviews with employees from every level and department in a northwestern wood products company. These employees were asked to describe what it was like to work in their organization and were urged to explain their perceptions.
through stories. Emerging themes were converted into 62 items on the original OCS. Questionnaires were administered to every organizational member (N = 267), and were filled out in scheduled locations at scheduled times. This procedure eliminated the problems of poor return rate and sampling error.

Items in each subscale were subjected to a standard set of interitem reliability and internal consistency analyses. Interitem correlations, Cronbach's alpha, and multiple correlations among items in each subscale (in which each item is regressed on the remaining items of the scale) were calculated. If analyses of interitem correlation revealed a minimal relationship, then low correlation items were dropped from the effected subscale. Additionally, to assess the strength of within-scale relationships, the squared multiple correlations of individual items with all other items in each subscale were also examined. An item was deleted if it was essentially predictable by the other items of the subscale. The revised questionnaire had 31 items (see Appendix A).

This revised OCS was then administered to 138 subjects who were employees of a private manufacturing company and to 195 subjects who were employees of a governmental agency. Identical reliability and internal consistency analyses to those described above were performed on both of these samples. These scores are presented in Tables 1 and 2. For all but three items, interitem correlations exceeded .34.

To investigate additional relationships between items in different scales and the covariant structure of the responses to the instrument as a whole, a factor analysis on the data from the government group was performed. As in any multivariate analysis, subjects with missing values on any of the questions were deleted from the calculations, leaving a total of 164 in the sample. A principal components analysis was performed and factors were retained if eigen values of components exceeded 1.0. A standard varimax rotation was applied to the resulting factor pattern and factor loadings for each of the variables of each retained factor inspected.

This analysis yielded six factors. Inspection of the rotated factor pattern provided additional corroboration of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>13-17</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All eight items from the supervision scale loaded very highly on Factor 1 (range: .64 to .82), and all six items from the involvement scale loaded highly on Factor 2 (range: .56 to .81). Similarly, four of five items on the meetings scale loaded highly on Factor 4 (range: .61 to .83). Items that loaded less than .56 with items from the scales to which they had been assigned were dropped from that scale.

Revised questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 52 subjects, representing over 29 organizations. Analyses of internal consistency identical to those described above were performed for the data from these subjects. High levels of internal consistency were obtained from all subscales. Inspection of within-scale squared multiple correlation coefficients revealed no item on any subscale that was highly unrelated to other items on that scale. Results of internal consistency analyses are presented in Table 3.

Additionally, to assess test-retest reliability, the full instrument was administered to 35 of the 52 subjects who agreed to participate in this phase of the research. All subjects provided information about their birthday and the maiden name of their mother on both occasions, allowing test and retest data to be matched while preserving the anonymity of research participants.

The resulting data were subjected to two types of analyses. Paired comparison t-tests were performed to evaluate possible differences between mean scale responses at time 1 and time 2. Second, Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated for each scale between responses on both occasions. These calculations permitted assessment of levels of reliability, consistency, and covariation between responses.

Differences between scale means at test and retest instrument administration were nonsignificant for all except the teamwork/conflict scale. Scores on this scale were significantly higher during the retest administration (t = 2.70, p < .01). Correlations between scale scores at time 1 and time 2 were also uniformly high. The only exception was once again for
teamwork/conflict. It is probable that the way questions 2 and 3, which were part of this scale, were asked (negative responses at the higher end of the scale, opposite all other items), is at least partly responsible for the lower levels of test-retest reliability noted for this scale. Results from this set of analyses are presented in Table 4.

### SAMPLE

The sample for the current study was composed of 195 government employees in a six-division department in the Pacific Northwest. Subjects were from every level in the organization (line workers, supervisors, clerical, professional-technical, and top management). A total of 195 subjects completed the Organizational Culture Survey. A representative sample of 91 subjects participated in 45-minute interviews.

### INTERVIEW FORMAT

Three researchers conducted interviews with a stratified sample of organizational members, representing employees from every level and division within the organization. A total of 91 employees were interviewed. Initially, the interviewers worked in pairs, to assure uniformity. To avoid interviewer drift, where interviewers gradually diverge in their format, researchers also worked in pairs at regular points throughout the interview process. The interviews followed a critical incident format, beginning with a general question and following up with probes that asked for specific examples, situations, and illustrations of a particular point. Interviewers took verbatim notes of subject responses. Because of confidentiality issues, subjects were not willing to have their interviews tape-recorded. To ensure that interviewers were reliably reporting subject responses, interviewer pairs met to confirm information collected in paired interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Name</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N of cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>interitem correlation</th>
<th>reliability</th>
<th>correlation coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork &amp; Conflict</td>
<td>Questions 1-6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Flow</td>
<td>Questions 7-11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Questions 12-15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Questions 16-19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Questions 20-26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions 27-31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATA ANALYSIS: INTERVIEWS

Each interview was coded by two trained coders. Prior to coding these interviews, the coders worked for three months on sample data to develop a reliable coding system. The operational definition and decision rules used in the coding are presented in Appendix B.

Coding was done by researchers blind to the organizational culture scale results. According to Bowers and Courtright (1984), in the absence of established standards for an instrument or procedure, researchers generally have established .70 as the minimum acceptable index of reliability. Inter-rater reliability for this study was .80.

Each interview was coded along the six factors of the Organizational Culture Survey: climate-atmosphere, involvement, teamwork, supervision, communication-information flow, and meetings. The interviews were analyzed for statements that indicated a subject’s satisfaction or dissatisfaction with each of the six areas. Coders counted the number of statements from each subject that indicated both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. For every statement counted, the exact language used by the subjects was also recorded.

Due to the complexity of the discourse being examined, consensual coding was used in the next phase of the research. First, the coders independently coded each statement. The coders then met, along with a third researcher who had observed subjects in actual work situations and was able to place statements into a larger framework. At this time the coders pooled their responses, discussed differences, and reached consensus for each statement.

For the few statements where consensus was not reached, the statement was not coded. This method is similar to that used by Putnam et al. (1985) who argue that such consensual coding is valuable for analyzing naturalistic interaction when the complexity of both substance and syntax allows for multiple interpretations.

Based on rates of satisfaction/dissatisfaction (S/D) in each of the coded interviews, mean S/D ratios were computed for
RESULTS

Scores were calculated for each OCS subscale, and analyses of variance were performed to determine differences among employees at each organizational level. Significant differences were obtained for climate-atmosphere, involvement, information flow-communication, and supervision:

- Climate-Atmosphere: $F = 11.91, p < .001$
- Involvement: $F = 14.12, p < .001$
- Communication-Info Flow: $F = 9.62, p < .01$
- Supervision: $F = 3.63, p < .01$

Duncan multiple range tests were performed to investigate the difference between pairs of groups on each of the scales. These tests indicated that, in every case, top management scores were significantly higher than line supervisors, clerical staff, and line workers:

1. Top management perceive a significantly more positive climate than line supervisors, clerical staff, and line workers.
2. Top management feel significantly more involved in the organization than any of the other three groups.
3. Top management perceive communication to be significantly stronger than any of the other three groups.
4. Top management perceive supervision to be significantly more effective than any of the other three groups. These analyses are presented in Table 5.

These patterns are confirmed by the S/D ratios that emerged from the interview data. To address differences in frequency between positive and negative comments, S/D ratios were computed on each factor for each person interviewed. These ratios were based on the total number of comments indicating satisfaction, divided by the total number of comments indicating dissatisfaction. Then, a paired comparison t-test was performed for each factor to determine if significant differences between the frequencies of positive and negative comments existed.

Significant or near significant differences were obtained on the following factors: teamwork, climate, information flow, involvement, and supervision. Only the meetings factor did not elicit significant differences. In all cases the mean number of negative responses was higher than the number of positive responses. For the teamwork factor, the mean number of positive and negative responses was 0.25 and 0.89 ($t(27) = -3.01, p < .01$); for climate, the means were 0.86 and 1.54 ($t(27) = -1.99, p < .05$); for information flow, means were 0.14 and 1.46 ($t(27) = -4.54, p < .001$); for involvement, 0.25 and 0.68 ($t(27) = -2.36, p < .01$), for supervision, 1.18 and 2.93 ($t(27) = -2.85, p < .01$); and meetings, 0.72 and 0.96 ($t(27) = -0.83, n.s.$).

What emerges from the analyses of OCS scores and S/D ratios is an organization with dissatisfied employees at all but the top management level. Employees are experiencing low morale and are dissatisfied with their organization’s level of teamwork, information flow, supervision, and involvement.
Results of these quantitative analyses, however, still leave key residual questions unanswered: Why are employees dissatisfied with the supervision they receive? Where does information flow break down? In what ways do employees want to be more involved? What factors contribute to their low morale?

The meaning and interpretations of these patterns are more completely understood through an examination of themes that emerged in the interviews. Verbatim comments were coded in six categories corresponding to the factors in the Organizational Culture Survey. Each category was operationally defined, and decision rules were made explicit (see Appendixes A and B). After the initial coding of verbatim comments, assertions that appeared frequently across divisions in the organization were treated as themes. Five main themes emerged from this process:

**ORGANIZATIONAL THEMES**

1. Top management and supervisors do not listen to or value the ideas and opinions of their employees.
2. Limited interaction between department and divisions causes misunderstanding and confusion.
3. Meetings are too often only informational and do not involve enough interaction and decision making.
4. Employees are often unclear about what they should be doing and where the organization itself is headed.
5. Supervisors are deficient in providing feedback to their employees, and giving recognition for good work and suggestions.

In the remainder of this section, each theme is analyzed and illustrated with verbatim comments as expressed by employees in the interviews. First, the perception of employees that their ideas and suggestions are not valued was expressed in a variety of statements. For example, one employee said, "I feel oppressed—not recognized for what I can do. My supervisors have strong positions that don't allow latitude. For example, I suggested a way to turn [our] image into a positive [one], and I didn't get any credit for it." Along the same lines, another comment was made concerning the supervisors' closed-mindedness: "If it is the supervisor's idea, he will do it. You have to word things in such a way that he will think it is his idea." An employee in a different division said, "The hardest part of my job is to get people to include me in the planning process. I feel I have good suggestions, but people don't believe me." Other employees complained about the fact that they "do not hear whether or not ideas have been accepted or rejected and why." Usually, "supervisors turn back their employees' suggestions without reason." As a result, "people say nothing. They know that nothing will happen." Finally, one employee asserts, "Why speak up—no one does anything."

The previous verbatim comments indicate that people seek recognition for their work and ideas. Lack of recognition makes them feel oppressed and unimportant. They are sensitive when nothing happens to their ideas after they are communicated. Recognition of successful ideas seems important, and related to employees' feelings of their own value. Finally, there is some indication in the interviews that if employees' ideas are listened to, reinforced, validated, or at least acknowledged, higher morale and commitment may result.

Another issue raised among employees in different levels is that limited interaction among departments and divisions in the organization creates misunderstanding and confusion. One employee said, "We need more communication among plant workers. We feel segregated and out of touch. People would be friendlier, [if they had] better in-plant communication." Other employees attributed the problem to lack of time: "We have so much to do; no time to communicate," and "Sometimes we become so focused on production, we lose sight of the human side. [We] need time to interact with other crews." Lack of communication with other departments causes time to be wasted and inefficiency in completing tasks. One employee offered an example: "I went across town to sweep glass. Another truck was there which could have done it coming
back." Finally, people feel frustrated by the fact that other departments do not have a clear definition of their role in the organization: “Other departments have a shaded view of what we are. [We] don’t know how to make this communication happen.” Apparently, employees want to feel that they are part of a team. They think it is important to communicate with people in areas other than their own. Interaction with other divisions seems to be important for several reasons. First, fewer mistakes are made because people have more complete information on how to coordinate their jobs. Second, people feel more like a team that works together toward the achievement of a common goal.

Involvement issues are also related to meetings, as in the following comments: “Meetings are only informational. They do not involve enough interaction and decision making.” Another employee said, “If major decisions [have to be made], they wait until the meeting is over so only key players are involved in decision making.” Employees suggested some problem areas in the way current meetings are conducted: lack of an agenda, a time keeper, facilitation by a trained consultant, and decisions that help them do their jobs. Another problem employees identified concerned only a few people contributing during meetings, but “when the meeting ends, [everyone] has plenty to say.” In addition, “People usually don’t show up and they are kept late,” because meetings “are voluntary, and people don’t get paid if [they are] off shift. [Since people don’t come] information gets distorted. They have made an effort to vary the time of the meetings. [Being] paid overtime may be an incentive to participate.” Employees in this organization discuss several aspects of meetings: results, quality, frequency, interaction, decision making. Absenteeism seems to be a problem. Employees suggest that in order for everyone to be there they must have an incentive, that is, get paid overtime.

Uncertainty about the future and the direction of the organization was another theme that emerged in our interviews. One employee said, “Not everyone in the organization knows why things are changing or when. For example, we went into a new process and a panic situation developed, which didn’t need to.” Others said, “Employees feel that no communication is coming through on what’s happening; until I read it in the paper I did not know they were considering it.” Still others asserted: “We are not sure of what our job responsibilities are. It’s difficult to be accountable without a definition.” Finally, an employee said, “We are afraid to make decisions [because] some confusion [exists] on what needs to be done and what decisions can be made.” Obviously, employees seek a sense of direction regarding both their work activities and where the organization as a whole is going. Feelings of uncertainty seem to have a negative effect on morale.

The final theme related to effectiveness of supervision. Comments about supervision are numerous and diverse: “My supervisor does not know enough about my work to evaluate me.” “My supervisor has enough knowledge, but he does not know how to deal with people.” Other employees felt “not trusted,” “at the bottom of the totem pole,” “wrong no matter what.” Supervisors give them a lot of negative feedback: “We only hear when we screw up.” “Our good work goes unnoticed.” They wanted to “change communication between supervisors and crew. [They would like their supervisors] to be assertive, delegate, and give performance evaluations.” Recognition seems to be a key factor in how supervisors are perceived by employees. Employees need more positive evaluation and praise. Employees apparently feel that their work and contributions are important and consequently feel offended and unappreciated when they are not recognized for the hard work and the good ideas they provide.

**DISCUSSION**

The research reported in this article develops a triangulation approach to the study of organizational culture, by employing reliably coded interviews to help interpret and place in context the results of statistical analyses. Analysis of questionnaire
data, satisfaction/dissatisfaction ratios, and interpretive themes reveal an organization where morale is negatively affected by the perception that management does not listen to or value employee ideas. Lack of information flow is another aspect of this organization with which employees were dissatisfied. Information is often blocked between divisions, between levels in the organization, and between supervisors and their employees. This blocking has apparently created a culture where employees are sometimes uncertain about what they are expected to do, and where they often feel unrecognized for their good work and unjustifiably criticized for their mistakes.

Close examination of the data indicates that perceptions differ among employees at different organizational levels. Managers consistently feel more involved in the organization and more appreciated. They also have more access to important information and rarely feel isolated and uninformed. This conclusion is significant. It suggests that organizations are generally composed of subcultures rather than one guiding mega-culture. Consequently, top managers must plan strategically if they have particular cultural values that they want to establish organizationwide.

The perceptions of respondents revealed in the analyses of questionnaire data were confirmed by the interviews, which illustrated qualitatively why employees believed as they did. The nature of the information accessed by each of the methods clearly diverged. Questionnaire data revealed expressed attitudes. The interviews illustrated why a particular attitude was held and how respondents made sense of what they believed to be true.

Perhaps the most significant contribution of this research is that it studied an ongoing organization in its natural environment and addressed a number of limitations of both qualitative and quantitative research. The Organizational Culture Survey is a reliable and stable instrument, having been developed and tested with item analysis, factor analysis, and test-retest reliability. The interpretive problems in this study were greatly reduced by two recommendations made by Dennis, Golhaber,

and Yates (1978). First, rather than one interviewer, three were used with regular, immediate debriefing periods. In addition, to facilitate the cross-validation of results, two data-gathering techniques were employed. This meant that reliably coded interviews were used to help interpret and place in context the results of statistical analyses.

Consequently, this study represents a replicable effort to access organizational culture both quantitatively and qualitatively. It offers researchers an approach to studying the ways in which people perceive and interpret the world of their organization.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>People I work with are direct and honest with each other.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>People I work with accept criticism without becoming defensive.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>People I work with have a productive working relationship.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>This organization values the ideas of workers at every level.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>When changes are made, the reasons why are made clear.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I have a say in decisions that affect my work.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My opinions count in this organization.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My supervisor gives me criticism in a positive manner.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My supervisor takes part in discussions on track.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Our discussions in meetings stay on track.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Time in meetings is well spent.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I know what’s happening in work sections outside of my own.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I get the information I need to do my job well.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I am asked to make suggestions about how to do my job better.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Job performance is made clear by my supervisor.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>My supervisor takes part in meetings.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>My supervisor is fair and straightforward in his dealings with me.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>My supervisor is a good listener.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>My supervisor takes part in discussion on track.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Our discussion in meetings stay on track.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Time in meetings is well spent.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I know what’s happening in work sections outside of my own.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I get the information I need to do my job well.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I am asked to make suggestions about how to do my job better.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Job performance is made clear by my supervisor.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>My supervisor takes part in meetings.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>My supervisor is fair and straightforward in his dealings with me.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>My supervisor is a good listener.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>My supervisor takes part in discussion on track.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Our discussion in meetings stay on track.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Time in meetings is well spent.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF CATEGORIES

Involvement: reported input and participation in decision making; respondents feel that their thoughts and ideas count and are encouraged by top management to offer opinions and suggestions.

Teamwork and conflict: reported coordination of effort, interpersonal cooperation, rapport, or antagonism, resentment, jealousy, mistrust, power struggle within sections or divisions; people talk directly and candidly about problems they have with each other.

Information flow: links, channels, contact, flow of communication to pertinent people or groups in the organization; reported feelings of isolation or being out of touch.

Climate and morale: reported feelings about work conditions, motivation, general atmosphere, organizational character.

Supervision: reported information by the employees on their immediate supervisor; the extent to which they are given positive and negative feedback on work performance; the extent to which job expectations are clear.

Meetings: reported information on whether meetings occur and how productive they are.

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE CODING DECISION RULES

1. Only valenced statements will be coded. Specifically, statements indicating satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

2. If two or more statements are part of, or help to support, the same assertion, they will be coded as one verbatim comment.

3. If two or more statements are separate, distinct assertions, they will each be coded as one verbatim comment.

4. If respondents are talking about an ideal or preferred state that the organization has not yet achieved, the statement will be coded in the negative direction.

5. When operational definitions of categories are mentioned, the statement is coded in that category.

6. When the issue of input into decision making is raised, the statement is always coded as “involvement.” If an employee makes a statement, directly attributing this degree of input to the immediate supervisor, the statement is also coded “supervision.”

7. When the issue of input into decision making is raised in a meeting context, the statement is coded as “involvement.”

8. When in doubt (if not clearly in a category), don’t code.

NOTE

1. The Organizational Culture Survey (in Appendixes A and B), © 1984, Glaser & Associates, Inc.
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