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ABSTRACT

The competing values framework proposed by Cameron and Quinn (1999) was used to describe the organizational culture type exhibited by Ohio State University Extension (OSU Extension) personnel. This framework assesses the dominant organizational culture based on four culture types: a) Clan; b) Hierarchy; c) Adhocracy; and d) Market. The study also investigated the learning organization profile exhibited by OSU Extension personnel based on the systems-linked organizational model proposed by Marquardt (1996). The systems-linked organizational model creates a learning organization profile based on five subsystems: a) Learning; b) Organization; c) People; d) Knowledge; and e) Technology. Relationships were established between dominant culture type and the learning organization profile and demographic groups.

A descriptive-type of research design was used. A questionnaire was mailed to OSU Extension personnel (n=434) at the county, district and state levels during August and September 1999. Instrument validity and reliability were established.

OSU Extension personnel exhibited a Clan culture type as dominant in both the current and preferred situations. The Clan culture portrays OSU Extension as an organization that concentrates on internal maintenance with flexibility, concern for people, and sensitivity for customers. The overall learning organization profile of OSU Extension
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background and Setting

The general systems theory characterizes all organizations as cooperative systems having a complex of physical, biological, personal, and social components of two or more individuals interacting in the pursuit of a common goal; with willingness to serve, a common purpose and communication as the core elements in a typical organization (Barnard, 1938; cited by Kreitner, 1995). General systems theory is a field of study in which the basic assumption is that everything is part of a more extensive and interdependent arrangement (Kreitner, 1995). Within the limits of this theory a series of levels of systems have been established. This hierarchy goes from specific to a more general type of systems including: cellular, organic, organismic, group, organizational, national, and supranational. Additionally, general systems theorists studying the organizational level have distinguished between open and closed-systems organizations. A closed-system is a self-sufficient entity, while an open-system depends on its environment for survival. Most organizations fall in the open-systems category because organizational survival depends on interaction with the surrounding environment (Kreitner, 1995).
A system can be perceived as a whole whose elements continually affect each other over time operating toward a common goal (Senge, 1990). The system structure however is the pattern of interrelationships among key components of the system and includes hierarchy and process flow and also attitudes and perceptions, quality of products and services, and decision-making processes. Systems thinking is composed of a large body of methods, practical tools, and principles developed over the past 50 years that assume a common objective: “... that behavior of all systems follows certain common principles, the nature of which are being discovered and articulated” (Senge, 1994; p. 89). Systems thinking is a conceptual framework which utilizes scientific knowledge and management tools developed to help organizations uncover and change those patterns of relationships. In this process of guiding organizations to continually enhance their capabilities in realizing their higher aspirations (learning), five vital dimensions must be taken into consideration: (a) systems thinking, (b) personal mastery, (c) mental models, (d) building shared vision and (e) team learning. In general, organizations can be thought of as learning systems because a set of values, norms, procedures, and business performance data are communicated formally or informally and assimilated by members (Senge, 1990; Senge, 1994; DiBella & Nevis, 1998).

Two new directions of thinking have evolved from systems theory: organizational learning and chaos theory. Organizational learning pictures the organization as a living and thinking open-system relying on feedback to adjust to ever-changing environmental conditions. According to the organizational learning approach, organizations are involved in a difficult process of anticipating, sensing, visualizing, and problem solving. In contrast,
the chaos theory states that every system has its own life and rules. Chaos theory followers try to find order in the random behavior patterns of organizations. A system is said to be chaotic when it becomes impossible to know where it will be next, but over a period of time the system seems to demonstrate an inherent order (Kreitner, 1995).

A learning organization is: "...an organization skilled at creating, acquiring, and transferring knowledge and at modifying its behavior to reflect new knowledge and insights" (Garvin, 1993; cited by Kreitner, 1995; p. 276). Organizational learning has three stages: (a) cognition (learning new concepts), (b) behavior (developing new skills and abilities), and (c) performance (getting things done). Five organizational skills are needed to turn new ideas into performance: a) solving problems, b) experimenting, c) learning from organizational experience (history), e) learning from others, and f) transferring and implementing the acquired knowledge (Kreitner, 1995; Romme & Dillen, 1996).

Learning organizations are said to be capable of:

1. Anticipating and adapting to environmental forces;
2. Speeding up the development of new products and services;
3. Becoming more effective in acquiring knowledge about competitors and collaborators;
4. Transferring that knowledge across departments in the organization;
5. Learning from own mistakes;
6. Making better use of organizational employees;
7. Shortening the time for implementation of strategies; and
Inducing the organization-wide adoption of continuous quality improvement (Marquardt, 1996).

Intimately related to the process of organizational learning is organizational culture. Culture is considered the total sum of all contributions of a group of people, in a designated area, within a given time. Culture represents, more specifically, the aesthetic or intellectual achievement or appreciation of an individual or a society, and also the life-style of a society as passed on from generation to generation (Rogers, Burdge, Korschning & Donnermeyer, 1988; Merrian-Webster, 1994). Culture has been analyzed in many ways by several disciplines, from anthropology to sociology, and conclusions in this regard point to a phenomenon that circles people at all times, being constantly ordained and invented by interactions with others. In consequence, the set of shared attitudes, values, goals and practices that characterizes a corporation or firm is what is known as organizational culture (Schein, 1992).

The definition of culture when taken to the organizational level has a particular interest because culture helps people understand the implications for leadership in an organization. Based on levels of culture that affect individual and organizational behavior, the following definition of organizational culture has been suggested: "An organization's culture is reflected by what is valued, the dominant managerial and leadership styles, the language and symbols, the procedures and routines, and the definitions of success that make an organization unique" (Cameron & Quinn, 1999; p. 4). Another important definition of organizational culture frequently quoted by scholars in the field is: "A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external
adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (Schein, 1992; p. 12). Three important components crucial in the understanding of the implications of organizational culture should be included: (a) the socialization process; (b) patterns of overt behavior; and (c) size of the group (Schein, 1992).

Connections between organizational culture and performance have been established (Wagner & Spencer, 1996). An increasing body of evidence supports a linkage between an organization’s culture (how works get done) and its business performance (what actually gets done). Corporate culture affects performance. Firms that put emphasis in key managerial components (i.e., customers, stakeholders, and employees) and leadership, outperform those that do not have these cultural characteristics (Kotter & Heskett, 1992). Consequently, corporations with weak cultures do not have the sense of purpose and direction and are less successful than those with a strong culture. Strong cultures are those that provide the stability and predictability to members of the culture group in order to respond properly to difficult situations (Masland, 1985; Wagner & Spencer, 1996).

Theories about organizations have in common two fundamental elements that cultural groups, irrespective of their size, must deal with: (a) survival, growth, and adaptation to their environment and (b) internal integration which permits the day-to-day functioning and the capacity to adjust. These common elements are said to be the cornerstone for a learning organization to subsist. Both organizational culture and organizational learning address how organizations adapt to their environment and develop
a competitive advantage. Organizational culture is considered an important element in the adaptation process of any organization. Furthermore, organizational culture, when combined with organizational capabilities or ability to apply learning experiences, enhances performance. Organizational culture and organizational learning are two overlapping concepts responsible for the successful implementation of creative ideas within organizations (Schein, 1992; Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

**Problem Statement**

The culture of an organization determines to a great measure the nature of the learning process and the way learning takes place in the organization. Organizational culture diagnosis and organizational learning assessment are two effective frameworks that can be used to enhance business performance. Organizational learning is the development of new insights or knowledge that have the potential to influence behavior. Organizational learning implies a modification in behavior that helps to improve business performance and the ability to adapt to change. On the other hand, organizational culture is the foundation of the learning organization. Organizational culture is an organizational value system that provides rules for sharing information, reaching general agreement, and acting on its meaning (Jaworsky & Kolhi, 1993; Slater & Narver, 1995; DiBella & Nevis, 1998).

The Strategic Framework Team appointed by the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) and the Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture (ES-USDA) in 1994, identified issues and actions for success in what was called the process of renewing the organization. The major issue identified was that in order to be visionary and responsive Extension should encompass a strategy of
multiple organizational models. Among the suggested actions that were proposed, the following have a clear link to organizational culture and learning orientation: a) rethink assumptions, methods, and processes about the organization, b) recognize Extension professionals as educational leaders in their communities, c) provide comprehensive and rigorous leadership development, d) have a commitment to present vision while working for its evolution, e) enter into a system of leadership partnership with other organizations, and f) recognize and work within organizational paradoxes (ECOP & CSREES, 1995).

Ohio State University Extension (OSUE) is a public funded organization dedicated: "To help people improve their lives through an educational process using scientific knowledge focused on identified issues and needs." (OSUE Annual Report, 1997; p. 1). In order to assure its mission, the organization must have a strong culture and high standards for organizational learning. Moreover, OSUE places a great deal of value on clients and their needs. A recent assessment of OSUE portrayed the organization as extroverted, proactive, formal, and action oriented in the four dimensions of customer orientation: definition, sensitivity, measurement and implementation, but an effort still needs to be made to raise the level of clientele orientation of OSUE employees (Berrio & Henderson, 1998).

The most common approaches used with the purpose of enhancing performance in business organizations include: Total Quality Management (TQM), downsizing, and reengineering initiatives. The observed failure of reengineering, as well as downsizing and TQM, in almost three quarters of the corporations in the United States, has been associated to the culture of the organization, which remained the same. Organizational
change is needed in order to adapt to external environmental conditions. However, regardless of the constant efforts practiced in many organizations to bring about organizational change, the efforts to improve organizational performance may fail because the organizational culture does not change. The dependence of organizational performance on culture change is due to the fact that without the alteration of the essential goals, values, and expectations of the organization's individuals, change remains superficial and the organizations returns quickly to the previous stage (Wagner & Spencer, 1996; Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

Cooperative Extension’s and OSU Extension’s organizational values play an important role in the way Extension personnel plan, implement, and evaluate educational programs. The identification of the set of values that Extension personnel hold is important for the health and productivity of the organization, and also provides policy makers with tools for evaluating current policies and future directions of the organization. But culture is not composed only of values; culture is the result of values, norms, and rules of behavior that members of the group use to reaffirm the culture to themselves and to project the culture to others. Group culture can be analyzed at different levels which are evident to the observer. These levels of culture constitute a holistic view of organizational culture that goes more in-depth by analyzing artifacts (visible organizational structure and processes), espoused values (strategies, goals, and philosophies), and basic assumptions (beliefs, perception, thoughts, and feelings). Changes in the environment frequently demand adaptation from organizations to ensure future success. In the process of adaptation, organizations often change strategy, adopt new technologies, redesign the
workplace, or restructure to better serve markets. The challenge is to change the organizational culture so it can enhance its performance (Schein, 1992; Safrit, Jones & Conklin, 1994; Safrit, Conklin & Jones, 1995; Wagner & Spencer, 1996).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to identify the type of organizational culture of OSUE by using the framework developed by Cameron and Quinn (1999). The framework proposed by Cameron and Quinn is called the competing values framework and focuses on indicators of effective organizations represented by four dominating culture types: (a) hierarchy culture; (b) market culture; (c) clan culture; and (d) adhocracy culture. Organizational culture is measured by the extent to which employees in the organization will agree or disagree with the statements contained in the organizational culture assessment instrument in both current and preferred situations (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

In addition to the identification of the type of organizational culture, this study also had the purpose of assessing the level of organizational learning of OSUE personnel by using the organizational learning research framework proposed by Marquardt (1996). The framework proposed by Marquardt is called a systems approach to quantum improvement and global success. This framework provides a methodology for the analysis of organizational learning in a systems learning organizational model composed of five basic dimensions: (a) organization; (b) people; (c) learning; (d) knowledge; and (e) technology. The frameworks proposed here will help determine the predominant culture of the organization and the organizational learning profile, providing the basis for future decision making and intervention for organizational change (Marquardt, 1996).
Three variables were identified for the study as shown in Figure 1.1. The independent variable was organizational culture (OC) represented by the six dimensions of OC included in the organizational culture assessment instrument as part of the competing values framework (Cameron & Quinn, 1999). The dependent variable was organizational learning (OL) represented by the five dimensions of OL included in the learning organization profile instrument as part of the systems learning organization model (Marquardt, 1996). Moderating variables were demographics characteristics that help to establish relationships between the independent and dependent variables among employee group categories.

**Objectives of the Study**

The objectives of the study were organized in terms of their relevance to the organization, clients, and stakeholders. The objectives of the study were to:

1. identify the dominant culture type of OSUE as perceived by their personnel;
   a. describe differences between current and preferred culture types;
   b. describe the strength of the culture type;
   c. describe the culture profile among groups of individuals in OSUE; and
2. describe the organizational learning profile of OSUE as perceived by their personnel;
3. describe demographic characteristics of OSUE personnel: job title, program area, sex, age, and length of employment;
4. describe relationships between the perceived type of organizational culture and the organizational learning profile and demographic characteristics of personnel.
Figure 1.1: Schematic representation of the identified variables for the study.
Definition of Terms

For the purpose of the study the following terms are operationally defined based on their relevance to this particular research study:

Type of Organizational Culture

The culture of a group can be formally defined as: “A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (Schein, 1992; p. 12). According to Cameron and Quinn (1999), the culture of an organization is reflected by what is valued, the dominant leadership style, the language and symbols, the procedures and routines, and the success indicators that makes an organization unique. For the purpose of this study, organizational culture will be determined as the organizational culture profile based on the competing values framework of Cameron and Quinn (1999) after the completion of the 24 items of the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) by members of OSUE. The OCAI consists of 24 statements pertaining to six key dimensions of organizational culture. Each dimension has four alternatives and the respondent is asked to distribute 100 points among the alternatives. Respondents are also asked to rank in an ipsative-type of scale their organization in a current versus preferred situation. After a mean score is obtained for each dimension and also for each situation, the organizational culture type is identified in the competing values framework as the current and preferred organizational culture type.
An ipsative-type of scale is a rank order scale in which a particular rank can be used only once (Vogt, 1999).

**Learning Organization Profile**

Organizational learning is the development of new knowledge and insights that have the potential to influence behavior (Slater & Narver, 1995). “A learning organization is an organization skilled at creating, acquiring, and transferring knowledge, and at modifying its behavior to reflect new knowledge and insights” (Garvin, 1993; cited by Romme & Dillen, 1997).

For the purpose of this study, the level of organizational learning of OSUE was determined by using the learning organization profile instrument developed by Marquardt (1996). OSU Extension personnel were asked to rank their organization on a 50-item instrument pertaining to five dimensions of organizational learning. Each dimension had ten items which were ranked by participants using a five point Likert-type attitudinal scale of measurement. An overall mean score was calculated for the whole organization and mean scores calculated for each dimension of the systems learning organizational model: (a) organization, (b) people, (c) learning, (d) knowledge, and (e) technology.

**Public, Non-Profit Organizations**

Public is a term that defines an organization being “...accessible to or shared by all members of the community.” (Merriam-Webster, 1994). Non-profit organizations are considered to be those businesses that do not directly seek to financially enrich members, management, or associations. Typically non-profit organizations promote education, health care, religion or other benevolent goals (Kreitner, 1995). For this particular study, a
public, non-profit organization was represented by a land-grant university Cooperative Extension Service, specifically Ohio State University Extension.

**Significance of the Study**

A learning organization is an organization committed to learn powerfully and collectively, and is constantly undergoing processes of transformation to better gather, handle, and use knowledge for enhancing corporate success. This type of organization empowers employees to learn while working, utilizing available resources and technology to optimize both learning and productivity. Organizations also have particular ways of thinking and acting based on symbols, role models, rituals, ideology, and values known as the organization’s culture. The nature of learning and the way in which learning occurs is determined in a large measure by the culture of the organization. Evidence suggest that the predominant organizational culture is that of a non-learning or anti-learning organization, because risk taking, development of new approaches to problems, and sharing of information are usually discouraged; instead being risk adverse, following procedures, and holding information is rewarded. Therefore to become a learning organization an effort has to be made to transform the organizational culture in such a way that the system of values, beliefs, ideology, and symbols are supportive of learning capable of developing a successful corporate learning culture (Marquardt, 1996; DiBella & Nevis, 1998).

Organizational survey research is considered a tool for intervention and organizational change. Organizational survey research, when designed in such a way that the predominant culture type in an organization can be identified, could also lead to ways of enhancing organizational performance. By looking at the organizational culture type
described by Cameron and Quinn (1999), characteristics of organizational performance can also be determined using the same frame of reference. Identifying the type of organizational culture may be a way to assess the degree of organizational learning in any institution. Few studies have explored relationships between type of organizational culture and learning organization profile. This study has important implications for policy, decision making, and leadership in the organization; and also for strategic planning and evaluation of programs oriented to raise the level of organizational learning.

OSU Extension is thought to be moving in the correct direction to become a more effective and efficient learning organization. OSU Extension administration has made a commitment in this respect by recently designating a professor to be the learning organization officer, and furthermore by creating and appointing Extension personnel to become part of the organizational learning and leadership team.

Another important aspect of the organizational culture is related not only to the country and to the organization itself, but also to the relationship between organizational culture and how the organization understands the cultural diversity and assimilation of employees from other race or ethnic groups background.

The present study will generate additional information to organizational and motivational theory by looking at possible relationships between organizational culture and the learning organization profile. The study is aimed at establishing a link between the organization's culture and its perceived ability to learn.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze current literature on the topic of the study, in order to present an overview and to emphasize the importance of the subject to be addressed. The chapter is organized according to the following sections: a) Organizational Theory, b) Organizational Behavior, c) Organizational Culture and c) Organizational Learning and/or Learning Organizations.

Organizational Theory

The objective of this section is to summarize some contemporary theories about organizations. Examining different organizational theories allows for the understanding of different facets about organizations. In addition, organizational theory helps to explain organizational change and transformation. Organizational theories were developed predominantly during the twentieth century as an intent to explain organizational phenomena. Organizations have been analyzed in different fashions. One way of examining organizational theories is to contrast traditional versus modern views of organizations. In the traditional view, organizations are considered to have closed system-thinking. This view assumes that organizations can accurately predict what will happen in their surrounding environment and that uncertainty can be overcome by planning and control
mechanisms, with the primary organizational objective of being economically efficient.

Within this line of thinking four traditional principles for organizations emerged guiding much of the early organizational design efforts. These principles included: (a) a well-defined hierarchy of authority, (b) unity of command, (c) authority equal to responsibility, and (d) downward delegation of authority, but not of responsibility. On the other hand, the non-traditional view of organizations is characterized by open-system thinking, assuming that organizations interact continuously with their uncertain environment. In this line of thought, organizations and their environment are governed by internal and external variables respectively, which are difficult to predict or control. The main goal of organizations under the non-traditional view is to adapt to an ever-changing environment for survival (Kreitner, 1995).

Another way of analyzing theories about organizations is to investigate different schools of thought that have prevailed over various time periods. Some of those schools of thought have been labeled by scholars as models or perspectives about organizations. These models or perspectives have suggested insights, but none of them have been empirically substantiated as "the" explanation for organizational phenomena (Hall, 1991; Scott, 1992; Kreitner, 1995).

In the analysis of organizational theories, Scott (1992) takes into consideration according to the order of their emergence, three perspectives about organizations which are: the rational, the natural, and the open system perspective. In the rational systems approach, organizations are tools designed to attain specific goals; this notion about organizations is rooted in the concept of rationality. Rationality is technically defined as
the extent to which actions are organized in such a way that they could lead to achievement of predetermined goals with a maximum of efficiency. The key features of organizations according to rational system theorists are goal specificity and formalization. Goals are preconceptions of desired ends, specific goals not only provide criteria for choosing among alternative activities to be performed, but also guide decision making about structure design in the organization. The more specific the goal, the more easy the design of the organizational structure to pursue the goal. Formalization refers to the set of rules that governs behavior of individuals in a precise and explicit way, and to roles and role relations which are established specifically for the position in the organizational structure independently of personal attributes (Scott, 1992).

Contributors to the rational systems perspective include Taylor's scientific management, Fayol's administrative theory, and Weber's theory of bureaucracy (Scott, 1992; Buford, Bedeian & Lindner, 1995; Kreitner, 1995). Taylor is known as the father of scientific management. His approach is based on scientific decision making, computer applications, and mathematical models. Taylor believed that the adoption of scientific management principles would lead to a new era of industrial peace based on scientifically determined procedures and rewards for managers and workers. Taylor developed four principles of scientific management: (a) science of management with a complete and clear set of laws, rules, and principles, (b) scientific selection, training, and development of workers, (c) cooperation between managers and workers to assure that the work is done, and (d) equal division of tasks and responsibilities between worker and management. The scientific management approach has had a deep and enduring effect on industrial
Fayol’s administrative management theory stresses work patterns with the goal of acquiring knowledge about elements of executive success. This approach which developed concurrently with the scientific management theory, put emphasis on management functions for the generation of administrative principles to guide the rationale for organizations activities. Although the scientific management approach viewed the organization from the bottom-up, Fayol studied management from the perspective of upper-level administration. Fayol was the first person to focus on management as a process. The major dimensions of management Fayol described were: organizing, command, planning, coordination, and control. Credit must be given to Fayol for the formulation of the first set of principles of management. Although Fayol recognizes that they are not applicable to all organizational situations, his 14 principles of management guided organizational activities toward formalization. The management principles included: (a) division of labor, (b) authority, (c) discipline, (d) unity of command, (e) unity of direction, (f) subordination of individual interest to general goals, (g) remuneration, (h) centralization, (i) chain of command, (j) order, (k) equity, (l) stability of tenure of personnel, (m) initiative, and (n) harmony and unity. Followers of the administrative management approach did not reach an agreement on the number of principles required, but they have agreed in the importance of two types of activities: coordination and specialization. Coordination emphasizes the scalar chain (pyramidal structure), unity-of-command (receiving orders from only one superior), unity-of-direction (number of
subordinates that one can really manage), and centralization principles (superiors handling exceptional situations and subordinates handling routine situations). Specialization focused on both how specific activities are distributed among the organizational arrangement and how positions can be grouped in strategic units. Specialization stresses the order (departmentation), division of labor (similarity of purpose), and harmony and unity principles (line functions for achievement of organizational goals) (Scott, 1992; Buford, Bedeian & Lindner, 1995).

The German sociologist Max Weber with his work about bureaucracy constructed the basis for the contemporary organizational theory. Bureaucracy is Weber's framework of a rationally efficient organization and consists of those positions or activities whose function is to service and maintain the organization itself. The definition of bureaucracy proposed by Scott (1992), can help to understand the implications for any organization: "...the existence of a specialized administrative staff. Like formalization and goal specificity, bureaucracy should be viewed as a variable; organizations vary in terms of how much of their personnel resources are devoted to administrative as compared to production activities" (p. 40). Efficiency of bureaucracies according to Weber is due to the following characteristics in the organization: (a) division of labor, (b) hierarchy of authority, (c) set of rules, and (d) impersonality. An important feature of the bureaucracy theory is the analysis of administrative systems based on different types of authority. Weber's model of administrative systems stresses that organizations are conformed by many interrelated factors with observations based on existing systems of power and domination. Weber differentiates among three types of authority: traditional authority,
rational-legal authority, and charismatic authority. Each authority type is associated with a
typical administrative structure. This typology is of interest because it refers to the basic
changes that occur in administrative systems over time; in Weber’s view only traditional
and rational-legal authority relations are stable enough to provide the basis for the
formation of permanent administrative structures (Scott, 1992; Buford, Bedeian &
Lindner, 1995; Kreitner, 1995).

Bureaucracy is recognized to have a negative connotation nowadays. Bureaucracy is
synonymous of a slow, insensitive to individual needs, and inefficient organization.
Bureaucratic characteristics are more progressive or intensified in some organizations than
in others. To try to eliminate bureaucracy is impractical, instead the challenge is to keep
bureaucracy within operational limits. A moderate degree of bureaucracy can raise
organizational efficiency, but a higher degree can obstruct efficiency (Kreitner, 1995).

Another approach to the analysis of organizational theories not based on the typical
historical perspective (deductive) refers also to current theories, models or views about
organizations but in an inductive way. The process utilized instead is contributory, which
permits to build upon empirical research based on the theories identified early. The focus
is on the organizational level of analysis based on the perspectives of actions taken. Hall
(1991) examining organizational theories takes into consideration five alternative schools
of thought which have tremendous explanatory power in organizational change and
transformation. These approaches basically are:

1. **The population-ecology model**: is also called the natural-selection model.
   
   The model is concerned with forms or population of organizations.
Organizational species that have the appropriate fit with the environment are selected over those that fit poorly or do not fit at all. Three stages are suggested for the natural selection model: variation, selection, and retention.

2. **The resource-dependence model**: also called the political-economy model, departs from the premise that decisions are made inside organizations. These decisions are made within the internal political context of the organization. The origin of resources is the environment but from the perspective of other organizations acting as well (inter-organizational model). The key element of this model is "strategic choice" assuming that a decision is made among alternatives.

3. **The rational-contingency model**: in the goal-based approach, goals are the reason why organizations act as they do (rational systems). Goals are part of the organizational culture and also of the mind set of decision makers. The ideology of the contingency theory is that the best way to organize an institution depends on the nature of the environment to which the organization must relate. Organizations are viewed as seeking to achieve goals and dealing with their environments.

4. **The transaction-cost model**: the fundamental principle of this model is the transaction or exchange of goods and services. By focusing on the cost of transactions rather than production, a new element is introduced into the
economics and sociology of organizations: the level of uncertainty in the organization’s surrounding environment.

5. **The institutional model**: this perspective views organizational design not as a rational process, instead design is a process signaled by both internal and external pressures that lead organizations to appear like each other over time. Within this perspective organizations are more homogeneous in particular fields, a phenomenon called “institutional isomorphism” (Hall, 1991).

**Organizational Behavior**

The following section is anchored in an increased management awareness that organizational success is highly dependent on the effective use of human resources. Applied behavioral sciences have a major role in establishing and maintaining human organizations. Applied behavioral sciences pertain to managers that try to understand, predict, and direct change and control behavior based on concepts and principles extracted from a variety of disciplines (e.g., psychology, sociology, social psychology, anthropology, and political sciences) useful in making decisions about behavior of individuals and groups (Hersey & Blanchard, 1993; Robbins, 1997). The study of people at work is broadly referred as the study of organizational behavior. Organizational behavior (OB) has been defined as: “...the systematic study of the actions and attitudes that people exhibit within organizations” (Robbins, 1997; p.2). Actions (behaviors or overt actions) are considered acts of will, they could be positive, negative, or have no evaluative implications; and attitudes are referred to as general and enduring positive or negative
feelings about some person, object, or issue (Infopedia, 1994; Petty & Cacioppo, 1996). Three types of behavior have been reported to be important determinants of employee performance: productivity, absenteeism, and turnover. The productivity role of employees is associated with the quantity and quality of the output generated, and is highly linked to performance. Absenteeism and turnover, when they exist in high rates, are detrimental for productivity. Another concern of OB is employee job satisfaction. OB seeks to use scientific knowledge measured and interpreted rigorously to attribute cause and effect in patterns of organizational behavior. The major goals of OB are: explanation, prediction, and control of human behavior (Hersey & Banchard, 1993; Robbins, 1997).

From a managerial perspective, challenges and opportunities have been identified for OB to provide solutions: (a) improving quality and productivity, (b) improving people skills, (c) managing work-force diversity, (d) responding to globalization, (e) empowering people, (f) stimulating innovation and change, (g) coping with temporariness, (h) coping with declining employee loyalty, (i) motivating the bi-modal work-force, and (j) improving ethical behavior (Robbins, 1997).

The fundamental approach used to understand organizational behavior is the relationship between motivation and behavior. Behavior is thought to be goal-oriented. Because behavior is motivated by a conscious or unconscious desire to attain some goal, employee behavior is the main reason why managers place emphasis on motivation. The basic unit of measurement of behavior is an activity, being a series of activities that constitute a specific behavior. Furthermore, motivation plays an important role in performance. Essentially performance is determined by three elements: (a) ability (able to
perform the job), (b) motivation (want to do the job), and (c) role clarity (understand what the job is). Motivation is a predisposition to behave in a specific manner to attain a particular need. The definition of motivation assumes that the individual is willing to do something conditioned by the action’s ability to fulfill an unmet need. Central to the definition of motivation is the concept of motive. Motives are usually equated with needs, wants, drives, or impulses in the individual, and are directed toward goals that may be conscious or unconscious. Job satisfaction, from the OB perspective, is concerned with attitudes people have toward their work more than efforts to fulfill a particular need. Of the several synonyms used to refer to motives, the term need is the more explicit one. Needs are defined as physiological or psychological individual deficiencies which in turn create tension and stimulate drives within the individual. In addition, a need is said to be the existing gap between what is and what should be in a given situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1991; Buford, Bedeian & Lindner, 1995; Witkin & Altschuld, 1995; Robbins, 1997).

Motivation appears to be the central issue in the study of OB. Managers have studied motivation in an effort to understand: what causes a specific behavior, what forces are responsible for directing behavior, and how behavior can be maintained. Most of the theories developed about motivation fall in either one of the following categories or approaches: content and process, or traditional and contemporary (Buford, Bedeian & Lindner, 1995; Robbins, 1997). The most important traditional theories about employee behavior that emerged during the decade of the 1950s were: Maslow Hierarchy of Needs, Theory X and Theory Y, and the motivation-hygiene theory. Although the validity of these
Theories have been questioned, they are still widely used. The theories are the foundation of the modern approaches and managers usually use them in order to explain employee motivation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1991; Buford, Bedeian & Lindner, 1995; Robbins, 1997).

The most widely known theory about motivation is Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Maslow's framework is useful to managers in answering questions about causes and forces that influence behavior. The hierarchy refers to the strength of the motive or need of an individual. A person's need with the greatest strength in a particular moment will be responsible for that person's behavior or actions. Managers want to increase their knowledge about needs that are more important to employees' behavior. Maslow has suggested that within each human being there is an hierarchical arrangement of five types of needs:

1. **Physiological**: including hunger, thirst, shelter, sex, and other physiological needs;
2. **Safety needs**: including the need for security, stability, and freedom from fear or threat;
3. **Social needs**: including affection, a sense of belonging, acceptance, and friendship;
4. **Esteem needs**: including both a need for personal achievement or self-esteem, and a need for recognition or respect from others;
5. **Self-actualization needs**: the need to become what the individual is capable of becoming; including personal growth, achievement of one's potential,

Maslow stresses that these needs are arranged in a hierarchical manner reflecting an order of importance. Therefore, when each type of need becomes satisfied the next type becomes important and in consequence individuals move up the hierarchy. This movement along the hierarchy is possible since satisfied needs no longer motivate behavior. In addition, Maslow distinguishes between two set of needs according to their importance: lower level needs and higher level needs. Lower level needs are thought to be satisfied externally (physiological and safety needs) and higher level needs (social, esteem, and self-actualization) are thought to be satisfied internally. Maslow also suggested that a person could move along different levels of the hierarchy either up or down depending on circumstances. In spite of the absence of evidence to confirm Maslow’s arrangement of needs and that satisfaction in one level leads to search for satisfaction in the next higher level, Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is still used extensively by managers to motivate their employees (Hersey & Blanchard, 1991; Buford, Bedeian & Lindner, 1995; Robbins, 1997).

Douglas McGregor (1960; cited by Kreitner, 1995), has been credited with launching the organizational behavior field and also his optimistic assumptions about working people called the Theory X and Theory Y. After analyzing the way managers dealt with subordinates, McGregor concluded that a manager’s view of the nature of human beings is based on certain assumptions, and managers tend to mold their behavior toward employees accordingly. The assumptions of Theory X are:
1. Employees inherently dislike work and will attempt to avoid it;
2. Employees must be coerced, controlled, or threatened with penalization to achieve the desired goals;
3. Employees will avoid responsibilities and seek formal direction when possible;
4. Employees place security as a high priority factor associated with work and will exhibit little aspirations.

The assumptions of Theory Y are:
1. Employees perception of work is like rest or play;
2. Employees will show commitment to the goals and will exercise self-direction and self-control;
3. The average employee will learn to accept and even seek responsibility;
4. Employees have the ability to make decisions, they can be creative (Kreitner, 1995; Robbins, 1997).

The motivational implications of McGregor’s theory is based on his belief that Theory Y assumptions were more valid than Theory X. He proposed that employee participation in decision making, responsible and challenging jobs, and good group relations would maximize job motivation. No evidence exists to confirm that either set of assumptions is valid or that by altering management actions accordingly, there will be an increase in employee motivation (Kreitner, 1995; Robbins, 1997).

The motivation-hygiene theory also called the two-factor theory, was developed by Herzberg (1966; cited by Buford, Bedeian & Lindner, 1995). He believed that attitude
toward work could determine success or failure in the workplace. In his work, Herzberg was concerned with factors that could affect job attitudes of employees. By analyzing what people want from their jobs, he identified factors which people related to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Factors that produced job satisfaction were labeled “motivators” and were related to job content. Factors that produced job dissatisfaction were labeled “hygienes” and were related to job context. Herzberg stressed that organizational characteristics when adequate (i.e., policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions, and salary) will eliminate job dissatisfaction and will keep people calm, but will not motivate individuals. However, emphasizing achievement, recognition, responsibility and growth in the workplace will be highly motivating for employees. One important implication of the motivation-hygiene theory is that it reduced Maslow’s hierarchy of needs from five levels to two. Herzberg’s hygienes are similar to Maslow’s lower level needs and motivators are similar to the higher level needs. This comparison lead to an agreement between both theories, suggesting that modern employees once they have fulfilled their lower level needs, such as social and economic progress, were satisfied. Consequently, lower level needs are no longer motivators and employees will be more likely to be primarily motivated by higher level needs. Although, Herzberg’s results are not generalizable, the value of his study relies on its managerial implications. First, an individual can be satisfied and dissatisfied at the same time. Second, improving work conditions does not always improve employee motivation (Buford, Bedeian & Lindner, 1995; Robbins, 1997).
Another set of theories on motivation has been labeled as contemporary. The following theories represent current knowledge on motivation:

1. **Three-Needs theory**: this theory states that there are three major motives or needs in the workplace: (a) need for achievement (drive to excel, to achieve, and to succeed), (b) need for power (make others behave in a certain way), and (c) need for affiliation (need for interpersonal relationships). Research is supportive of the fact that predictions can be made based on relationship between achievement needs and job performance. Research has been less supportive about power and affiliation needs. High achievers are individuals who prefer job situations with responsibility, feedback, and an intermediate degree of risk. A high need for achievement does not necessarily lead to being a good manager, especially in large organizations. Need for affiliation and power are closely related to managerial success. The best managers are high in their need for power and low in their need for affiliation (Robbins, 1997).

2. **Goal-Setting theory**: this theory suggests a cognitive approach to motivation. The goal-setting theory states that intentions, as the expression of goals, can be a major source of work motivation. Considerable evidence supports the fact that specific and challenging goals lead to increased performance. On the other hand, difficult goals instead of easy ones result in higher performance but only if they are accepted. Although research is not conclusive in the role of personnel participation in the goal-setting
process, participation tends to be preferable to assignment when resistance is expected. Under the umbrella of this theory the general recommendation, for the majority of workers, is the assignment of difficult goals (Robbins, 1997).

3. **Reinforcement theory:** this theory is not strictly a motivational theory because it stresses a behavioristic approach to motivation, which argues that reinforcement conditions behavior. Reinforcement theory states that what controls behavior are the so called “reinforcers” and they are defined as: “...any consequences that, when immediately following a response, increase the probability that the behavior will be repeated” (Robbins, 1997; p. 5). Reinforcement theory is not concerned with what initiated the behavior, but focuses on what happens to an individual when he or she takes some action and helps explain how people learn (Buford, Bedeian & Lindner, 1995; Robbins, 1997).

4. **Equity theory:** this theory argues that employees weigh their inputs to a specific job situation against the outcome of a specific job situation. In addition, they compare their input-outcome ratio with the input-outcome ratio of relevant others. So a state of equity or inequity could exist depending on whether the employee appreciation of this relationship is. The equity theory indicates that it is not only a matter of total rewards from a job situation, it is also a matter of relationship to rewards others received. This theory takes into consideration inputs such as effort, experience,
education, and competence, which are compared with outcomes such as salary, raises, and recognition. Research results confirm that employee motivation is highly influenced by absolute as well as relative rewards. So when an inequity is perceived, tension is created in the employee. The reaction is to correct the situation which might signify lower or higher quality or productivity, absenteeism, or even resignation (Buford, Bedeian & Lindner, 1995; Robbins, 1997).

5. Expectancy theory: this theory is based on the belief that people will act to maximize their reward; motivation is determined by the belief that effort will be rewarded and the value attached to the specific reward. Expectancy theory is thought to have three variables: (a) attractiveness, (b) performance-reward linkage, and (c) effort-performance linkage. This theory has brought to discussion two important motivational issues: payoff or rewards and individual expectations. Some of the applications for this theory are: organizational rewards must be aligned to rewards employees seek; individual self-interest (i.e., value the individual puts in organizational payoffs) so organizations must be concerned with the attractiveness of rewards; and organizations must know employee’s own expectations so desired performance can be clearly linked to rewards (Buford, Bedeian & Lindner, 1995; Robbins, 1997).
Organizational Culture

Culture is a concept borrowed originally from the field of anthropology and is considered to be the total sum of all contributions of a group of people, in a designated area, within a given time. Culture represents the aesthetic or intellectual achievement or appreciation of an individual or a society, and also the life-style of a society as passed on from generation to generation. The concept of culture has been widely examined by several disciplines (e.g., anthropology, archaeology, art, education, history, and sociology). Culture is about shared mental models. Culture is a collective shared way in which people perceive the world, the mental categories that people use to desegregate the world out, how people emotionally react to what they perceive, and how people assign values to things (Merrian-Webster, 1994; Schein, 1994; Smart & St. John, 1996).

In an effort to reach a consensus on a definition of organizational culture (OC), Schein (1992) has proposed a formal definition of a group's culture as: "A pattern of shared assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems" (p. 12). The central issue in OC is its linkage with organizational performance, reflecting the capacity to solve problems in two dimensions: (a) organizational survival in and adaptation to the external environment and (b) integration of internal processes to assure a capacity for continuous adaptation. In addition, Smart and Hamm (1993), have stated that: "Culture contributes to the solution of external adaptation issues through providing consensus about mission and strategy.
operational goals, means, performance criteria, and remedial and repair strategies, and to the solution of *internal integration issues* through providing consensus about language, conceptual categories, group boundaries, and explanations of the unexplainable, as well as criteria for differentiation of influence and power (i.e., stratification), intimacy (i.e., peer relationships), and allocation of rewards and punishment (p. 95).

More recently Cameron and Quinn (1999) have defined OC as the reflection of what is valued, the dominant leadership style, the language and symbols, the procedures and routines, and the definitions of success that characterizes an organization. OC represents the values, underlying assumptions, expectations, collective memories, and definitions present in an organization. Furthermore, Schein (1992) states that OC and leadership are two sides of the same coin. First, leaders create cultures when they create groups or organizations. Second, the existing culture determines the criteria for leadership in the group or organization (Schein, 1992; Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

Based on a review of current definitions of OC and other social systems, Rousseau (1990) argues that the basic elements of the culture construct are:

1. Culture is a social process associated with a unit (group or organization) in which members have a set of elements in common (i.e., assumptions and world-views, values, behavioral norms, patterns of activities, and material artifacts).

2. Depending on the degree to which these elements are consciously experienced by members, they might differ in function and content.
3. Cultural elements can vary in their availability to outsiders and in the degree to which members must actively provide information and interact in the interpretation before outsiders can understand them.

4. Cultural elements common to all units with sufficient social stability are to be called a culture.

5. Organizations are social systems which are to be characterized to determine whether the function and content of the cultural elements are unique to a particular social unit or can be generalized across units (i.e., subculture).

Some authors argue that a fundamental distinction between organizational culture and national culture must be made. They have stated that OC is based on the visible practices of an organization and may be consciously change; while national culture is based on the primary values and practices that characterizes countries, and may change a little or not at all, over time (Robbins, 1997; Smith, 1998).

Organizational culture can be analyzed by examining the different levels in which it manifest itself. The term “cultural level” refers to the degree to which the cultural phenomena is visible to the observer. These manifestations could range from a very tangible open manifestation to a very intangible embedded (unconscious) manifestation. In this regard Schein (1992), has proposed the following levels of culture:

1. **Artifacts**: are the visible organizational structures and processes. The artifacts level is the most superficial level and includes all that one can see, hear and feel when exposed to a group with a different culture. Artifacts
include visible products of the group, such as the physical environment, language, technology, and products and services. Artifacts also include style reflected by type of clothing, manners of address, myths and stories, and rituals and ceremonies. This level of culture is easy to observe, but difficult to decipher in practice.

2. **Espoused values**: are considered organizational justifications, they are strategies, goals, and philosophies. A solution to a certain problem an organization is facing can come from an individual usually identified as a leader in the group, although the proposed solution only reflects the individual's own assumptions about reality. Therefore, whatever is proposed as solution will not have the status of a value until it emerges from the group. Members of the group should have taken joint action and together observe the outcome of that action. Some values are thought to be promulgated by prophets, founders, and leaders in the organization and they work to reduce uncertainty in the group. As the values continue to work they become embedded in the philosophy or ideology of an organization.

3. **Basic assumptions**: this level of culture is unconscious and includes beliefs, perceptions, thoughts, and feelings. Basic assumptions are different from dominant value orientations. Basic assumptions tend to be those theories-in-use that a group neither confronts nor debates. Problem solutions are hypotheses supported by a value. Once a solution to a problem works
repeatedly in an organization it begins to be treated as a reality, as the way nature works. This level of culture is critical for a learning organization, because it causes the group to reexamine basic assumptions and possibly change some of the more permanent portions of cognitive structure which is extremely difficult, but not impossible (Schein, 1992).

The espoused values level of organizational culture has been used to analyze OSU Extension. The organizational values of the cooperative Extension system has been defined as: "any concept or idea that is held by the members of an organization and shapes the organization’s philosophy, processes, and goals" (Conklin, Jones & Safrit, 1991, p. 1). The identification of a set of organizational values held by OSU Extension personnel was the first step for improving the health and productivity in the organization. In addition, the organizational values assessment provided critical information needed to review policies and programs. The organizational values of OSU Extension identified by Safrit, Jones and Conklin (1994) have been the base for the proactive reexamination of the organization’s vision and mission statements. The organizational values identified and the associated level of agreement among Extension personnel are as follows: honesty/integrity in our work (93%), credibility with clientele (92%), programs that help people solve problems (87%), useful/practical programs (85%), an emphasis on excellence in educational programming (85%), helping people help themselves (82%), quick response to clientele concerns (81%), good fringe benefits for employees (80%), adequate resources to perform job responsibilities (80%), financial support from the local level
(80%), and teamwork among immediate coworkers (79%) (Safrit, Jones & Conklin, 1994; Safrit, Conklin & Jones, 1995).

According to Schein (1992) the organizational stage of evolution plays an important role in the actions needed as culture change mechanisms. Three organizational stages of evolution have been identified: (1) founding and early growth; (2) midlife; and (3) maturity and decline. In the founding and early growth stage, the main cultural essence comes from the founders and their values and assumptions; the emphasis is on differentiating from other organizations and clearly identifying the environment according to the organization’s distinctive competencies. In the midlife stage, the organization is no longer under the prescriptions of its founders; at least two generations of managers have administrated the organization; the organization has grown in size enough to overpower its founders; and from a cultural standpoint the organization is well established and must maintain itself through a continuous growth and renewal process. In the maturity and decline stage, the organization is no longer able to growth because it has saturated its markets or has become obsolete with its products and services; organizations in this stage hold intrinsically shared assumptions and reflect strong cultures.

Schein (1992) proposed eleven mechanisms as culture change options, these mechanisms are cumulative which means that at later organizational stages of evolution prior change mechanisms have already functioned or are still in operation. These mechanisms are:
1. **Founding and early growth:** (a) incremental change through general and specific evolution; (b) change through insight from organizational therapy; (c) change through promotion of hybrids within the culture;

2. **Midlife:** (d) change through systematic promotion from selected subcultures; (e) planned change through organizational development projects and the creation of parallel learning structures; (f) unfreezing and change through technological seduction;

3. **Maturity and decline:** (g) change through infusion of outsiders; (h) unfreezing through scandal and myth explosion (i) change through turnarounds; (j) change through coercive persuasion and destruction and rebirth (Schein, 1992).

The organizational culture framework to be used in this study is based on a theoretical model called the “Competing Values Framework.” This framework was originally developed as the result of research in the area of organizational effectiveness by Cameron and Quinn (1999). The framework is useful in identifying how multiple organizational phenomena interact. Four dominant cultural types have emerged from this framework which are the base for the “Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument” (OCAI). Each of the four cultural types defines a set of core values, assumptions, interpretations, and approaches that characterizes organizations. Determining the most significant dimensions in which to focus the study of OC and using an underlying framework like the competing values framework is important for narrowing the scope to key cultural dimensions based on empirical evidence. The OCAI framework has
demonstrated to have both face and empirical validity that helps in the integration of multiple dimensions of organizational culture proposed by other authors (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

The purpose of the competing values framework is to diagnose and facilitate the social process of change in an organization. The framework has been found to be in agreement with well-known and well-recognized models about the way people organize their thinking, their values and assumptions, and also in the way people process information. The competing values framework is based on indicators organized in two main dimensions. One dimension differentiates effectiveness criteria that emphasize flexibility, discretion, and dynamism from stability, order, and control. This dimension distinguishes between organizations that are viewed as effective if they are changing, adaptable, and organic from organizations that are viewed as effective if they are stable, predictable, and mechanistic. The second dimension is related to effectiveness criteria that emphasize an internal orientation, integration, and unity from an external orientation, differentiation, and rivalry. This dimension distinguishes between organizations that are viewed as effective if they exhibit a harmonious internal system from organizations that are viewed as effective if they are focusing on external competition. These two dimensions form four quadrants, each representing a particular set of organizational effectiveness indicators. Figure 2.1 represents how the two dimensions relate to each other, forming the four core clusters by which organizational values are grouped. Opposite values in each quadrant are responsible for the name given to the competing values framework. Each of the quadrants in the framework has been labeled to represent a specific type of culture, each based on their most important characteristics (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).
Figure 2.1: The Competing Values Framework for Assessing Organizational Culture (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).
The fundamental characteristics of each of the four culture types are:

1. **Hierarchy culture**: characterized by formal rules, structure, and policies. Procedures are the core precept in the organization. Leaders are perceived to be effective if they are good coordinators and organizers. Stability, predictability, and efficiency are important for the organization in the long run.

2. **Market culture**: includes organizations characterized by being results-oriented. Leaders are viewed as tough, demanding, hard-driving producers, and competitors. There is an emphasis on winning over the competition. The organization is concerned with competitive actions and with achieving goals and target markets. Success is a matter of market share and penetration.

3. **Clan culture**: characterized as a family-type organization. A clan culture is represented as a friendly place to work, where people share a lot of themselves. Leaders are viewed as mentors or facilitators. The glue of the organization is loyalty and tradition, and a high level of commitment exits among members. Clan organizations emphasize individual development, morale, teamwork, participation, and consensus.

4. **Adhocracy culture**: characterized as a dynamic, entrepreneurial, and creative organization. Leadership is thought to be visionary, innovative, and risk oriented. A commitment to experimentation and innovation exist among members to place the organization at the leading edge of new knowledge, products, or services. Emphasis is on rapid growth and
acquisition of new resources, and success is based on products and services that are unique and original (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

In addition to the characterization of the type of culture of an organization, the competing values framework describes other important aspects of organizations. These additional aspects considered to have an important role in organizational performance are: leadership roles, effectiveness criteria, and core management theories related with each of the culture types. Research conducted using this framework has revealed that more than 80% of organizations have been characterized as having one or more of the culture types as described by Cameron and Quinn (1999). On the other hand, those organizations that do not have a dominant culture type tend to be unclear about their culture, demonstrating an equilibrium in characteristics of the four culture types (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

The applicability of the competing values framework must be seen as related to three important management dimensions: leadership, effectiveness, and organizational theory. In regards to organizational leadership, managers who are more successful are those considered to have the leadership style that matches the culture type. Effective leaders in organizations dominated by a hierarchy culture are those who are better at organizing, controlling, monitoring, administering, coordinating, and maintaining efficiency. In an organization dominated by a market culture, effective leaders are those who are better at directing, producing results, negotiating, and motivating others. When the organization is dominated by a clan culture, effective leaders are considered to be parent-figures, team-builders, facilitators, nurturers, mentors, and supporters. When an organization is dominated by an adhocracy culture, effective leaders tend to be entrepreneurial, visionary, innovative, creative, risk, and future-oriented Cameron & Quinn, 1999).
Effectiveness criteria and organizational theory are also believed to match the type of organizational culture. The efficiency criteria most valued in the hierarchy culture are efficiency, timeliness, smooth functioning, and predictability. Within the hierarchical culture type the dominant operational theory is that control fosters efficiency. In the market culture the most valued efficiency criteria are achieving goals, outpacing the competition, increasing market share, and achieving high levels of return of investment. The operational theory underlying a market culture is that competition enhances productivity and therefore higher levels of effectiveness are reached. In the clan culture the effectiveness criteria most valued in the organization include cohesion, high levels of employee morale and job satisfaction, teamwork, and human resource development. The operational theory dominating a clan culture is that personnel participation fosters empowerment and commitment leading to enhance effectiveness. Finally, the effectiveness criteria most valued in an adhocracy culture are new products, creative problem solving, new ideas, and growth in the marketplace. The governing operational theory in the adhocracy culture is related to the fact that new products and ideas create new markets, customers, and opportunities for success (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

The competing values framework can be used in constructing an organizational culture profile. Through the use of the OCAI an organizational culture profile can be drawn by establishing the organization's dominant culture type characteristics. In this respect the overall culture profile of an organization can be identified as:

- **Clan culture**: an organization that concentrates on internal maintenance with flexibility, concern for people, and sensitivity for customers.
Hierarchical culture: an organization that focuses on internal alimony with a need for stability and control.

Adhocracy culture: an organization that concentrates on external positioning with a high degree of flexibility and individuality.

Market culture: an organization that focuses on external alimony with a need for stability and control.

The essence of the competing values framework is represented in what can be extracted from interpreting the culture profile of the organization. In addition to the culture profile six standard comparisons can also be made. These six standard comparisons are called the six culture attributes represented by: (1) type of culture that dominates the organization, (2) discrepancies between the current and preferred future culture, (3) strength of the culture type, (4) congruence of findings among groups of individuals in the organization, (5) comparison of the organization's culture type with the average culture profile of other relevant organizations in the area, and (6) comparability of the organization culture type with general future trends in OC (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

The competing values framework has experienced quite an evolution since the early research work in organizational effectiveness (Cameron, 1978; 1983; Smart & Hamm, 1993; Smart & St. John, 1996). Cameron (1978) proposed a nine-dimension framework for measuring effectiveness in institutions of higher education. The framework experienced some obstacles in identifying criteria and also in the uniqueness of organizational attributes of colleges and universities. Evidence was found to be consistent with some patterns of effectiveness across the nine dimensions. Smart and Hamm (1993), studying the applicability of Cameron's nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness in two-year
colleges, showed results that strongly supported the applicability of this framework, indicating that effectiveness of institutions varies significantly across two-year colleges based on their mission orientation. More recently, Smart and St. John (1996) studied organizational culture type and culture strength associated with effectiveness in American higher education institutions using the competing values model. The findings provided support to the hypothesis that both culture type and culture strength are factors that can influence organizational effectiveness. They concluded that the most prevalent organizational culture type found in almost two thirds of higher education institutions was the Clan culture, which was also perceived to be the most effective culture type.

Recognizing that the culture affects an organization’s ability to perform, Iowa State University Extension (ISUE) conducted a study to have a better understanding of its organizational culture (Broshar & Jost, 1995). The study had two phases, in the first phase researchers wanted to assess the existing organizational culture in order to begin an effective intervention program and to diagnose personnel training needs. In the second phase of the study, they wanted to have information about the way managers operated under a variety of conditions, and also to learn how staff perceived their manager’s practice and style. The results of the research lead to in an instructive process for both managers and the organization as a whole. A management culture profile of ISUE was drawn as the result of the implementation and confrontation of both: the manager style appraisal and quality potential assessment (QPA) procedures. Results indicated that a substantial number of managers and staff perceived the dominant management style to be that of regulator or comforter. In addition, when comparing the results to the QAP assessment, the conclusion was that the ISUE administrative team management culture
was consistent with the notion of patriarchy. The final recommendation was that the
Extension administrative team must change its management culture from patriarchy to one
conductive to enhance competence in order to fully develop the learning capacity of its
staff (Broshar & Jost, 1995).

Organizational Learning

Organizational learning (OL) has been the focus of considerable attention in the
literature. In the last five years the amount of work generated has grown at such a great
proportion that it has outpaced what was published before the beginning of this decade
(Easterby-Smith, 1997). Some academic disciplines have been identified as contributors to
the recent understanding of organizational learning: (a) psychology, (b) management
science, (c) marketing, (d) production management, (e) sociology, and (f) cultural
anthropology. Psychology is primarily concerned with human development within the
organizational context. The contributions to OL from the psychological perspective can be
summarized as follows: (a) different hierarchical levels to individual learning,
(b) recognition of the importance of context, (c) individual learning processes adjusted for
organizational learning, (d) importance of cognitive maps and frames of thinking, and
(e) interrelationships between thinking and action. The management science perspective is
concerned with the gathering and processing of information about organizations. The
contributions of this discipline to OL can be summarized as follows: (a) creation and
dissemination of information, (b) organizational knowledge, (c) levels of learning within
organizations, (d) information technology, and (e) a holistic view of organizations.
Sociology focuses on social systems and organizational structures where learning occurs
that might affect organizational learning itself. The primary contributions of sociology to
OL are summarized as follows: (a) questioning the nature and process of learning in organizations, (b) analyzing politics, conflict, and power distribution as normal realities in organizations, and (c) raising the question of whose interests are served by implementing organizational learning. The marketing perspective focuses on competition, and learning is viewed as a matter of competitive advantage. The contributions of marketing to OL can be summarized as follows: (a) competitive advantage could be gained through organizational learning, (b) organizational adaptation capabilities to a changing environment, (c) importance of knowledge that could be generated by direct experience, and (d) technical information exchange among constituencies, as well as technology transfer. Production management is primarily focused on the relationship between learning and organizational productivity/efficiency. The contributions of production management to OL can be summarized as follows: (a) use of productivity as a criterion to assess level of organizational learning, (b) the concept of the learning curve, (c) endogenous and exogenous sources of learning, and (d) the role of organizational design on the transfer of learning from the individual to the organization. The cultural perspective is related to “culture” in both the national and organizational dimensions and is seen as a significant cause and effect of organizational learning. The contributions of cultural anthropology to OL can be summarized as follows: (a) importance of values and beliefs, (b) culture may affect both the process and nature of organizational learning, and (c) some cultures can be considered better than others in facilitating organizational learning (Easterby-Smith, 1997).

Several concepts of organizational learning have emerged from the literature, but one the most popular definitions of OL is the one formulated by Senge (1990) as:
"...organizations where people continually expand their capacity to create results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together" (p. 3). On the other hand, Garvin (1993; cited by Kreitner, 1995; p. 276) in an effort to consolidate different conceptions has launched the following definition of OL: "A learning organization is an organization skilled at creating, acquiring, and transferring knowledge, and at modifying its behavior to reflect new knowledge and insight." Moreover, Romme and Dillen (1997) have argued that Garvin's definition of OL is different from the descriptive perspective presented by the majority of authors, stating that his definition of OL is normative in nature. Garvin's definition relies on the requirements that an organization must satisfy in order to become a learning organization.

Some debate has arisen from an existent dichotomy in the use of the terms organizational learning and the learning organization. Both concepts are so intimately related that sometimes they are used interchangeably in the literature. The difference between organizational learning and the learning organization refers to process versus structure. Organizational learning is used to describe certain type of activities that take place in an organization. Organizational learning is a construct which implies that the entity called an organization actually gets engaged in the process of gathering and processing information, and as a consequence its potential behavior is changed. Learning organization is a construct related to an organization that has a thoughtful philosophy for anticipating, reacting, and responding to change, complexity, and uncertainty. The learning organization refers to a particular type of organization: it is an organization that is good at organizational learning. The consequence of this debate is that the concept of
organizational learning always comes first and the learning organization follows, but they are mutually inclusive. This dichotomy also implies that organizational learning is a complex and multidimensional issue (Malhotra, 1996; Tsang, 1997).

Organizational learning is the development of new knowledge and insight that have the potential to influence behavior. In this context, learning facilitates change in behavior that leads to improved performance. Therefore, organizations must pursue the integration of learning processes, behavior change, and performance improvement in order to adapt to an ever-changing environment. Some scholars have equated organizational learning with market orientation. Market orientation refers to an organization’s effort to generate market intelligence (information), dissemination of that intelligence across departments, and the overall organizational response to that intelligence. For the majority of organizations market orientation is a valuable tool because it focuses the organization on: continuously collecting information about customer needs and competitors capabilities and using the information to create superior customer value (Jaworsky & Kolhi, 1993; Slater & Narver, 1995).

According to Garvin (1993; cited by Kreitner, 1995) five organizational skills are needed by an institution to become a learning organization in an effort to thrive more than survive: (a) solving problems, (b) experimenting, (c) learning from organizational experience/history, (d) learning from others, and (e) transferring and implementing. The current efforts in enabling these organizational skills in institutions of the public and private sectors have added a valuable amount of knowledge to organizational theory helping managers and administrators to cope with organizational adaptation and change (Kreitner, 1995).
Historically, the emphasis in public services has not been on meeting customer expectations or overcoming competition, but on obtaining public press. Customer care and competitors are relatively recent in public service organizations. These two areas (i.e., customers and competitors) are increasing in importance. Some approaches have been identified for developing a learning organization in the public sector which include:

- **Identifying key objectives and evaluating progress:** refers to the involvement of customers and stakeholders in the development and evaluation of key objectives and as a way to assure accountability;

- **Establishing a learning philosophy:** effective learning organizations practice an equal opportunity policy. Involvement of all employees of the organization in the learning process enables them to have ownership of the change process;

- **Networking:** a process that takes place at different levels in the organization. The most important level is networking that takes place within the organization in order to have an understanding of people who have talents or specific skills that could be used as a valuable resource in the transformation process (Cook, 1997).

Some national organized initiatives, such as “Investors in People” and “National Vocational Qualifications,” can help public service institutions become learning organizations. “Investors in People” focuses on training and communications with employees. However, the main focus of “Investors in People” is on training as opposed to learning, this implies that an integral approach to become a learning organization must be used. “National Vocational Qualifications” are also part of strategies for developing a
learning organization in the public sector. Competency-based training and work-based assessment are the main tools of the National Vocational Qualifications. Although they have an important value in the process of learning, a question has been raised of whether the training encourages a total organizational learning culture (Cook, 1997).

Organizational learning has been viewed as a three-stage process that includes: information acquisition, information dissemination, and shared interpretation. Information acquisition refers to information that comes from direct individual experience, experience of others, and organizational memory. Information dissemination deals with effective dissemination or sharing of information which increases information value to organizational members. Shared interpretation is the final stage of OL and implies a consensus to the meaning of information and its implications among members of the organization that must be established in order for organizational learning to occur. Organizations driven by this shared vision are said to be prodigious in developing a competitive advantage (Slater & Narver, 1995).

Several models of OL have been proposed. Bierly and Hämäläinen (1995) have proposed a “strategic model of organizational learning.” The strategic model of organizational learning takes place at four external and four internal learning domains. An important domain of organizational learning involves the external environment of the organization; external learning takes place by networking and information exchange. The external learning domain includes: customer learning; competitor learning; network learning; and institutional learning. Another important domain of organizational learning involves internal organizational processes; internal learning pertains to the increase of shared knowledge of members of the organization. The internal learning domain includes:
individual learning; intrafunctional learning; interfunctional learning; and multilevel learning.

Some features that characterize public service organizations have been identified that have specific implications for creating a learning organization. The set of identified characteristics are:

1. Multiple and sometimes conflicting service objectives;
2. Multiple expectations;
3. Many stakeholders with various degrees of political power;
4. Specific demands and expectations of funding agencies;
5. Services beneficiaries do not contribute directly;
6. Available resources vary across funding agencies;
7. Funding is received in advance for services;
8. Ever-changing ruling local parties;
9. Deal with government directives;
10. Statutory requirements;
11. Restrictions for raising capital or using revenues; and
12. Sensitivity to community pressure (Stewart, 1997).

Based on the aforementioned characteristics and using Senge’s (1990) approach to creating a learning organization, Stewart (1997) has argued that a learning organization in the public sector needs to demonstrate control of the following five disciplines: personal mastery, mental models, building a shared vision, team building, and systems thinking. Furthermore, the author recommends a model called “learning organization model” that could be applied in public service setting, which focuses on six levels of organizational
learning: environment (where and when), behavior (what), capabilities/skills (how), beliefs (why), identity (who), and transmission (who else). In addition, OL takes place in two dimensions: internal and external and at three different levels in the organization: individual, team/group, and organization (Senge, 1990; Stewart, 1997).

Some authors have mentioned the relevance of important learning theories in explaining how learning occurs in organizations. Under the behaviorist perspective, learning proposes a change in behavior, focusing on the end rather than the means of the learning process, and the permanence of a desired change. Cognitive learning theories, on the other hand, focus on cognitive processes which control learning and behavior. Under this perspective the learning process is thought to be involuntary with learners reacting mechanistically to feedback. Contrary to the behaviorist and cognitive approaches to learning are the constructivist learning theories. The constructivist perspective suggests that learning is about creating meaning. Under this perspective learning is a process of assimilation of new experiences and creation of new knowledge structures. Constructivism is concerned with transformation of knowledge that affects subsequent thinking and performance. The constructivist approach also takes into consideration social relations and proposes that individuals create and re-create meaning constantly as a consequence of the social interaction with others. The constructivist approach is helpful in the understanding of learning mediated by interpersonal relationships and in organizational settings (Preskill & Torres, 1999).

The framework of reference that will be used to assess the learning organization profile of Ohio State University Extension is called “the systems-linked organization model” and was proposed by Marquardt (1996). According to this framework a learning
organization is defined as: "...an organization which learns powerfully and collectively and is continually transforming itself to better collect, manage, and use knowledge for corporate success. It empowers people within and outside the company to learn as they work. Technology is utilized to optimize both learning and productivity" (p. 19). The following are important characteristics and dimensions thought to be part of the system-linked learning organization model:

1. Learning is accomplished by the organizational system as a whole;
2. Members of the organization recognize the importance of learning as an ongoing process;
3. Learning is continuous, linked to organizational strategy and success;
4. Creative and generative learning are stressed;
5. Adopting a systems thinking is eminent;
6. Success is dependent of continuous access to information and data resources;
7. An organizational climate that encourages rewards and accelerates individual and group learning exists;
8. Employees network in an innovative and community-like manner inside and outside the organization;
9. Failure is viewed as an opportunity to learn;
10. The force that drives the organization is quality and continuous improvement;
11. Reflective action is encouraged;
12. The organization has well-developed core competencies;
13. Agile, flexible, capacity for continuous adaptation, capacity to renew and
revitalize in response to an ever-changing environment (Marquardt, 1996).

Figure 2.2 shows a graphical representation of the systems-linked organization
model. The model is composed of five subsystems dynamically interconnected and
complementary of each other. The subsystems are: learning, organization, people,
knowledge, and technology. The heart of the systems learning organizational model is the
learning subsystem from which the other four subsystems permeate, but the other
subsystems are necessary to enhance the quality of and impact learning has in the
organization (Marquardt, 1996).

The following are the core characteristics of each of the subsystems comprising
Marquardt's (1996) systems learning organizational model:

1. **Learning subsystem:** in this subsystem, learning takes place at the
individual, group, and organizational levels. This subsystem is based on the
skills necessary to maximize organizational learning, represented by the six
disciplines proposed by Senge (1990). The learning subsystem also refers
to several types of learning crucial to the learning organization:
(a) adaptive, anticipatory, and generative learning, (b) single loop, double
loop, and deutero learning, and (c) action reflection learning.

2. **Organization subsystem:** this subsystem is considered the organization
itself, the place and physical structure in which learning occurs. The
organization subsystem has four components: (a) culture (values, beliefs,
practices, rituals, and customs), (b) vision (hopes, goals and future
Figure 2.2: Systems learning organization model (Marquardt, 1996).
direction), (c) strategy (action plans, methodologies, tactics, and steps toward the vision), and (d) structure (departments, levels and configurations).

3. **People subsystem**: the people subsystem includes groups of individuals that are of value in enabling and potentiating learning in the organization. This subsystem includes: (a) employees, (b) managers/leaders, (c) customers, (d) suppliers and vendors, (e) alliance partners, and (f) community groups.

4. **Knowledge subsystem**: this subsystem refers to the direction of the acquired and generated knowledge of the organization; in this respect collection and dissemination of information in the organization occurs through diverse channels and during different time frames. This subsystem includes: (a) acquisition (collection of outside information), (b) creation (new knowledge), (c) storage (coding and preserving information), (d) transfer and utilization (information movement).

5. **Technology subsystem**: the technology subsystem is the technological network needed to gain access and to exchange information and learning. The subsystem includes: (a) information technology (computer based technology), (b) technology-based learning (multiple audio-visual and computer-based), and (c) “electronic performance support system” (EPSS) (capture, storage and distribution of information).

The systems learning organizational model framework can be used in constructing an organizational learning profile. Through the use of the “learning organization profile” (LOP) instrument an organizational learning profile can be drawn by establishing the
organization's dominant learning characteristics in each dimension of organizational learning. In this respect the LOP is an instrument for intervention and change, and the purpose of the framework is to make recommendations to take action in becoming a learning organization. The framework proposes a series of 16 steps which any organization may follow to begin the process of transformation into a learning organization, with the anticipated knowledge that they are considered possibilities and not prescriptions for all situations (Marquardt, 1996).

Although the systems-linked learning organization profile is recommended by the American Society for Training and Development (Van Buren & Lucadamo, 1996) as an instrument designed to diagnose and intervene in order to create a learning organization, empirical evidence about testing the framework could not be found in the literature. The only evidence are case studies which include company efforts in which the framework has successfully operated (e.g., Singapore Institute of Management, Rover Group, National Semiconductor, Pentax, Astra International, Price Waterhouse, DuPont). In this regard Tsang (1997) analyzing this issue has argued that a rigorous research methodology (quantitative and qualitative) is needed in order to give validity and reliability to OL theories. In the field of organizational learning most of the writers gather information from clients after providing consultancy services. In a collaborative effort consultants and clients diagnose and develop solutions to problems; they adopt a rough action research process. They often cite real-life cases with the purpose of illustrating where the theories are coming from (ASTD, 1996; Tsang, 1997).
Summary of Literature Review

The concepts, principles, frameworks of reference, and models of both organizational culture and organizational learning discussed in the last two sections of this chapter lead to the conclusion that, the topic to be addressed by this study is complex and multidimensional in nature. On the other hand, the organizational theory and organizational behavior sections set down the boundaries for a more profound understanding of the mechanism by which OC and OL operates within the structural (organization) and human relation (social) levels. From the sections on organizational theory and organizational behavior some important implications can be drawn for managers, administrators and policymakers.

The macro level of “national” culture is based on the primary values, beliefs and practices of inhabitants which characterizes a specific country. National culture changes little or not at all over time, and some cultures are said to be better at learning than others. The micro level of “group” or “organization” culture is based on values, beliefs, procedures, expectations, and definitions which characterizes groups or organizations. Organizational culture could be consciously changed, and this is the core assumption of organizational learning theory. OC is the consequence of the organization’s prior experience and learning, and is the basis for building its capacity to learn. Furthermore, OC has been equated with level of performance of the organization. OC is related to the organization’s capacity to adapt to an external environment and to create a functional internal integration compatible with its capacity for competitiveness (Schein, 1992; Robbins, 1997; Smith, 1998; Cameron & Quinn, 1999).
There is a great deal of agreement between scholars of diverse disciplines about the importance of systems thinking methodology in helping organizations uncover and change patterns of behavior. Systems thinking is a conceptual framework which utilizes current scientific knowledge and management tools to help in the process of development of the learning organization. Senge’s (1990) five dimensions of organizational learning, needed to enhance organization’s capabilities as learning entities, are constantly encountered in different models recommended in order to achieve a high level of organizational learning (Senge, 1990; Senge, 1994; Scott, 1996, Stewart, 1996; Marquardt, 1996).

The competing values framework will be used to assess the type of organizational culture of OSU Extension. It has the purpose of facilitating the social process of change in the organization by drawing an organizational culture profile in two dimensions: current and preferred. In addition to the culture type, another aspects of the organization’s culture will also be assessed by the competing values framework: the dominant characteristics, the leadership style, the management of employees, the organizational glue, the strategic emphases, and criteria for success. The framework has been widely tested and findings support the hypotheses that culture type can influence the level of organizational learning, and also the institutional effectiveness (Cameron, 1978; Smart & Hamm, 1993; Smart & St. John, 1996; Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

Organizational learning is the development of new knowledge and insight with the potential to influence behavior. Organizations engage themselves in a process of learning that facilitates change in behavior which leads to performance improvement. The learning organization argument is said to be more evident than ever in the public service sector, including the Cooperative Extension Service. Different frameworks and models have been
proposed for the development of the learning organization in both the public and the
private sectors. The systems learning organizational model is the framework that will be
used to assess the learning organization profile of OSU Extension in five dimensions:
learning, organization, people, knowledge, and technology. Although the systems learning
organization model is recommended by the American Society for Training and
Development (ASTD) as an instrument designed to diagnose and intervene in order to
create a learning organization, numerous case studies reported in the literature supports it
use (e.g., Singapore Institute of Management, Rover Group, National Semiconductor,

Finally, this study is aimed at establishing the existence of functional linkages
between both frameworks: organizational culture and the learning organization. The intent
of the study is to develop empirical evidence to support this relationship. At the same time
recommendations based on the findings will be developed to enhance OSU Extension
organizational learning capabilities.
CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES

The objective of this chapter is to describe the research procedures employed in designing and conducting the study. The following sections are included in the chapter: a) Research Design, b) Population and Sampling, c) Instrumentation, d) Data Collection, and e) Data Analysis.

Research Design

The present study is classified as both non-experimental quantitative and descriptive type of research. The study is considered non-experimental quantitative because there is an existing set of identified variables and the purpose of the study is to establish relationships among them, without any manipulation of the variables. This study is also a descriptive type of research because it focuses on questions about the nature, extent, incidence, or distribution of variables; it involves a description of the findings but not the manipulation of variables. Descriptive, associational, or interventional studies describe a given state of affairs as completely and detailed as possible. Another characteristic of this type of research is that it does not begin with a specific hypothesis, instead it uses research questions and objectives and the study is based on characteristics of variables (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996; Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1996).
This research study was designed as an evaluation survey with the purpose of exploring and describing Ohio State University Extension’s organizational culture and organizational learning profiles. The conceptual, operational and evaluative frameworks to be used in the study are based on the competing values framework model developed by Cameron and Quinn (1999) for assessing the organizational culture profile and on the systems learning organization model developed by Marquardt (1996) for assessing the learning organization profile in different organizational contexts (public and private). These evaluative frameworks are integrated by the following major components and the interrelations among them, each focusing on an important dimension of the organizational profile: (1) organizational culture: (a) clan, (b) adhocracy, (c) market, and (d) hierarchy; and (2) organizational learning: (a) organization, (b) knowledge, (c) learning, (d) technology, and (e) people.

This study is also considered an organizational survey because it is designed as an intervention for change. Organizational survey research is aimed at using survey results as part of a larger change effort to diagnose issues related to leadership, teamwork, and management behavior and to determine the impact of these issues on employee outcomes (Burke, Coruzzi, & Church, 1996).

In order to avoid bias and variance that could lead to a lower quality survey, for this study a “Total Survey Error” approach was utilized to aid in the design, implementation of decisions, and interpretation of results in the research process. In this context four aspects were considered crucial for the research design:
1. **Coverage error**: all elements of the population had an equal and independent chance of being selected to conform the sample, because all members of the accessible population were included in the frame list provided by OSU Extension.

2. **Non-response error**: when possible, data were gathered from every individual in the sample. The respondent group was be statistically compared to the non-respondent group for differences.

3. **Measurement error**: validity and reliability of the research instrument were established by a panel of experts and a pilot test.

4. **Sampling error**: the use of a stratified random sampling technique guaranteed minimum variance (Lavrakas, 1996).

In determining Ohio State University Extension organizational culture and learning organization profile, the main focus of the study was be to analyze the nature, scope and strategic response of the organization on each of the dimensional components of the frameworks used and to establish possible linkages among them.

**Population and Sampling**

In defining the population of interest for the study, target and accessible populations were established. The target population was all Ohio State University Extension personnel and the accessible population was OSU Extension personnel at the state, district and county levels employed in 1999. The population frame used was **OSU Extension Personnel Data Base**, May 1999, obtained from the office of Communications & Technology of Ohio State University Extension. The organizational groups involved in the
study from OSU Extension were divided into three major categories: (a) Extension professionals, (b) Extension paraprofessionals, and (c) support staff. These three groups totaled 965 individuals located in 88 counties within the five Extension districts of the state of Ohio. The Extension professional category included:

1. Extension Agent
2. Extension Associate
3. Assistant Professor
4. Associate Professor
5. Instructor

The Extension paraprofessional category included:

1. Program Assistant
2. Nutrition Educator

The Extension support staff category included:

1. Office Associate
2. Office Assistant
3. Information Associate
4. Information Assistant

The sample method to be utilized was random sampling and was used to ensure that every member of the population has an equal and independent chance of being selected to be included in the sample. From this method a technique called stratified random sampling was used to select individuals from selected subgroups or strata within the population of
interest in the same proportion as they exist in that population (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1996; Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996).

From the available list of OSU Extension personnel in the 88 counties and five districts in Ohio, a proportion was established for each of the categories involved in the study. The category of professionals (N= 357) represented 37 % of the population; the paraprofessionals category (N= 347) represented 36 %, and the support staff category (N= 261) represented 27 %.

Based on the method for determining sample size for research activities developed by Krejcie and Morgan (1970), for a given population of up to 741 individuals (county) the sample size recommended is 254; for a given population of up to 152 individuals (state) the sample size recommended is 108. In the case of the district population, because of the low number of individuals (N= 72) a census was gathered. In selecting the individuals from the categories the available list of OSU Extension personnel was used in conjunction with a table of random numbers. A three digit number (county and state populations) was chosen from a column in the table to select individuals from the groups they represent (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996).

**Instrumentation**

This research was considered a cross-sectional study. Cross-sectional studies gather information from a sample of the population of interest at a single point in time, and only one instrument will be used to collect the research data (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1996)

The instrument consisted of two parts. Part I was adapted from an instrument called Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) designed by Cameron and Quinn
(1999) to assess organizational culture in six key dimensions: (a) dominant characteristics, (b) organizational leadership, (c) management, (d) organizational glue, (e) strategic emphases, and (f) criteria for success. The OCAI contains statements related to the organizational culture in public or private organizations. The organizational culture profile of OSU Extension is based on an average score on a 24-item ipsative type of measurement instrument. Each set of items in a specific dimension are rated from 0 to 100 points. The ratings of items in each dimension are summated and a average score is calculated for the dimension, and also the organization’s overall organizational culture profile is determined. By using the competing values framework, average scores are plotted and the dominant type of culture is determined in both present and preferred situations. Part II was adapted from an instrument called Learning Organization Profile (LOP) developed by Marquardt (1996) to assess the level of organizational learning in five main organizational systems: (a) organization, (b) knowledge, (c) learning, (d) technology, and (e) people. The LOP questionnaire contains statements related to organizational learning in public or private organizations. The perception of OSU Extension personnel as a learning organization will be calculated using a mean score on a 50-item, five-point, Likert-type measurement instrument. Each item is rated from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The ratings of the 10 items in each sub-system are summated and a mean score is calculated for the sub-system. The ratings of the 50 items are summated and a mean score of organizational learning is calculated for the organization. A higher score indicates a higher learning organization profile. At the same time demographic information was obtained from five questions about job title, major program area assignment, sex, age, and length of
employment in OSU Extension with the objective of summarizing the findings according to the specific group of employees involved.

**Instrument Validity**

For the purpose of this particular study, the validity of the instrument was determined by content-related and face-related evidence. Content validity is the degree to which an instrument measures an intended content area and is basically judgmental of the representativeness of the items on the instrument. Face validity is related to whether the instrument is suitable for the intended audience (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996; Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1996).

The OCAI has been used in several studies in the area of organizational culture so evidence of validity and reliability exist. Validity refers to the extent to which organizational culture is really the phenomena that is supposed to be measured by the instrument. Evidence of OCAI validity was generated by a study of organizational culture of 334 institutions of higher education. The study, considered to be representative of the population of four-year colleges and universities in the United States, concluded that no organization was characterized by only one culture type, but a dominant culture was evident in most institutions. The study revealed that 71% of organizations had congruent cultures (one culture type dominating), while 29% had incongruent cultures (culture type not consistent with various aspects of the organization). In addition, evidence of validity of OCAI was also found by calculating convergent and discriminant validity, tests for these two types of validity were conducted using a multitrait-multimethod analysis and a multidimensional scaling analysis in several studies (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).
Content validity was established by a panel of experts purposefully selected (n= 7) from Ohio State University Extension and the Department of Human and Community Resource Development of The Ohio State University. The panel of experts were chosen based on their familiarity with the evaluative framework; knowledge of research theory and statistical procedures; knowledge of concepts and principles of leadership, management, organizational culture, and organizational learning; and management and administrative experience with the population being surveyed.

To establish face validity a field test was conducted after the panel of experts review. A group of individuals (n = 7) from the target population were asked to comment on the clarity, wording, thoroughness, ease of use, and appropriateness of the instrument. The group to be selected for the field test was composed of employees from Ohio State University Extension, represented by faculty and staff personnel.

Instrument Reliability

Reliability of the organizational culture assessment instrument refers to the extent to which the instrument measures culture types consistently. Cronbach alpha coefficients of internal consistency have been calculated in studies carried out in different settings (i.e., public and private) and findings were conclusive of OCAI being a reliable instrument. An assessment of the culture profile in higher education institutions revealed the following reliability coefficients: clan reliability: .82, adhocracy reliability: .83, hierarchy reliability: .67, and market reliability: .78 (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

For the purpose of the study reliability was determined by using data collected in a pilot test conducted with a representative sample of the target population (n = 20). In
assessing reliability a coefficient of internal consistency was determined for each section of
the instrument; this coefficient provides the proportion of the variance in the observed
scores that is free of error (Dillman, 1978).

A Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency method was used for sections I and II of the
instrument. First, a coefficient of internal consistency was calculated for each of the
individual dimensions of the framework in the section, and then a coefficient of internal
consistency was calculated for the all section (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1996; Dillman,
1978).

With the purpose of ensuring the reliability of the questionnaire to be used, a pilot
test was conducted with a group of individuals thought to be representative of the
population of interest (n = 20). From a total number of 20 questionnaires sent 13 were
returned, for an overall response rate of 65 %. Of 13 questionnaires received 11 were
usable, for a usable response rate of 55 %.

In assessing the reliability of scales used in the questionnaire a coefficient of internal
consistency was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha methodology for parts I and II of the
questionnaire. The results for part I containing statements related to the organizational
culture type, using an ipsative-type of measurement scale, are shown in Table 3.1.

Based on the reliability findings for each of the culture types contained in part I of
the questionnaire and compared with the reliability coefficients reported by the authors,
part I of the instrument was determined to be reliable, assuring that this part of the
instrument provided stable and reliable responses (Cameron & Quinn, 1999; Santos,
1999).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture Type</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficients for Current Situation</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficients for Preferred Situation</th>
<th>Reported Reliability Coefficients*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhocracy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reliability coefficients reported by Cameron & Quinn (1999).

Table 3.1: Coefficients of internal consistency using Cronbach’s alpha methodology for assessing reliability of Part I of the questionnaire.

For part II of the questionnaire pertaining to statements about the learning organization profile using a Likert-type scale of measurement, a coefficient of internal consistency using Cronbach’s alpha was also calculated. The reliability coefficient for part II of the questionnaire was .96, a value considered to be representative of a reliable instrument, assuring that stable and reliable responses will be obtained from this part of the questionnaire (Santos, 1999).

Data Collection

In collecting data from the accessible population a modification of the procedure recommended by Salant and Dilman (1994) was used. The particular procedure included the following steps:
1. **First step:** A cover letter was sent to all members of the sample with details about the survey, a questionnaire, a gift, and a stamped return envelope.

2. **Second step:** About one week later, a follow-up postcard was sent to all members of the sample giving thanks to all who have responded and asking for a response from those who have not.

3. **Third step:** Three weeks after the first mailing, a new cover letter was sent to those who have not responded yet with a replacement questionnaire and a stamped return envelope.

Authorization was requested from The Ohio State University Human Subjects Review Committee, and approval was also granted from Ohio State University Extension Administrative Cabinet for conducting the study with Extension personnel.

**Data Analysis**

Data related to each of the four objectives of the study were be analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics techniques. For the quantitative data pertaining to the description of the organizational culture and learning organization profiles, frequencies, percentages, means, medians, modes, standard deviations, and range were used as descriptive statistics (objectives one to three). In objective four for the description of the relationship between organizational culture and learning organization profile Hopkins, Hopkins, and Glass (1996) basic inferential statistics along with Davis' (1971) convention were used for relationship measurements and reported by Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficients. Analysis of variance, t-test, and the Chi-square statistic were calculated in establishing differences among groups of the study. The SPSS 8.0 computer
A program was used in the quantitative analysis (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1996; Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996; Hopkins, Hopkins, & Glass, 1996).

Two major variables were identified for the study: organizational culture has been labeled the independent variable and is represented by the organizational culture type (clan, adhocracy, hierarchy and market) in both dimensions current and preferred; and organizational learning has been labeled as the dependent variable and is represented by the dominant learning characteristics perceived by OSU Extension personnel in each dimension of organizational learning (learning, organization, knowledge, people, and technology). The level of measurement of the independent variable is an interval scale and the level of measurement of the dependent variable is an interval scale. In addition, moderating variables identified as demographics were used to compare groups of employees in the organization, the level of measurement of these variables were nominal or categorical.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

This chapter is organized into four sections, each representing the findings from data analysis for the following objectives of the study: (a) a description of the dominant culture type of OSUE as perceived by their personnel. This objective is subdivided into:

1. a description of differences between current and preferred culture types;
2. a description of the strength of the culture type;
3. a description of the culture types among groups of individuals at OSUE.

(b) a description of the learning organization profile of OSUE as perceived by their personnel; (c) a description of demographic characteristics of OSUE personnel by job title, major program area, sex, age, and length of employment and, (d) a description of relationship between the perceived type of organizational culture and the organizational learning profile.
Sample

The first mailing and follow-up postcard resulted in a 53% response rate. The first mailing, containing a cover letter, a copy of the questionnaire, a stamped, self-addressed envelope, and a gift incentive, was sent to OSU Extension personnel on August 27, 1999. On September 3, 1999 a follow-up postcard was sent to all Extension employees in the sample. On September 16, 1999, a second mailing containing a cover letter, a copy of the questionnaire, and a stamped, self-addressed envelope was sent to all personnel in the sample population who had not returned questionnaires. A final return deadline was established for September 30, 1999. The overall return rate for the study was 74% with a 68% usable return rate (Table 4.1). As illustrated in Figure 4.1, the number of returned questionnaires with usable data was 297.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. in Population</th>
<th>No. in Sample</th>
<th>No. of Usable Responses</th>
<th>% of Usable Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU Extension Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Number of usable responses by OSU Extension personnel (n=297).
Sample Population
n=434

Respondents
n=323
(74%)

Non-respondents
n=111
(26%)

Usable Questionnaires
n=297
(68%)

Nonusable Questionnaires
n=26
(6%)

Demographics Gathered
n=111

No Longer Employed
n=6

Vacation/Sabbatical
n=7

Refuse to Participate
n=13

Figure 4.1: Illustration of sample of respondents and non-respondents
Data pertaining to demographic characteristics for the 111 non-respondents were gathered from the OSU Extension Data Base, May 1999. Demographic data were gathered for the following items: (a) job title, (b) major program area, (c) sex, (d) age, and (e) length of employment in OSU Extension.

Respondents and non-respondents had a mean age of 45 years. The mean age for respondents and non-respondents is shown in Table 4.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>44.94</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>-.294</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>45.24</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Differences between age of respondents and non-respondents.

A t-test of independence was used for respondents and non-respondents in the sample on the variable age. A critical t value of -.294 was calculated along with its associated probability p= .769.

Table 4.3 illustrates the percentages of males and females in the respondent and non-respondent groups. A Chi-square test of independence was used for respondents and non-respondents in the sample on the variable sex. A phi coefficient statistic of -.016 was calculated with an associated probability of p= .747.
Table 4.3: Differences between gender of respondents and non-respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Non-respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job title characteristics of respondents (Table 4.4) showed that professionals (n= 144) had the highest frequency, while for non-respondents professionals also represented the highest frequency (n= 66). A Chi-square test of independence was used for respondents and non-respondents in the sample on the variable job title. A Cramer’s V statistic of .104 was calculated with an associated probability of p= .221.

Table 4.4: Differences between job title of respondents and non-respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Non-respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals-Administrators</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Program area characteristics of respondents (Table 4.5) showed that Agriculture & Natural Resources (n= 79) had the highest frequency, while for non-respondents Agriculture & Natural Resources also represented the highest frequency (n= 34). In addition, the second highest frequency of respondents was 4-H Youth Development (n= 74), while for non-respondents the second higher frequency was the “More than One” (n= 23) and Family & Consumer Sciences categories (n= 22). A Chi-square test of independence was used for respondents and non-respondents in the sample on the variable program area. A Cramer’s V statistic of .133 was calculated with an associated probability of p= .126.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Respondents f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Non-respondents f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agr. &amp; Natural Resources</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fam. &amp; Consumer Science</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H Youth Development</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Differences between major program area of respondents and non-respondents.

Respondents and non-respondents had a mean length of employment at OSU Extension of 11 years (Table 4.6). A t-test of independence was used for respondents and

80
non-respondents in the sample on the variable length of employment. A critical t value of -.283 was calculated along with its associated probability p= .778.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>-.283</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Differences between length of employment of respondents and non-respondents.

Since no statistically significant differences were found between respondents and non-respondents on the five demographic characteristics selected, the results of this study can be generalized to the population of Ohio State University Extension employees and to the sample drawn.

Dominant Culture Type

Dominant Culture Type-Current Situation

Table 4.7 illustrates the perceived current dominant culture type of OSU Extension personnel by demographic groups. The organization’s dominant culture type in the current situation is the highest mean score of the four culture type mean scores recorded. The dominant culture type was estimated by the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (Part I of questionnaire) and is based on a ipsative-type scale of measurement of 100 points. An analysis of the highest mean scores obtained (Mean= 28.44) shows that the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Dominant Culture</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Group (Extension)</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>28.44</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>28.51</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>28.36</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.907</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30.03</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29.09</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr. &amp; Nat. Resources</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Development</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.82</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fam. &amp; Con. Sciences</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29.23</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H Youth Develop.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28.56</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Title</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.774</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals/Admins.</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>27.51</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28.62</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29.88</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40 years</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29.18</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>28.46</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥51 years</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>27.53</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-05 years</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>29.46</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-13 years</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>28.05</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥14 years</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<.05
Note: Mean scores could range from 0 to 100. Mean scores represent a percentage out of 100.

Table 4.7: Dominant culture type of OSU Extension personnel in the actual situation.
dominant culture type for OSU Extension personnel in the current situation is the Clan
culture.

The dominant culture type exhibited by OSU Extension personnel in both male and
female categories was the Clan culture. No statistically significant difference was found
between the categories males and females.

The dominant culture type exhibited by OSU Extension personnel at the county and
district levels was the Clan culture. At the state level the dominant culture type exhibited
by OSU Extension personnel was the Hierarchy culture. No statistically significant
differences were found among personnel at the county, district, and state levels.

The dominant culture type exhibited by OSU Extension personnel in the Agriculture
& Natural Resources, Family & Consumer Sciences, 4-H Youth Development and More
than One Program Area categories was the Clan culture; in the Community Development
program area the dominant culture type was the Hierarchy culture. No statistically
significant differences were found among the five program area categories.

The dominant culture type exhibited by OSU Extension personnel in the categories
labeled as professionals, paraprofessionals, and support staff was the Clan culture. No
statistically significant differences were found among job title categories in this
demographic group.

The dominant culture type exhibited by OSU Extension personnel in all age
categories was the Clan culture. No statistically significant differences were found among
age categories in this demographic group. The dominant culture type exhibited by OSU
Extension personnel in all length of employment categories was the Clan culture. No
statistically significant differences were found among length of employment categories in this demographic group.

**Dominant Culture Type-Preferred Situation**

Table 4.8 illustrates the dominant culture type of OSU Extension personnel by demographic groups in the preferred situation. The mean score representing the organization's dominant culture type in the preferred situation is the highest mean score of the four culture type mean scores recorded. The dominant culture type was estimated by the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (Part I of questionnaire) and is based on a ipsative-type scale of measurement of 100 points. An analysis of the highest mean scores obtained (Mean= 32.14) shows that the dominant culture type for OSU Extension personnel in the preferred situation is the Clan culture.

The dominant culture type exhibited by OSU Extension personnel in both male and female categories was the Clan culture. No statistically significant difference was found between the categories males and females.

The dominant culture type exhibited by OSU Extension personnel at the county, district, and state levels was the Clan culture. No statistically significant differences were found among personnel at the county, district and state levels.

The dominant culture type exhibited by OSU Extension personnel in the Agriculture & Natural Resources, Community Development, Family & Consumer Sciences, 4-H Youth Development and More than One Program Area categories was the Clan culture. No statistically significant differences were found among the five program area categories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Dominant Culture</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Group (Extension)</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.976</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>31.72</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>32.37</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>32.17</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33.79</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30.86</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr.&amp; Nat. Resources</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31.35</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Development</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.45</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fam. &amp; Con. Sciences</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31.54</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H Youth Develop.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>32.23</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals-Admin.</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>31.53</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31.17</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>33.89</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40 years</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>32.94</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>31.38</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥51 years</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>32.35</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1367</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-05 years</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>31.46</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-13 years</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>31.86</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥14 years</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>33.21</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>Clan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05

Note: Mean scores could range from 0 to 100. Mean scores represent a percentage out of 100.

Table 4.8: Dominant culture type of OSU Extension personnel in the preferred situation.
The dominant culture type exhibited by OSU Extension personnel in the categories labeled as professionals, paraprofessionals, and support staff was the Clan culture. A statistically significant difference was found among job title categories. The post hoc pairwise multiple comparison analysis using Tukey method revealed that there were not significant differences between pairs of groups, meaning that the significant difference could be between one group and a combination of two other groups.

The dominant culture type exhibited by OSU Extension personnel in all age categories was the Clan culture. No statistically significant differences were found among age categories in this demographic group.

The dominant culture type exhibited by OSU Extension personnel in all length of employment categories was the Clan culture. No statistically significant differences were found among length of employment categories.

Table 4.9 illustrates the highest mean scores by culture type for OSU Extension personnel in both actual and preferred situations. The highest mean scores indicates the emphasis placed in each culture type representing the basic assumptions, styles, and values that predominates in the organization.

When the mean scores of the following culture types: Adhocracy, Market and Hierarchy, are compared with the mean score of the dominant Clan culture exhibited by OSU Extension personnel statistically significant differences are found between the dominant Clan culture and the Market and Hierarchy culture types in both current and preferred situations. On the other hand, no statistically significant difference was found between the dominant Clan culture and the Adhocracy culture type.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture Type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>28.44</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhocracy</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>27.93</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>22.09</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.310</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6.595</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>25.63</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.003</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.943</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≥ .05
Note: Mean scores could range from 0 to 100. Representing a percentage out of 100.

Table 4.9: Mean scores by culture type for OSU Extension personnel in both current and preferred situations.

Figure 4.2 shows a graphical representation of the mean scores obtained in each of the four culture types for both the current and preferred situations of OSU Extension personnel using the competing values framework axis and quadrants. Figure 4.2 shows that the mean scores are diminishing in the Hierarchy and Market culture quadrants (current), and the mean scores in the Clan and Adhocracy quadrants are increasing (preferred).
Figure 4.2: Graphical representation of the highest mean scores in the four culture types for both actual and preferred situations of OSU Extension personnel.
Dominant Culture Type Strength

The strength of the dominant culture type exhibited by OSU Extension personnel is related to the ipsative-type of scale used for the estimation of the dominant culture type using the OCAI instrument. According to the instructions for the administration of the OCAI instrument, 100 points should be distributed between four possible alternatives in six organizational dimensions. An even distribution of 25 points between the four alternatives in the six dimensions would establish the point in which the culture strength is considered neutral. So a strong culture type would have a mean score above 25 points or 25%, while a weak culture type would have a mean score below 25 points or 25%. In the case of the dominant culture type exhibited by OSU Extension personnel in the current situation a mean score of 28.44 for the Clan culture was considered slightly strong; while a mean score of 32.14 in the preferred situation for the Clan culture was considered moderately strong (Smart & St. John, 1996; Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

Dimensions of Organizational Culture

Six dimensions were analyzed by the organizational culture assessment instrument using the competing values framework. The highest mean score for each of the culture types in both current and preferred situations for OSU Extension personnel are shown in Table 4.10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Current Situation</th>
<th>Preferred Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Characteristics</td>
<td>27.49</td>
<td>14.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>30.05</td>
<td>14.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>30.64</td>
<td>13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Glue</td>
<td>26.90</td>
<td>15.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Emphases</td>
<td>28.90</td>
<td>11.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Success</td>
<td>34.07</td>
<td>17.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores could range from 0 to 100. Mean scores represent a percentage out of 100.

Table 4.10: Highest mean scores on the organizational culture dimensions for OSU Extension personnel.

The mean scores illustrated in Table 4.10 could range from 0 to 100, representing a percentage out of 100 points. In the current situation the highest mean score exhibited by OSU Extension personnel was in the criteria for success dimension (Mean = 34.07), while the lowest mean score recorded was in the organizational glue dimension (Mean = 26.90).
In the preferred situation the highest mean score exhibited by OSU Extension personnel was in the criteria for success dimension (Mean = 37.19), while the lowest mean score recorded was in the dominant characteristics dimension (Mean = 28.83). Two dimensional profiles demonstrated to be different from the overall Clan culture profile in the current situation: organizational leadership (Hierarchy) and strategic emphases (Adhocracy). Two dimensional profiles demonstrated to be different from the overall Clan culture profile in the preferred situation: dominant characteristics (Adhocracy) and strategic emphases (Adhocracy).

Learning Organization Profile

An analysis of the learning organization profile of OSU Extension personnel is presented in Table 4.11. A summated mean score on a five-point, Likert-type scale pertaining to the 50 items of the Learning Organization Profile (LOP) assessment instrument (Part II of the questionnaire) was computed (Mean = 160; S.D. = 26.94). Scores could range from 50 to 250, mean scores values higher or lower than 125 are representative of a positive or negative belief that OSU Extension represents an organization which holds the core characteristics of a learning organization in the five dimensions of the learning organization profile.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Group (Extension)</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>26.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.631</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>26.12</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>26.94</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.891</td>
<td>.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>27.22</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>23.79</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>26.76</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.873</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr. &amp; Nat. Resources</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>26.79</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Development</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>33.40</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fam. &amp; Con. Sciences</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H Youth Develop.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>28.26</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.702</td>
<td>.026*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals/Admins.</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>26.69</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>26.11</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40 years</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>26.60</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>26.31</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 51 years</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>28.39</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.433</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-05 years</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-13 years</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>23.67</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 14 years</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>27.93</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< .05

Note: Mean scores could range from 50 to 250. A higher mean score indicates a more positive belief that OSU Extension possess the characteristics of a learning organization.

Table 4.11: Learning organization profile of OSU Extension personnel.
The learning organization profile mean score was higher for females (Mean= 163) than for males (Mean= 153). A statistically significant difference was found between males and females on the variable learning organization profile.

The highest learning organization profile mean score was at the district level (Mean= 166) followed by the county level (Mean= 161) and state level (Mean= 151). A statistically significant differences were found among location categories. The post hoc pairwise multiple comparison analysis using Tukey method, revealed that county and district levels had a statistically significant higher mean score of learning organization profile than the state level.

The highest learning organization profile mean score was in the Family & Consumer Sciences program area (Mean= 167), while the lowest learning organization profile mean score was in the Agriculture & Natural Resources program area (Mean= 156). No statistically significant difference was found among program areas on the variable learning organization profile.

The highest learning organization profile mean score was in the paraprofessionals and support staff (Mean= 164) categories, while the lowest learning organization mean score was in the professionals (Mean= 156) category. A statistically significant difference was found among job title categories for the variable learning organization profile. The post hoc pairwise multiple comparison analysis using Tukey method revealed that there were not significant differences between pairs of groups, meaning that the significant difference could be between one group and a combination of two other groups.
The highest learning organization profile mean score was in the age group category \( \geq 51 \) years (Mean= 162), while the lowest learning organization mean score was in the age group category 41-50 years (Mean= 157). No statistically significant differences were found among age categories on the variable learning organization profile.

The highest learning organization profile mean score for length of employment was in the 06-13 years category (Mean= 163), while the lowest learning organization profile mean score was in the \( \geq 14 \) years category (Mean= 156). No statistically significant differences were found among length of employment categories on the variable learning organization profile.

**Dimensions of the Learning Organization Profile**

Five dimensions were analyzed by the learning organization profile instrument using the systems-linked learning organizational model. Table 4.12, shows the highest mean score expressed by OSU Extension personnel in each of the dimensions of the learning organization profile.

The analysis of the learning organization profile dimensions shows that the highest mean score exhibited by OSU Extension personnel was in the organizational transformation dimension (Mean= 33.66), while the lowest mean score recorded was in the technology application dimension (Mean= 30.05).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>33.66</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Empowerment</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>33.21</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Management</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Dynamics</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>31.34</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Application</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>30.05</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean scores could range from 10 to 50. A higher mean score indicates the level of importance of the dimension in the organization's learning organization profile.

Table 4.12: Highest mean score on the learning organization profile dimensions of OSU Extension personnel.

Relationships between Organizational Culture Type and Learning Organization Profile of OSU Extension Personnel

In determining the statistical relation between the dominant organizational culture type in the current and preferred situations and the dependent variable learning organization profile, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was utilized for establishing the relationships between these variables. Table 4.13 shows the different values of association calculated. Davis convention (1971), was used to explain associations between variables.
Table 4.13: Correlation coefficients between dominant culture type, selected demographic characteristics and learning organization profile.

As shown in Table 4.13, a statistically significant, low, positive association was found between learning organization profile and culture type in both actual and preferred situations. Indicating that a stronger culture score is associated with a higher learning organization profile score.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Culture is the sum of all contributions of a group of people, in a designated area, within a given time. The essential elements and characteristics of culture include:

a) material products of a society; b) values, beliefs, norms, attitudes, and behavior of members; c) shared; d) transmitted; e) possessed by members of a society; and f) normative. In a society, culture is manifested through its social groups. An organization is a social group in which people are in constant interaction and communication, and have settled together geographically with a common interest or goal. When the actions of organizations refer to some aspects of culture created to satisfy specific needs of the society they are called institutions (Rogers, Burdge, Korschling & Donnermeyer, 1988; Schein, 1992).

Organizational culture (OC) has been defined as: "A pattern of shared assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems" (Schein, 1999; p. 12). The inherent meaning contained in this concept is that first, in order to ensure its survival the organization or institution must adapt to an ever-
changing external environment; and second, the organization or institution must securely integrate its internal processes in order to assure a constant adaptation capacity (Smart & Hamm, 1993).

The contemporary definition of organizational culture includes what is valued, the dominant leadership style, the language and symbols, the procedures and routines, and the definitions of success that characterizes an organization. OC represents the values, underlying assumptions, expectations, collective memories, and definitions present in an organization. Cameron and Quinn (1999) have developed an organizational culture framework based on a theoretical model called the “Competing Values Framework.” Based on six organizational culture dimensions and four dominant culture types (i.e., clan, adhocracy, market, and hierarchy) they generated an “Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument” which is used to identify the organizational culture profile based on the core values, assumptions, interpretations, and approaches that characterize organizations (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

The central issue associated with organizational culture is the linkage with organizational performance. Connections between OC and performance have been established. An increasing body of evidence supports a linkage between an organization’s culture (how works get done) and its business performance (what actually gets done). In the business arena, evidence has confirmed that companies which put emphasis in key managerial components such as customers, stakeholders and employees, and leadership, outperform those that do not have these cultural characteristics (Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Wagner & Spencer, 1996).
Organizational learning (OL) is a term extensively used in the literature nowadays to make reference to the processes of learning that occurs within organizations. In an effort to consolidate different thoughts on the topic of organizational learning, Garvin (1993; cited by Kreitner, 1995; p. 276), has launched the following definition of OL: “A learning organization is an organization skilled at creating, acquiring, and transferring knowledge, and at modifying its behavior to reflect new knowledge and insight.” A distinction has been made between the terms organizational learning and learning organization. Organizational learning refers to the learning activities that takes place in the organization, while learning organization refers to the structure for learning already in place in the organization. Although the difference is only of semantics, it is clear that both concepts (process and structure) are mutually inclusive (Kreitner, 1995; Malhotra, 1996; Tsang, 1997).

Marquardt (1996) has developed an organizational learning framework based on a theoretical model called the “Systems-linked Organizational Model.” Based on five dimensions of organizational learning the author has generated the “Organizational Learning Profile” instrument, which is used to identify a learning organization profile in five sub-systems of learning, organization, people, knowledge, and technology.

Organizational learning is the development of new knowledge and insight that has the potential to influence the behavior of people in the organization. The central issue with organizational learning is that learning facilitates change in behavior that leads to improved performance. Therefore, organizations must pursue the integration of learning processes,
behavior change, and performance improvement in order to adapt to an ever-changing environment (Jaworsky & Kolhi, 1993; Slater & Narver, 1995).

The culture of Ohio State University Extension plays an important role in the way Extension personnel plan, implement, and evaluate educational programs. OSU Extension is perceived by its personnel to be an institution devoted to satisfying the needs and wants of its clients through programs that are clearly defined, sensible to public needs, constantly monitored for success, and pro-actively implemented (Berrio & Henderson, 1997). Recently OSU Extension has undertaken an effort to become a more effective and efficient organization and has created a new position for an organizational learning officer, demonstrating the value that the institution gives to the lifelong learning process and the learning structure.

The purpose of this study was to describe the dominant culture type and learning organization profile of Ohio State University Extension. The researcher was also interested in studying factors that may account for variation among the learning organization profile. The dominant culture type and selected demographic characteristics may be associated with the learning organization profile of Ohio State University Extension personnel.

**Research Objectives**

The following objectives were established to guide the study:

1. Describe the dominant culture type of OSUE as perceived by their personnel.

This objective is subdivided into:
a. Describe the dominant culture type in both current and preferred situations;
b. Describe the strength of the culture type;
c. Describe the culture profile findings among groups of individuals at OSUE.

2. Describe the learning organization profile of OSUE as perceived by their personnel;

3. Describe OSUE personnel by demographic characteristics of by job title, major program area, sex, age, and length of employment and;

4. Describe the relationship between the perceived type of organizational culture and the learning organization profile.

Methodology

The study was classified as descriptive. The target and accessible populations were Ohio State University Extension personnel distributed in five districts and 88 counties (N=965). A sample was drawn from the population (N=434), composed of the following three personnel categories: professionals (n=357), paraprofessionals (n=347), and support staff (n=261).

The questionnaire used to gather data from the sample consisted of two parts. For Part I a modified version of the "Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument" developed by Cameron and Quinn (1999) was used to describe the organizational culture profile of Ohio State University Extension. This part of the questionnaire was divided into six sections. Each section represented one of the dimensions of organizational culture.
proposed by the authors. Parts II focused on the learning organization profile. Part I consisted of an ipsative-type of measurement scale and Part II consisted of a Likert-type measurement scale. Demographic information was obtained from five questions about job title, major program area assignment, sex, age, and length of employment in OSU Extension with the objective of summarizing the findings according to the specific group of employees involved.

Data were collected by a mail questionnaire using a modification of the procedures recommended by Salant and Dilman (1994). The package was mailed the fourth week of August, 1999. Subjects were encouraged to return the questionnaire by September 10, 1999. A follow-up postcard was mailed to the sample giving thanks to all who had responded and asking for a response from those who had not. A second mailing was sent to non-respondents on September 16, 1999. A deadline for data collection was set for September 30, 1990. The first mailing and follow-up postcard resulted in a 53% response rate. After the second mailing an overall response rate of 74% was established for the study.

Data were analyzed by the SPSS Base 8.0 (1999) computer program. Descriptive statistics including means, medians, modes, standard deviations, ranges, frequencies, and percentages were calculated for objectives 1 through 3. Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated to describe the relationship in objective number 4. An analysis of variance was performed for testing differences among demographic groups (location, job title, program area, age and length of employment) on the variables dominant culture type (actual and preferred situations) and learning organization profile. A
t-test for means difference between sex and dominant culture type and learning organization profile was also performed.

Summary of Findings

Objective 1- Describe the dominant culture type of Ohio State University Extension as perceived by their personnel:

(a) Describe the dominant culture type in both current and preferred situations:

A mean score for each of the four culture types was calculated. The highest mean score on a hundred-point ipsative-type of scale was 28.44, indicating that the dominant culture type in the current situation for OSU Extension was the Clan culture. The highest mean score on a hundred-point ipsative-type of scale was 32.14, indicating that the dominant culture type in the preferred situation for OSU Extension was the Clan culture. The analysis of organizational culture dimensions revealed that the highest mean score exhibited by OSU Extension personnel was in the criteria for success dimension (Mean= 34.07), while the lowest mean score recorded was in the organizational glue dimension (Mean= 26.90). In the preferred situation the highest mean score exhibited by OSU Extension personnel was in the criteria for success dimension (Mean= 37.19), while the lowest mean score recorded was in the dominant characteristics dimension (Mean= 28.83).

(b) Describe the strength of the dominant culture type:

A mean score of 28.44 for the Clan culture in the current situation indicated a slightly strong dominant culture type for OSU Extension. A mean score of 32.14 for the Clan culture in the preferred situation indicated a moderately strong dominant culture type for OSU Extension.
(c) Describe the culture profile findings among groups of individuals at OSUE:

In the demographic groups labeled as sex, job title, age, and length of employment the highest mean scores indicated that the dominant culture type in the current situation was the Clan culture. In the demographic groups labeled as location and program area the highest mean score indicated that the dominant culture type in the current situation was the Hierarchical culture. The analysis of variance for categories within demographic groups indicates that no statistically significant differences were found. In the demographic groups labeled as sex, location, program area, job title, age, and length of employment the highest mean scores indicated that the dominant culture type in the preferred situation was the Clan culture. The analysis of variance for categories within demographic groups indicated that in the job title demographic group a statistically significant difference was found among professionals, paraprofessionals and support staff categories. The post hoc pairwise multiple comparison analysis using the Tukey method revealed no significant differences between pairs of groups, meaning that the significant difference could be between one group and a combination of two other groups.

Objective 2- Describe the learning organization profile of OSUE as perceived by their personnel:

The summated mean score in 50 items on a five-point Likert-type scale was 160, indicating a positive judgement by OSU Extension personnel that OSU Extension represents an organization which holds the core characteristics of a learning organization in the five dimensions of the learning organization profile. Females had a statistically significant higher mean score (Mean= 163) than males (Mean= 153) on the learning
organization profile. The highest mean score on the learning organization profile was exhibited by district personnel (Mean= 166), while county personnel had the second highest mean score (Mean= 161) and state personnel had the lowest mean score (Mean= 151). The post hoc pairwise multiple comparison analysis using Tukey method, revealed that personnel at the county and district levels had a statistically significant higher mean score of learning organization profile than personnel at the state level. The highest mean score of learning organization profile was in the Family & Consumer Science program area (Mean= 167) and the lowest mean score was in the Agriculture & Natural Resources program area (Mean= 156). Paraprofessionals and support staff had statistically significant higher mean scores on the learning organization profile (Mean= 164), than professionals with a mean score of 156. OSU Extension personnel over 51 years of age and personnel with 6-13 years of employment had the highest mean scores on the learning organization profile. The analysis of the learning organization profile dimensions revealed that the highest mean score exhibited by OSU Extension personnel was in the organizational transformation dimension (Mean= 33.66), while the lowest mean score registered was in the technology application dimension (Mean= 30.05).

Objective 3- Describe personal characteristics of Ohio State University Extension personnel: sex, location, program area, job title, age and length of employment.

Sixty seven percent of the respondents were females while 33% were males. The distribution of respondent in the sample according to location was: 77% were county based personnel, 7% were district based personnel, and 16% state based personnel. In the respondent sample the modal category was represented by the Agriculture & Natural
Resources program area (27%). Of the three group categories of job title, professionals (49%) represented the highest proportion of OSU Extension personnel. The mean age of the sample was 45 years (S.D. = 8.85). The mean length of employment was eleven years (S.D. = 8.22).

Objective 4- Describe relationships between the perceived type of organizational culture in both the current and preferred situations and the learning organization profile.

In establishing a statistical relation between the type of organizational culture in both current and preferred situations and the learning organization profile, Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficients were used as measures of association to determine relationships between the independent variables (dominant organizational culture type in both current and preferred situations) and the dependent variable (learning organization profile). A statistically significant, positive, low association was found between learning organization profile and dominant culture type in both actual and preferred situations. The meaning of this relationship is that the perceived dominant culture type is associated with the perceived characteristics of a learning organization.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions may be generalized to the population of OSU Extension personnel at the county, district and state levels. Ten conclusions were produced:

1. According to the four possible culture types analyzed by the “Competing Values Framework” proposed by Cameron and Quinn (1999), the dominant culture type exhibited by Extension personnel is classified as the Clan culture in both current and
preferred situations. The findings of this study are in agreement with the fact that almost
two thirds of the colleges and universities in a nation-wide study currently have a Clan
culture type (Smart & St. John, 1996). The Clan culture classification applied to Extension
portrays the institution as an organization that concentrates on internal maintenance with
flexibility, concern for people, and sensitivity for customers. The Clan culture is
characterized as a family type of organization and represents a friendly place to work,
where people share a lot of themselves. The Clan culture views its leaders as having the
role of mentors or facilitators. The glue that maintains the organization together is loyalty
and tradition, with a high level of commitment among its members. Clan organizations
emphasize individual development, morale, teamwork, participation, and consensus.

2. The strength of the culture is determined by the number of points
conceded to a specific culture type. In the current situation, the Clan culture type exhibited
by OSU Extension is slightly strong while in the preferred situation the Clan culture type is
considered moderately strong. OSU Extension personnel desire a stronger (moderately)
Clan culture in the future. This finding is in agreement with what research has revealed
about organizations that possess strong cultures; they are associated with having
homogeneity of effort, clear focus, and higher performance in environments where unity
and common vision is required (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

3. Extension personnel located at the state level and personnel in the
Community Development program area perceive the Hierarchy culture as the
organization’s current dominant culture type, while in the preferred situation the same
group of respondents have a desire to change to a Clan culture. The perception of a
Hierarchical culture type in the current situation by state and community development personnel suggests an agreement with what research has revealed about public sector organizations, which are inclined to exhibit a Hierarchical type of culture (Cameron & Quinn, 1999). The emphasis on a Clan culture type in the preferred situation is also in agreement with previous research about colleges and universities, which are inclined to exhibit a Clan type of culture (Smart & St. John, 1996). Organizational success will depend on matching the culture type with the demands of the external environment. The Hierarchical type of culture is present in organizations that focus on internal maintenance with a need for stability and control. The Clan culture is considered the nearest culture type to what educational organizations must resemble (Smart & St. John, 1996; Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

4. Three dimensions of organizational culture displayed a distinctive profile from the overall culture profile exhibited by OSU Extension in current and preferred situations. The dimension labeled as dominant characteristics is concerned with what the overall organization is like; the Adhocracy classification in the preferred situation is not in agreement with the overall culture profile of OSU Extension (Clan) but it is in agreement with the finding that no statistically significant difference was found between the mean scores of the Clan and Adhocracy cultures in the preferred situation. This finding suggest that OSU Extension possesses a combination of the core characteristics of the dominant Clan culture with those of the less dominant Adhocracy culture type. The dimension labeled as organizational leadership is related to the dominant leadership style and approaches used by leaders and administrators in the organization; the Hierarchy
classification in the current situation of this dimension is not in agreement with the overall
culture profile of OSU Extension (Clan). In terms of the leadership style, OSU Extension
personnel perceives its leaders and administrators as currently having a Hierarchical type
of culture, wanting them to change to a preferred Clan culture type. The dimension labeled
as strategic emphases is concerned with the definition of areas of emphasis that drives the
organization’s strategy; the Adhocracy classification in both the current and preferred
situations are not in agreement with the overall Clan culture exhibited by OSU Extension
personnel, but they are in agreement with the finding that no statistically significant
difference was found between the mean scores of the Clan and Adhocracy cultures in both
current and preferred situation. This finding suggest that OSU Extension possesses a
combination of the core characteristics of the dominant Clan culture with those of the less
dominant Adhocracy culture type when it comes to areas of emphasis and strategy in the
current situation, and OSU Extension personnel want this condition to become stronger in
the future (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

5. The overall learning organization profile of OSU Extension is slightly
high, revealing the organization’s belief that OSU Extension represents an institution
holding the core characteristics of a learning organization on the five dimensions of the
systems learning organizational model proposed by Marquardt (1996). According to these
five dimensions, the core characteristics of a learning organization are: (a) learning in the
organization takes place at individual, group, and organizational levels; (b) an adaptable
culture capable of integrating relationships and encouraging learning by enhancing
teamwork, self-management, empowerment, and sharing. Vision that captures the goals,
objectives, and a sense of direction for the future. Strategy related to action plans, tactics, and methodology used to implement the vision, optimizing acquired, transferred, and utilized learning. An structure that maximizes contact, information flow, local responsibility, and collaboration; (c) organizational groups consisting of employees, managers, customers, stakeholders and the community itself are empowered and enabled to learn; (d) information acquisition, creation, transfer, and utilization are part of an ongoing and interactive process instead of a sequential and independent process; and (e) technological networks and information tools permit information exchange and learning (Marquardt, 1996).

6. Females have a higher learning organization profile than males. This conclusion is compatible with documented differences among traits, attitudes, and activities for females and males that can affect organizational learning (Hoyer & Macinnis, 1997). According to research in the field of consumer psychology, in Western societies, males are guided by “agentic goals” which stress mastery, self-assertiveness, and self-efficacy, while women have been guided more by “communal goals” of affiliation and promoting harmonious relations with others. Furthermore, men tend to be more competitive, independent, externally motivated, and more willing to take risks. In contrast, women tend to be more cooperative, interdependent, intrinsically motivated, and risk adverse. The above female characteristics and the fact that women also tend to have stereotypical jobs like those of secretary, nurse, or teacher, may help explain the difference in learning organization profile between males and females in the study (Hoyer & Macinnis, 1997).
7. OSU Extension personnel at the district level have a higher learning organization profile than Extension personnel at the state and county locations.

8. Paraprofessionals and support staff have a higher learning organization profile than professionals. Paraprofessionals and support staff categories combined represent employees who look inward the organization as a major source of learning experiences, while professionals look more for outside complementary sources (i.e., universities, societies, foundations) of learning experiences.

9. The analysis of the five sub-systems included in the systems-linked organizational learning model revealed that the highest mean score exhibited by OSU Extension personnel was in the organization subsystem. Although the variation between mean scores is negligible, the rank given to the organization sub-system reveals the high importance that OSU Extension personnel gives to the setting were learning occurs and its four key components: vision, culture, strategy, and structure. On the other hand, the lowest mean score exhibited by OSU Extension personnel was in the technology subsystem revealing the lesser importance OSU Extension personnel give to technological networks and information tools used to gain access to information and learning in the organization (Marquardt, 1996).

10. A low, positive association exists between dominant culture type and the learning organization profile of OSU Extension in both current and preferred situations. The meaning of this relationship is that the perceived dominant culture type is associated with the perceived characteristics of a learning organization. The findings show that as the culture type becomes stronger, the learning organization profile score tends to increase.
Recommendations

Based on the literature review and findings of the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. The Clan culture is not only the most frequent culture type in the U.S. higher education system, but the most effective as perceived by trustees, administrators, and department chairpersons (Smart & St. John, 1996). The existing evidence that performance in colleges and universities is associated with their culture type, indicates that higher education leaders play an important role in creating and rooting culture in a group and also in managing and changing that culture. "Leaders create culture and,...must manage and sometimes change culture"(Schein, 1992; p.209). In order to move the current Clan culture to a stronger preferred Clan culture a change process must be initiated. Schein (1992) has argued that the organizational stage of evolution plays an important role in the actions needed as culture change mechanisms. According to his framework, OSU Extension is considered an organization in its midlife stage of evolution because it is not longer under the prescriptions of its founders, at least two generations of managers have administrated the organization, the organization has grown in size enough to overpower its founders, and from a cultural stand point the organization is well established and must maintain itself through a continuous growth and renewal process. The culture change process recommended by the author for an organization at its midlife stage include: (a) "change through systematic promotion from selected subcultures" which means that leaders have to assess the strengths and weaknesses of different subcultures in the organization, select a specific subculture, and then systematically promote people from
that subculture into power positions in the total culture; (b) "planned change through organizational development projects and the creation of parallel learning structures" which means that culture change has to be considered in all organizational development projects as a planned change process, a top-down approach is recommended integrating organizational plans and strategies with human resource development initiatives; (c) "unfreezing and change through technological seduction" which means that technology could have a positive impact on the organization's culture, technological innovations such as systems thinking, TQM, CQI, and networking are among several recommended as change mechanisms (Schein, 1992; Smart & St. John, 1996)

2. Some demographic groups considered in this study displayed a different culture type from the overall dominant Clan culture of Extension. The demographic groups conformed by OSU Extension employees at the state level and in the Community Development program area exhibited a Hierarchical type of culture in the current situation. Evidence supports the fact that the culture type considered most effective in a college or university setting is the Clan culture. In addition organizational success is said to depend on matching the culture type with the demands of the external environment (Smart & St. John, 1996; Cameron & Quinn, 1999). In this respect Cameron & Quinn (1999) have recommended a series of six steps for designing an organizational culture change process. The purpose of these steps is to assure involvement at all levels of the organization and to minimize resistance of those affected, clarify the emphasis of the new culture, identify what should remain unaltered, and to initiate specific procedures for actions to implement the new organizational culture. These steps should be used in the
design and implementation of any strategy to change the current culture of the demographic groups involved. The steps are: a) “diagnosis and consensus for the present” by selecting key individuals of the organization a consensus about the current organizational culture is reached; b) “diagnosing and consensus for the future” using the same group of individuals a consensus about the future organizational culture is also reached; c) “what it means” this is the most important step of the process because the group then identifies what should be emphasize or de-emphasize about a specific culture, keeping in mind that mobilizing to a particular culture does not mean to completely abandon the characteristics of other types of culture; d) “illustrative stories” refers to key incidents or events used to illustrate about the core values and beliefs of the new organizational culture; e) “strategic action steps” this steps implies actions that should be taken to promote the desired change (i.e., identify small wins, generate social support, provide information); and f) “an implementation plan” it is a complete plan of actions and strategies including timetables, deadlines, short-term goals and long-term goals (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

3. Especial attention should be given to the findings related to the dimensions of organizational culture. In regards to OC in the current situation the organizational leadership dimension shows a Hierarchical type of culture not compatible with the overall Clan culture type preferred by OSU Extension personnel. The leadership style and processes in the organization need to be reexamined to make them more compatible with the type of culture the organization’s needs to be more effective and efficient in the educational arena. The Adhocracy type of culture in the strategic emphases dimension in
both current and preferred situations is suggesting that in this particular dimension OSU Extension personnel perceives the organization as a more dynamic, entrepreneurial, and creative place to work with people willing to take risks, this perception from an strategy and planning standpoint is a positive characteristic that the organization should be looking at maintaining or incorporating in the new culture change process. A similar recommendation is presented for the dominant characteristics dimension which exhibited an Adhocracy type of culture in the preferred situation.

4. Although the overall learning organization profile of OSU Extension is slightly high, revealing the organization’s positive belief that OSU Extension represents an institution holding the core characteristics of a learning organization, to assure a competitive advantage in the non-formal educational arena an effort has to be made to raise the learning organization profile level of OSU Extension employees. In this regard the institution must initiate an organizational transformation process for learning excellence. This transformation must include developing a shared vision and an organizational learning culture, creating a powerful strategy for building a learning organization and a structure capable of implementing that strategy, and finally developing a transformational leadership style at the decision making instances to achieve high levels of ethics, motivation, and performance (Covey, 1989; Schein, 1992; Kreitner, 1995; Marquardt, 1996). In this organizational transformation process for learning excellence, special attention must be directed toward increasing the learning organization profile level of OSU county and state personnel, and also of personnel in the professional job title category. In this regard the set of steps recommended by Marquardt (1996) to become a
learning organization has a great deal of applicability for raising the learning organization profile level of the aforementioned categories of personnel. The steps contained in the author’s framework are: a) commitment to become a learning organization; b) connect learning with business operations; c) assess the learning organization profile; d) communicate the vision; e) recognize the importance of system thinking and action; f) leaders should demonstrate their commitment to learning; g) transform the organizational culture to one of learning and continuous improvement; h) establish organizational strategies for learning; i) cut bureaucracy and streamline the structure; j) empower employees; k) take organizational learning to the entire business change; l) capture learning and release knowledge; m) acquire and utilize technology in learning; n) enhance learning at the individual, group, and organizational levels; o) learn about learning organization; and p) exercise continuous adaptation, improvement and learning. The author gives specific guidelines for implementing each step to become a learning organization in any public or private institution (Marquardt, 1996). Although the mean score in each of the dimensions of organizational learning are very similar, attention must be directed toward the importance of technology application in the learning process of OSU Extension personnel. This finding might indicate a need to promote among personnel in the organization, the use of technological networks and information tools to gain access to information and learning (Marquardt, 1996).

Need for Further Study

Organizational culture and organizational learning are important issues within any public or private service organization (Schein, 1992; Marquardt, 1996; Smart & St. John,
Evidence has been presented by several researchers connecting organizational culture and organizational learning with performance (Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Smart & St. John, 1996; Cameron & Quinn, 1999). The challenge for OSU Extension as an educational institution is to identify critical effectiveness dimensions and standards for its evaluation, and to assess the perception of stakeholders, leaders and administrators about OSU Extension effectiveness. The next step would be to compare the perceived effectiveness level with the dominant culture type and learning organization profile exhibited by Extension personnel. These effectiveness indicators could be of great value in program planning and evaluation within the organization. In addition, a follow-up evaluation of the organizational culture should be done periodically to detect possible deviations from culture change and learning plans and strategies of the institution (Smart & St. John, 1996; Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

Another important issue that could be addressed in future studies is the analysis of the current management culture. The understanding and change of an organizational culture is said to depend on the way leaders create and manage culture (Schein, 1992). In order to have a complete picture of the organizational culture profile, a management culture assessment study must be conducted to reveal the management practices and styles not only with regards to the dominant culture type administrators and policy makers perceive having, but also to obtain an idea of how staff perceive their manager's style and practices (Broshar & Jost, 1995).

In this study, the level of analysis of the organizational culture phenomena was at the "basic assumptions" level of OSU Extension (Schein, 1992). This level of analysis deals
with beliefs, perceptions, thoughts, and feelings of individuals. The "espoused values" level was also analyzed in OSU Extension as the first step for improving the health and productivity of the organization. This level deals with the strategies, goals and philosophies of the organization and was analyzed by identifying the set of organizational values held by OSU Extension personnel (Safrit, Jones & Conklin; 1994). There is a need to examine the other level of culture proposed by Schein (1992) in order to have a holistic perspective of the organizational culture phenomenon at OSU Extension. This complementary culture level is called "artifacts." Artifacts are the visible organizational structure and processes. So a holistic approach to the study of organizational culture must be pursued by the organization in the future integrating these three levels of analysis (Schein, 1992). In addition, data gathered by this study should also be compared with secondary data contained in public documents of the organization (i.e., annual reports, strategic plans, evaluation reports) in order to find specific patterns of performance that could be linked to Extension's organizational culture and organizational learning profiles.
APPENDIX A

Organizational Culture and Organizational Learning Instrument
ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING IN PUBLIC, NON-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS: A PROFILE OF OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

Sponsored by Ohio State University Extension and the Department of Human and Community Resource Development, The Ohio State University 1999

We know that you are busy and have time constraints.

We thank you for your assistance with this research study!
INFORMATION ABOUT THE SURVEY

The purpose of this study is to understand how the management and leadership practices are being perceived by Ohio State University Extension. The main objective is to identify the type of organizational culture and the learning organization profile exhibited by Ohio State University Extension personnel.

The instrument is being sent to a randomly selected sample of Ohio State University Extension personnel at the state, district, and county levels. The questionnaire consists of two parts. Part I contains statements about organizational culture in two dimensions: current and preferred. Part II contains items about the learning organization profile.

For the purpose of this study organizational culture is reflected by what is valued, the dominant leadership style, the language and symbols, the procedures and routines, and the success indicators that make an organization unique. A learning organization is an organization where people continually expand their capacity to create results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part I: Type of Organizational Culture

**Instructions:** The following section refers to some of the characteristics of organizational culture in public, non-profit institutions. For each of the six dimensions of organizational culture included in this section, take 100 points and distribute those points between the statements listed under each dimension in a way that reflects the extent to which you believe the statement is true about OSU Extension. Please score your response in the space provided beside each statement in both current and preferred situations as it is shown in the example provided below.

Example

- A At OSU Extension people feel free to speak their minds about what they have learned.
- B At OSU Extension mistakes are clearly viewed as positive growth opportunities throughout the system.
- C At OSU Extension there are clear and specific expectations of each employee to complete a specified number of courses and training annually.
- D At OSU Extension continuous improvement is expected and treated receptively.
1. Dominant Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>OSU Extension is very controlled and structured place. Formal procedures generally govern what people do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>OSU Extension is a very dynamic and entrepreneurial place. People are willing to stick their necks out and take risks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>OSU Extension is very results oriented. A major concern is with getting the job done. People are very competitive and achievement oriented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>OSU Extension is a very personal place. It is like an extended family. People seem to share a lot of themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please turn to the next page!

2. Organizational Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The leadership in OSU Extension is generally considered to exemplify mentoring, facilitating, and nurturing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The leadership in OSU Extension is generally considered to exemplify a no-nonsense, aggressive, results-oriented focus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The leadership in OSU Extension is generally considered to exemplify entrepreneurship, innovating, or risk taking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The leadership in OSU Extension is generally considered to exemplify coordinating, organizing, or smooth-running efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please turn to the next page!
### 3. Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The management style in OSU Extension is characterized by hard-driving competitiveness, high demands, and achievement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The management style in OSU Extension is characterized by individual risk taking, innovation, freedom, and uniqueness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The management style in OSU Extension is characterized by team work, consensus, and participation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The management style in OSU Extension is characterized by security of employment, conformity, predictability, and stability in relationships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please turn to the next page!

### 4. Organizational Glue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The glue that holds OSU Extension together is loyalty and mutual trust. Commitment to this organization runs high.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The glue that holds OSU Extension together is formal rules and policies. Maintaining a smooth-running organization is important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The glue that holds OSU Extension together is the emphasis on achievement and goal accomplishment. Aggressiveness and winning are common themes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The glue that holds OSU Extension together is commitment to innovation and development. There is an emphasis on being on the cutting edge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please turn to the next page!
### 5. Strategic Emphases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>OSU Extension emphasizes acquiring new resources and creating new challenges. Trying new things and prospecting for opportunities are valued.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>OSU Extension emphasizes human development. High trust, openness, and participation persist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>OSU Extension emphasizes competitive actions and achievement. Hitting targets and winning in the marketplace are dominant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>OSU Extension emphasizes permanence and stability. Efficiency, control, and smooth operations are important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Criteria for Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>OSU Extension defines success on the basis of the development of human resources, teamwork, employee commitment, and concern for people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>OSU Extension defines success on the basis of having the most unique or newest service. It is a service leader and innovator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>OSU Extension defines success on the basis of efficiency. Dependable delivery, smooth scheduling, and low-cost production are critical.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>OSU Extension defines success on the basis of winning the marketplace and outpacing the competition. Competitive market leadership is key.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please turn to the next page!
PART II: Learning Organization Profile

Instructions: The following section identifies some of the important characteristics regarding an organization's learning profile for public, non-profit institutions. For each item listed below, rate the extent to which the statement is true about OSU Extension. Please score your response in the space provided beside each statement, using the following scale:

- 5 = To a very large extent.
- 4 = To a great extent.
- 3 = To a moderated extent.
- 2 = To a small extent.
- 1 = Not at all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>LEVEL OF EXTENT (Please circle your answer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sees continuous learning by employees as a high priority.</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Encourages and expects employees to manage their own learning and development.</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Avoids distortion of information and blocking of communication channels through skills such as active listening and effective feedback. | ![Chart](chart.png) |
4. Trains and coaches employees in learning how to learn. | ![Chart](chart.png) |
5. Uses various accelerated learning methodologies (e.g., mind-mapping, mnemonics, peripherals, imagery, music, etc.). | ![Chart](chart.png) |
6. Expands knowledge through adaptive, anticipatory, and creative learning approaches. | ![Chart](chart.png) |
7. Uses the action-learning process (e.g., learning from careful reflection on the problem or situation, and applying the learning to future actions). | ![Chart](chart.png) |
8. Encourages teams to learn from one another and to share learning in a variety of ways (e.g., via electronic bulletin boards, printed newsletters, and intergroup meetings). | ![Chart](chart.png) |
9. Thinks and acts with a comprehensive, systems approach. | ![Chart](chart.png) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>LEVEL OF EXTENT (Please circle your answer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Provides training for teams in how to work and learn in groups.</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Organizational Transformation: Vision, Culture, Strategy, and Structure</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University Extension...</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Stresses the importance of being a learning organization.</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supports the vision of a learning organization.</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Encourages a climate that supports and recognizes the importance of learning.</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is committed to continuous learning for improvement.</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Learns from failures as well as successes.</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rewards employees and teams for learning and helping each other.</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Incorporates learning opportunities into operations and programs.</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>LEVEL OF EXTENT (Please circle your answer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Designs ways to share knowledge and enhance learning throughout the organization</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. OSU Extension is streamlined, with few levels of administration, to maximize communication and learning across levels.</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Coordinates on the basis of goals and learning rather than maintaining separation in terms of fixed departments.</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. People Empowerment: Employee, Administrator, Customer, Alliances, Partners, and Community</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University Extension...</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Strives to develop an empowered work force that is able and committed to qualitative learning and performance.</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Decentralizes and delegates authority, responsibility and learning capability.</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Encourages administrators and employees to work in partnership to learn and solve problems together.</td>
<td>![Table with ratings 1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARACTERISTIC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Encourages administrators to take on the roles of coaching, mentoring, and facilitating learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Generates and enhances learning opportunities as well as encourages experimentation and reflection on what was learned so that new knowledge can be used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Actively shares information with clients and stakeholders, to obtain their ideas and inputs in order to learn and improve services/products.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gives clients and stakeholders opportunities to participate in learning and training activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Maximizes learning from clients and stakeholders through up-front planning of resources and strategies devoted to knowledge and skill acquisition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Participates in joint learning events with clientele, community groups, professional associations, and academic institutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Actively seeks learning partners among clients and stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. Knowledge Management: Acquisition, Creation, Storage/Retrieval, and Transfer/Utilization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Actively seeks information that improves the work of the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has an accessible system for collecting internal and external information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Monitors trends outside the organization by looking at what others do (e.g., benchmarking, best practices, attending conferences, and examining published research).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Trains employees in skills of creative thinking and experimentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Creates demonstration projects where new ways of developing a product and/or delivering a service are tested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ensures that important knowledge is coded, stored, and made available to those who need and can use it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHARACTERISTIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Makes employees aware of the need to retain important organizational learnings and share such knowledge with others.  

8. Uses cross-functional teams to transfer important learning across groups, departments and divisions.  

9. Continually develops new strategies and mechanisms for sharing learning throughout the organization.  

10. Supports specific areas, units, and projects that generate knowledge by providing people with learning opportunities.  

### V. Technology Applications: Information Systems, Technology-Based Learning, and Electronic Performance Support Systems

*Ohio State University Extension...*

1. Facilitates learning by effective and efficient computer-based information systems.  

2. Ensures that employees have easy access to the information highway (e.g., local networks, Internet, on-line).  

3. Incorporates electronic multimedia support and learning environment based on the powerful integration of art, color, music, and visuals in learning facilities.  

4. Makes available to employees computer-assisted learning programs and electronic job aids (e.g., just-in-time and flowcharting software).  

5. Uses groupware technology to facilitate group processes (e.g., project management, team process, meeting management).  

6. Supports "just-in-time" learning, a system that integrates high-technology learning systems, coaching, and actual work on the job into a single, seamless process.  

7. Via an electronic support performance system enables employees to learn and to do their work better.  


9. Ensures employees have full access to the information they need to do their jobs effectively.
LEVEL OF EXTENT  
(Please circle your answer)

CHARACTERISTIC  
Not at all  | To a very large extent

10. Adapts software systems to collect, code, store, create, and transfer information in ways best suited to meet employee needs.

Demographic Data:

1. What is your job title?: (Please circle one)
   1) Support Staff.
   2) Program Assistant.
   3) Nutrition Educator.
   4) Extension Agent.
   5) Extension Associate.
   6) Other, specify: ____________.

2. What is your major program area assignment?: (Please circle one)
   1) Agriculture and Natural Resources.
   2) Community Development.
   3) Family and Consumer Science.
   4) 4-H Youth Development.

3. What is your gender?: (Please circle one)
   1) Male
   2) Female

4. What is your present age?: ____________ years.

5. Length of employment in OSU Extension?: ____________ years.

If you have any comments or concerns about OSU Extension organizational culture or organizational learning, please feel free to write them in the space provided below (if you need more space please attach your comments on a separate sheet of paper).

Thank you for your time and assistance!

Please return the completed questionnaire by Friday September 10, 1999 in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope to Angel Berrio, PhD Candidate Department of Human and Community Resource Development 208 Agricultural Administration Building, 2120 Fyffe Road Columbus, OH 43210

Code No. ______
APPENDIX B

Panel of Experts
PANEL OF EXPERTS

Keith L. Smith, Associate Vice-president & Director
Ohio State University Extension
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, OH 43210
(614) 292-4067

Barbara G. Ludwig, Associate Director & Chair
Ohio State University Extension
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, OH 43210
(614) 292-4067

Nikki L. Conklin, Associate Professor
Ohio State University Extension
Organizational Learning Officer
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, OH 43210
(614) 292-4067

Jo M. Jones, Associate Professor
Ohio State University Extension
Organizational Learning Team
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, OH 43210
(614) 292-6182
APPENDIX C

Authorization for the use of the "Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument"

from Dr. Kim Cameron
Cameron, Kim, 05:10 PM 4/2/1999, RE: Organizational Culture

X-Ph: V4.48orb2
From: "Cameron, Kim" <ksc6@quinnell.som.cwru.edu>
To: "Angel Berrio" <berrio.1@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: Organizational Culture
Date: Fri., 2 Apr 1999 17:10:45 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Dear Angel:

You certainly have my permission to use the instruments found in Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture in your doctoral dissertation. Thanks very much for writing.

Kim Cameron

-----Original Message-----
From: Angel Berrio [mailto:berrio.1@osu.edu]
Sent: Friday, April 02, 1999 10:37 AM
To: ksc6@po.cwru.edu
Subject: Organizational Culture

Dear Dr. Cameron:

I am an international student pursuing my PhD in the Department of Human and Community Resource Development at The Ohio State University, majoring in Agricultural Education (Extension). For my dissertation I am planning to study Organizational Culture and to explore relationships with the Organizational Learning process as applied to non-profit organizations. During my literature review I came across one source of information related to "Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture" based on The Competing Values Framework, 1999. I enjoyed the book and I found that your framework and assessment instrument could be very helpful in my dissertation. I want to request you permission to use the "Organizational Culture Diagnostic Instrument" in my dissertation in the understanding that full credit will be given to you and Dr. Quinn as the authors of the framework of the study and the assessment instrument. Thank you in advance for your time and kindness, if you have any questions please contact me at (614) 688-4704.

Angel Berrio (Graduate Student)
OSU Extension Business Office
Phone: (614) 688-4704
Fax: (614) 292-1240
berrio.1@osu.edu
APPENDIX D

Authorization for the use of the “Learning Organization Profile”

instrument from Dr. Michael Marquardt
To: mjmq@aol.com
From: Angel Berrio <berrio.1@osu.edu>
Subject: Organizational Learning
Cc: 
Bcc: 
Attached:

Dear Mr. Marquardt:
I am an international student pursuing my PhD in the Department of Human and Community Resource Development at The Ohio State University, majoring in Agricultural Education (Extension). For my dissertation I am planning to study the Organizational Learning process as applied to non-profit organizations, and to explore relationships with organizational culture. During my literature review I came across with two sources of information related to the "Learning Organization Profile" instrument, one was your book "Building the Learning Organization" and another was the ASTD's Guide to learning organization assessment instruments. The purpose of this message is to request you permission to use the aforementioned instrument in my dissertation in the understanding that full credit will be given to you as the author of the framework of study and the assessment instrument. Thank you in advance for your time and kindness, if you have any questions please contact me at (614) 688-4704.
Dear Angel Berrio,

You have my permission to use the Learning Organization Instrument.
Best of success!

Sincerely,
Dr. Michael Marquardt
APPENDIX E

Correspondence
May 24, 1999

Dear Colleague,

Enclosed is a mail survey instrument that has been developed for use in my dissertation research. The purpose of my study is to assess the organizational culture and organizational learning profiles of Ohio State University Extension. This instrument will be sent to a randomly selected sample of OSU Extension personnel at the county level (i.e., agents, chairs, program assistants, nutrition educators, and office assistants).

Before this instrument can be used, its validity needs to be established. The instrument is being sent to several professionals with knowledge of Extension, leadership, organizational culture (OC) and organizational learning (OL). Your assistance as an expert in your field is being sought in determining the validity of this instrument in the following ways:

- content and clarity of the items
- wording
- complexity
- reading level
- length
- format
- threatening or controversial items
- overall appearance

Please return the instrument in the attached campus envelop by June 09, 1999. Please write your comments and suggestions directly on the instrument. Your input to this study is very valuable. Thank you very much for your assistance!

Sincerely,

Angel Berrio
PhD Candidate
Dear Extension Employee:

As an Ohio State University Extension (OSU Extension) state personnel you are committed to a lifelong learning process that is expressed through the dominant culture of the organization, a demonstration of Extension's core values and beliefs. We are asking for your help to better understand OSU Extension organizational culture (OC) and the learning organization profile (LOP).

The questionnaire consists of two sections. The survey should take 20-25 minutes to complete. The questionnaire is being sent to a randomly selected sample of OSU Extension personnel at the county, district and state levels. We know that your time is of value, but the findings of this study will help Extension become a more effective and efficient learning organization. Your responses are crucial and will be kept completely confidential. A code number placed at the top of this page will only be used for follow-up purposes and to facilitate the data entry process. No names will be published. Data will be summarized by groups. All questionnaires will be destroyed. For each of the section please respond as candidly as possible. Your participation is voluntary, you may decline to answer any question and you may withdraw at any time without penalty. We would appreciate your honest response.

Thank you for taking the time to complete the questionnaire. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed campus envelope by Monday, September 13, 1999. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Angel Berrio at the phone: (614) 688-4704 or to the e-mail address: berrio.1@osu.edu. We thank you again for your valuable input to this study. Please accept the included gift as a token of appreciation for participating in the study.

Sincerely,

Dr. N. L. McCaslin
Chair
Department of Human and Community Resource Development

Dr. Keith Smith
Assoc Vice President & Director
Ohio State University Extension

Angel Berrio
PhD Candidate

August 27, 1999
September 17, 1999

Dear Extension Employee:

About three weeks ago, we wrote to you seeking your opinion about Organizational Culture (OC) and Organizational Learning (OL). As of today, we have not received your completed questionnaire. We realize that you may not have had time to complete it. However, we would genuinely appreciate hearing from you.

This study is being conducted to have a better understanding of the aforementioned topics related to Ohio State University (OSU) Extension, so they can be useful in improving the future design and delivery of OSU Extension programs. Your name was drawn randomly from a list of OSU Extension personnel through a scientific sampling process in which every employee had an equal chance of being selected. In order for information from the study to be truly representative, it is essential that each person in the sample return their questionnaire.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed. We would be happy to answer any questions you have about the study. Please feel free to contact Angel Berrio (Doctoral Candidate) by E-mail to berrio.1@osu.edu or by phone at (614) 688-4704.

Sincerely,

Dr. N. L. McCaslin
Chair
Department of Human and Community Resource Development

Dr. Keith Smith
Assoc. Vice President & Director
Ohio State University Extension

Angel Berrio
PhD Candidate
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APPENDIX F

Exemption from Human Subjects Committee Review
APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE REVIEW

All research activities that will involve human beings as research subjects must be reviewed and approved by the appropriate human subjects review committee, or receive exemption status, prior to implementation of the research.

Principal Investigator: Henderson Janet L. (Signature)
(Must be OSU Faculty) Last First Initial
Academic Title: Associate Professor Phone No. 292-0450 Fax No. 292-7007
Department: Human and Community Resource Development Department No. 1118
Campus Address: 204 Agr. Admin. Bldg. 2120 Fyffe Rd.

Co-Investigator(s):

Room Number Building Street Address
Berrio Angel A. (Signature)
Last First Initial (688-4704)

Phone No. 292-7007
Room Number Building Street Address

PROTOCOL TITLE: Organizational Culture and Organizational Learning in Public, Non-profit Institutions: A Profile of Ohio State University Extension.

THE ONLY INVOLVEMENT OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN THE PROPOSED RESEARCH ACTIVITY WILL BE IN ONE OR MORE OF THE EXEMPTION CATEGORIES LISTED ON THE BACK OF THIS APPLICATION.

CATEGORY: (Check one or more) #1 #2 X #3 #4 #5 #6

SOURCE OF FUNDING FOR PROPOSED RESEARCH: (Check A or B)
A. OSURF: Sponsor RF Proposal/Project No.
B. Other (Identify) Ohio State University Extension.

EXEMPTION STATUS: APPROVED DISAPPROVED

6/25/99 Chairperson

** Principal Investigator must submit a protocol to the appropriate Human Subjects Review Committee.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO INVESTIGATORS: Exempting an activity from review DOES NOT absolve the investigators of the activity from ensuring that the welfare of human subjects in the activity is protected and that methods used, and information provided, to gain subject consent are appropriate to the activity.
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