

Analysis of Adhocracy Culture Implementation Approach and Performance of Universities in Kenya

¹*Susan Wairimu Chege, ²Prof Evangeline Gichunge and ³Dr. Wilson Muema
¹²³Strategic Management, Kenya Methodist University
*Corresponding author e-mail: susanberita@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Chege, S. W., Gachunge, E., & Muema, W. (2022). Analysis of Adhocracy Culture Implementation Approach and Performance of Universities in Kenya. *Journal of Strategic Management*, 2(3), 1-10.

Abstract

The recent increase in competition and insufficient government financing, as well as the government's increased focus on technical, vocational education training, have had a significant negative impact on higher education's service delivery and performance. The study sought to determine the effect of role culture implementation approach on university performance in Kenya. The study used a descriptive research approach, and its target population included 444 senior university employees from all 74 accredited universities in Kenya. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. Adhocracy culture insignificantly influenced universities' performance by -13.3% (R square value of -0.133). The correlation value of ($r=-.097$, $p<0.05$) showed the negative relationship between adhocracy culture and universities' performance. The chi-square value of $\chi^2(5) = 0.038$, $p=0.049$ proved there was an insignificant relationship between adhocracy culture and universities' performance. Adhocracy culture was insignificantly associated with placement and research output performance, university ranking, student placement by KUCCPS, and graduation rate. Organization managers must have a good understanding of the adhocracy culture that exists in universities and the impact it generates on typical performance. This is very important while making imperative decisions.

Keywords: *Adhocracy culture, Implementation approach, performance*

1.0 Introduction

Entrepreneurial culture is another name for adhocracy culture. This culture focuses on flexibility for competitive positions and has open systems that absorb new ideas and willingness to try new practices (Cameron & Quinn, 2006). Adhocracy culture pushes flexibility, adaptability, and creativity among its members. The culture is capable of coping with dynamic environmental changes and innovation is the key driver for this culture. Adhocracy culture creates an environment that encourages staff to freely take any initiatives as the strategy for competitive advantage (Deshpande & Farley, 2019). Adhocracy culture has a strong effect on different product performances in dynamic environments. Leaders or proponents of this culture are creative and show high-risk acceptance (they dare to take new risks by implementing new things).

The word adhocracy originates from the term ad-hoc which means something temporal, specialized, or dynamic. This suggests the all-emergency issues in an organization are

examined and addressed by an ad-hoc committee. An ad-hoc committee could be a task force created to address emerging issues and once the tasks are accomplished, the task force is immediately dismantled (Cameron & Quinn, 2016). Relating to adhocracy culture implies that adhocracies are temporary like ad-hoc committees. Adhocracies take quick changes when new situations emerge. This also indicates that the primary purpose of adhocracy culture is to model flexibility, creativity, and adaptability when uncertainty exists. Therefore, development of an adhocracy culture is done out of necessity in the information age (Cameron & Quinn, 2016).

Adaptability

In Open System Theory (O.S.T) there is a great emphasis on how organizations relate to the environments they operate (Boulding, 2018). The OST is a reflection on how an organization adapts to changes in environmental setup. This theory in relation to adhocracy culture assumes that firms are processing information in particular environments and employ adaptive skills to shift new conditions. Therefore, an organization operates as a system created by energetic input-output. In this case, the energy from the output is reactive to the system. Skyttner (2017) views an organization as a socio-technical system that has social components and technical components. Social components are people while technical components are technologies and machines (Skyttner, 2017).

Flexibility

From managerial perspective of human resources, Acar (2019) defines flexibility as the organization adapting to composition, size, people, responsiveness, human resource inputs, and costs needed to attain the goals and objectives of an organization. Organizational flexibility can also be explained as how the work is done when the work is done and when the work is done (Acar, 2019). Organizational flexibility is paramount, and several factors are essential for creating flexibility in the organizational environment. The business environment is characterized by dynamic changes day in day out and therefore organizations must address such changes for continual survival. Technological changes, social changes, economical changes, political changes, global factors and legal changes form an environment in which businesses operate in different periods. Managers must be able to adopt responsive strategies to these changes which call for flexibility throughout. As the workplace needs flexibility, workforce also needs flexibility. Changes in how work is executed mean that the workforce is also going to be flexible with new rules, procedures, and instructions for doing the job (Ghoneim, 2019).

Creativity

Another literature perspective has a different outlook on creative orientation of Adhocracy culture. According to Sohal's (2017) argument, an adhocratic type of culture does not encourage the sharing of knowledge. Firms pursuing this kind of culture focus on individuals who have a passion for risk-taking, meeting new challenges, are inspired to innovate and are committed to experimenting with new ideas. Despite all the above traits of adhocracy culture, they require the managerial commitment to usage of sufficient tools that inspire flexibility, innovation, and creativity. These instruments are motivation, recognition, and rewards which facilitate knowledge sharing within the firms functioning with this kind of culture. However, knowledge sharing can be attained in this kind of environment if the organizational management shifts to a motivating group of organization members rather than individual members. The organizational management can then motivate the groups to take risks, meet challenges and innovate ideas. With this, group members will collaborate or enhance

cooperation among them rather than competing individually which will improve knowledge sharing culture.

Woikicki (2019) defines innovation as the act of introducing something new. Innovation is the mother of anything new and there is no progress or something new when there is no innovation. An organization that does not make any progress cannot fight in a competitive market environment. Modern existence is a result of innovation. Innovation has some undesirable results, but change is inevitable. A study by Skyttner (2017) found that higher learning institutions achieved positive changes in many cases through innovation.

Naranjo-Valencia, Jimenez-Jimenez, and Sanz-Valle (2019) posited that the values adopted by the management in organizational culture can encourage or discourage innovation performance and performance outcomes. Good values encourage innovation and performance and performance outcomes while unsuitable culture retards innovation and performance and performance outcomes. Woikicki (2019) suggests innovation and performance can be attained using an adhocracy culture. Decentralized organizational structures increase the chances of implementing business strategy in all organizational contexts while innovations are key elements that drive continual organizational success in modern competitive markets.

Problem Statement

Research on the relationship between organizational performance and implementation methods of management culture has been reported as ambiguous and contradictory. According to Ojo's research (2018), there is no clear relationship between organizational effectiveness and methods of implementing organizational culture. The strategy of implementing organizational culture is widely used in many organizational structures, but it is still a very complex concept and is an important factor in the success or failure of an organization. Recent increased competition and insufficient government funding, as well as increased government focus on technical and vocational education, have had a significant negative impact on higher education (TVET) supply and performance.

Rahid, Sambasivan and Johari (2017) argue that the negative performance of Kenyan universities is due to their tight performance. Most universities have recently come under public scrutiny due to declining performance levels. While largely due to increasing student numbers, limited resources, staff turnover, lack of investment, labor disputes and brain drain, universities need to be strategic and understand the value of adopting a healthy corporate culture as a key component to gain competitive advantage (Obiwuru et al., 2018). Despite the fact that there is a lot of previous research that establishes this relationship, very little evidence has been shown about how organizational culture implementation strategies affect college performance (Simons, Dávila, & Kaplan, 2018). This study set out to fill this gap by analyzing the performance of Kenyan institutions in relation to adhocracy culture implementation.

Research Hypothesis

H₀: Adhocracy culture implementation approach and university performance in Kenya are unrelated in any meaningful way.

2.0 Literature Review

A study done by Naranjo-Valencia et al. (2017) showed that organizations that attained positive results had strong organizational cultures in place. A study done by Belias and Koustelios (2019) also indicated that was meant to take though a firm in fast-paced changing circumstances through adapting and adjustments. They described adhocracy culture as the kind of culture that is informal, adjustable, and flexible and operates against bureaucracy. The

culture seeks rapid growth through innovation, taking risks, and experimentation. Organizations with an adhocracy culture hire leaders who are not only risk-takers and innovative but also visionary (Lizbetinova & Caha, 2019). The assumption behind the adhocracy culture is that firms need to pioneer innovation initiatives by developing new services and products for their future success.

Therefore, innovation, creativity, and adaptability have a significant role in improving the competitiveness of an organization similar to the ad-hoc committees created to immediately solve arising issues. Empirical literature by Felipe, Roldán, and Leal-Rodríguez (2017) asserts that the environment is turbulent due to rapid changes in the information age whereby from day to day the half-life of products is reducing. Competitive firms that keep up with the market pace must remain innovation oriented to develop high-quality products recurrently since the half-life of previously produced products decreases.

According to Al-Ali, Al-Nahyan, and Sohal (2017), an adhocracy culture encourages project managers to take risks. Some projects demonstrate blatant examples of a risk-taking atmosphere, such as the Apollo 11 moon mission. Engineers took tremendous risks in this undertaking by putting their foot on the moon without knowing exactly what was beyond the horizon of the earth's atmosphere (Porcu et al., 2017). Many risk-takers have been inspired to take on more risk after this project's success, while those whose initiatives failed pushed risk-takers to put in much more effort (Abubakar, Elrehail, Alatailat, & Elçi, 2019). This shows that missions involving danger may be upbeat as well as gloomy.

Attaining good performance results in an organization requires heavy investment and thus great risks are included. However, when the resources are meager creativity is needed to attain organizational missions based on the strategic plan (Müller & de Lichtenberg, 2018). The ability to turn ideas into reality makes strategy visible leading to their implementation. To pull through obstacles effective strategy implementation creativity and risk-taking are needed and therefore adhocracy culture is needed (Oredo et al., 2017). Some of the cases of creativity is buying materials in advance at a cheap cost long before they are needed for usage in construction industry. This also involves taking risks which is the main component of adhocracy since market prices may continue to depreciate (Spade, 2018).

Very successful firms are adaptive firms since they can change from one culture to another in accordance with the trends as stated by Cameron and Quinn (2016). Most businesses involved in consulting, aerospace, filmmaking, and software development among others have adopted an adhocracy culture. These kinds of businesses are challenged by the production of novel services and products to seize new opportunities (Cameron & Quinn, 2016). The powers in an adhocracy culture cannot be centralized like in hierarchies since innovation, is in the highest demand. The powers are decentralized as each team and each person is empowered to handle real issues being addressed at a given time.

According to Brännström and Staffansson (2019), individuality is encouraged in an adhocracy culture since every person participates in research, development, and production process among other aspects. A consulting firm is the best example where every client is served differently from others. Their issues are solved as an independent project. Therefore, the service providers must set up a temporary plan to meet the demands of a client. Once the task of the project concludes, the ad-hoc committee is dispersed.

A study done in Syria on manufacturing firms by Haffar, Al-Karaghoul, and Ghoneim (2019) in manufacturing firms in Syria addressed the influence of different types of cultures on organization members' Individual Readiness for Change (IRFC) in relation to Total Quality

Management (TQM) implementation the study used survey design with help of the questionnaires shared across three hundred and fifty manufacturing firms. The study outcomes showed there was a significant correlation between individual readiness for change and the type of culture adopted by organizations. Haffar et al. (2019) concluded that managers must ensure organization members are aligned with the cultural requirements of the organization to attain change management goals. The study also recommended that a firm that wants to implement changes regularly must build an adhocracy culture as this culture simplifies strategy implementation process. Most firms have implemented their strategies successfully through flexibility and creativity linked with adhocracy culture.

A study done in Turkey by Yesil and Kaya (2018) focused on organizational culture and its consequences on Turkish businesses. A descriptive research approach was employed in this study with help of regression analysis while analyzing the study findings. A comparison was made among different kinds of cultures such as hierarchies and clan cultures. The results indicated that both clan culture and adhocratic culture enhanced knowledge and information sharing which improved business efficiency. Non-financial measures such as specialized treatment, quality service, resource allocation, employee satisfaction, customer satisfaction, and affordability were also used as independent sub-variables. Different sub-variables yielded varying outcomes and therefore the study findings were not generalized. However, the study failed to address financial measures for business efficiency.

A study was done in Tunisia by Khedhaouria, Gharbi, Bahri, and Nakara (2020) explored the effects of different kinds of cultures (adhocracy culture, clan culture, hierarchy culture & market culture) on entrepreneurial orientation and success of small businesses. Entrepreneurial orientation included activity, risk-taking, and innovation. The empirical results showed that market culture and adhocracy culture promoted entrepreneurship through constructive actions, creativity, and innovation in small businesses. The empirical results also showed an insignificant association between large business results and adhocracy culture. When used as mediating variable, there was a significant connection between entity efficiency and adhocracy culture.

Another study conducted by Tseng (2019) addressed the influence of information changes and corporate culture on production rate of a firm in a Chinese business setup. The relationship between adhocracy culture and information changes and the effects on performance was specifically analyzed. There was a positive impact of adhocracy culture by improving knowledge conversion and staff production rate. Adhocracy culture also shaped behaviors and attitudes of individual staff towards attaining their objectives through creativity. Zhang and Zhu (2017) also examined 4 kinds of cultures in 9 states of China. The study sampled 25 business enterprises to determine the link between clan culture, adhocracy culture, market culture, and hierarchy culture and the productivity of business firms. The empirical findings evidenced that adhocracy culture had significant positive effects productivity of the firms in terms of sales turnover. Clan culture and market improve staff behaviors and attitudes at the workplace.

Research by Mutai (2018) examined how organizational culture affected Telecommunication firms in Kenya using Airtel as a case study. The empirical results of the study documented that culture enabled Airtel Kenya to implement its strategies successfully. The study finding also proved that Airtel Kenya had a good foundation of culture which improved good coordination of activities in all its environments. Communication systems were also identified as primary factors contributing to effective strategy implementation. Without communication, the staff remained tentative and hesitant to decide on difficult situations during strategy implementation.

The study done by Nongo and Ikyanyon (2017) in Kenya professional bodies established a significant association between adhocracy culture and strategy implementation. The study concluded that adhocracy culture and its effects cannot be ignored and therefore the study recommended organizations work towards establishing structures that hold adhocracy in the work environment. Structures at both business managerial level and operational managerial level should be developed in a manner that all organization ranks can accommodate an adhocracy culture. The leadership structure of the organization should also be designed by factoring in adhocracy culture. Nongo and Ikyanyon (2017) also recommended good practices whereby top managerial commitment to seek the involvement of staff for specified periods during strategy implementation to experiment with adhocracy. Irrespective of whether the culture fails to work or works for a specific section, the best leaders must ensure they have the right individual with the ability to implement plans in an ad-hoc manner. In achieving this, leaders should empower its subordinate members in all ranks by training them to run different activities in an adhocratic manner.

A study done by Omukaga (2016) also examined the impact of adhocracy culture on public water firms in Kenya. Correlation coefficient results showed an affirmative effect on results. Regression analysis was also done the results showed adhocratic culture improved productivity by 0.189 units. The study concluded that there was a significant positive relationship between adhocratic culture and effectiveness of an organization.

3.0 Methodology

The study used a descriptive research approach, and its target population included 444 senior university employees from all 74 accredited universities in Kenya, including the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Dean of Faculty, Dean of Students, Heads of Departments, and Registrar. The study's ultimate sample size of 365 individuals was calculated using the Yamane formula. Additionally, the research's primary technique for acquiring quantitative data was a questionnaire. Before being loaded into SPSS version 23 for analysis, the acquired data was cleaned. Descriptive as well as illative figures were employed to evaluate the information. The effectiveness of Kenya's public universities was examined using inferential statistics to evaluate the link concerning role culture implementation approach and operation. To evaluate and display explanatory data, frequencies, proportions, means, and universal variation were used. Multiple direct degeneration assessments, the Chi-square test, normality tests, the test for homogeneity of variances, and the multicollinearity test were all examples of inferential statistics. Link evaluation happened to be utilized to establish the link between the reliant and autonomous variables.

4.0 Results and Discussion

Adhocracy culture insignificantly influenced universities' performance by -13.3% (R square value of -0.133). The correlation value of ($r=-.097$, $p<0.05$) showed the negative relationship between adhocracy culture and universities' performance. The chi-square value of $\chi^2(5) = 0.038$, $p=0.049$ proved there was an insignificant relationship between adhocracy culture and universities' performance. Adhocracy culture was insignificantly associated with student placement by KUCCPS ($p=0.418>0.05$), research output performance ($X^2=.655$, $df=1$, $p=0.418$), university ranking ($X^2=0$, $df=1$, $p=1 > 0.05$), and graduation rate ($X^2=.556$, $df=1$, $p=0.656$) at 5% significance level

Hypothesis Testing

The chi-square value of $\chi^2(5) = 0.038$, $p=0.049$ proved there was no significant relationship between adhocracy culture and universities' performance. The null hypothesis there is no

significant relationship between adhocracy culture implementation strategy and performance of universities in Kenya was accepted. The empirical results of a study done by Khedhaouria, Nakara, Gharbi, and Bahri (2020) also established that entrepreneurship enhanced small business success through promotion of constructive and creative actions in adhocratic and market cultural environments. The research, however, did not find a link between adhocracy culture and company results. Instead, the survey used a mediating variable.

Logistic Model for the Relationship between Adhocracy Culture and the Performance of Universities

H₀: there is no significant relationship between adhocracy culture implementation strategy and performance of universities

The relationship between adhocracy culture implementation strategy and performance of universities was tested at a 5% level of significance ($\alpha=0.05$). The model predicts 36.3% of the responses were correct; p-value ($p=0.004<0.05$), the chi-square value of -4.79 is insignificant; the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between adhocracy culture implementation strategy and performance of universities was accepted. The Nagelkerke R-square value shows that 21% of the variation in performance of universities is elaborated by the logistic model. Wald statistic further gives an index of the insignificance of the predictor in the model. The outcomes showed that adhocracy culture was not a significant predictor of performance of universities (Wald=-2.003, $p<0.05$). Therefore, the researcher rejected the alternative hypothesis and accepts the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the adhocracy culture implementation strategy and performance of universities. Adhocracy culture had an odds ratio (Exp (B)) of -0.623. This implied that there was a negative relationship between adhocracy culture implementation strategy and performance of universities.

Discussion

Adhocracy culture insignificantly influenced universities' performance by -13.3% (R square value of -0.133). The correlation value of ($r=-.097$, $p<0.05$) showed the negative relationship between adhocracy culture and universities' performance. The chi-square value of $\chi^2 (5) = 0.038$, $p=0.049$ proved there was an insignificant relationship between adhocracy culture and universities' performance. Adhocracy culture was insignificantly associated with placement and research output performance, university ranking, student placement by KUCCPS, and graduation rate. Khedhaouria, Nakara, Gharbi, and Bahri (2020) explored the effects of different kinds of cultures (adhocracy culture and market culture) on entrepreneurial orientation and success of small businesses. Entrepreneurial orientation included activity, risk-taking, and innovation. The empirical results showed that market culture and adhocracy culture promoted entrepreneurship through constructive actions, creativity, and innovation in small businesses. The empirical results also showed an insignificant association between large business results and adhocracy culture. When used as mediating variable, there was a significant connection between entity efficiency and adhocracy culture.

A study done by Yesil and Kaya (2018) made a comparison among different kinds of cultures such as hierarchies and clan cultures. The results indicated that clan culture enhanced knowledge information sharing which improved business efficiency while adhocracy culture impaired knowledge information sharing. Adhocracy culture improved resource allocation and employee satisfaction but had an insignificant effect on financial performance. Therefore, the study findings were not generalized.

5.0 Conclusion

Adhocracy culture insignificantly affected universities' performance. Adhocracy culture was insignificantly associated with placement and research output performance of the universities. Adhocracy negatively affected university ranking and had an insignificant relationship with student placement by KUCCPS and with graduation rate.

6.0 Recommendations

Organization managers must have a good understanding of the adhocracy culture that exists in universities and the impact it generates on typical performance. This is very important while making imperative decisions. It is always good to change the culture when it does not yield positive outcomes. Therefore, change is inevitable. Strategic cultural management is about achieving long-run objectives through reinforcement of existing organizational culture or change of culture in specified approaches. This implies changing values and the styles activities are executed day in and day out. Strategies meant to change culture focus on the way an organization can be moved from the present state to a future desired state.

References

- Abubakar, A. M., Elrehail, H., Alatailat, M. A., & Elçi, A. (2019). Knowledge management, decision-making style, and organizational performance. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 4(2), 104-114.
- Acar, P. (2019). Organizational culture types and their effects o organizational performance in Turkish hospitals. *Emerging Markets Journal*, 3(3), 18-31
- Al-Ali, A. A., Singh, S. K., Al-Nahyan, M., &Sohal, A. S. (2017). Change management through leadership: The mediating role of organizational culture. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 25(4), 723–739.
- Belias, D., &Koustelios, A. (2019). Organizational culture and job satisfaction: A review. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 4(2), 132–149. <https://www.econjournals.com/index.php/irmm/article/view/746>
- between organizational culture, innovation, and performance in Spanish companies. *RevistaLatinoamericana de Psicologia*, 48(1), 30–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rlp.2015.09.009>
- Boulding, K.E. (2018). General Systems Theory- the skeleton of science. *Management Science*, 2(3), 197-208.
- Brännström, H., &Staffansson, F. (2019). The prominence of organizational culture in workplace well: A qualitative research on an international organization. SE-901 87 Umea Sweden: *Umeå School of Business and Economics*, Umeå University.
- Cameron, & Quinn, R. E. (2006). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture*. San Francisco: The Jossey-Bass, Revised Edition, 7 (4) 11–37.
- Cameron, K., & Quinn, R. E. (2016). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley
- Commitment to the Organization. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(22), 21-28
- Deshpande, R., & Farley, J. U. (2019) Corporate culture and market orientation: Comparing Indian and Japanese firms. *Journal of International Marketing*, 7 (4) 111–127.

- Felipe, C. M., Roldán, J. L., & Leal-Rodríguez, A. L. (2017). Impact of organizational culture values on organizational agility. *Sustainability*, 9(12), 2354.
- Ghoneim, A. (2019). An empirical investigation of the influence of organizational culture on Haffar, M., Al-Karaghoul, W., & Ghoneim, A. (2018). An empirical investigation of the influence of organizational culture on individual readiness for change in Syrian manufacturing organizations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 27(1), 5-22.
- individual readiness for change in Syrian manufacturing organizations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 27(1), 5-22.
- Khedhaouria, A., Nakara, W. A., Gharbi, S., & Bahri, C. (2020). The relationship between organizational culture and small-firm performance: Entrepreneurial orientation as mediator. *European Management Review*, 17(2), 515-528.
- Ližbetinová, L., Lorincová, S., & Čaha, Z. (2016). The application of the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) to logistics enterprises. *Nase More*, 63(3), 170-176. <https://doi.org/10.17818/NM/2016/SI17>
- Müller, S. D., & de Lichtenberg, C. G. (2018). The culture of ITIL: Values and implementation challenges. *Information Systems Management*, 35(1), 49-61
- Mutai, P. K. (2018). *Organizational culture and strategy implementation at Airtel Kenya*
- Naranjo-Valencia, J. C., Jiménez-Jiménez, D., & Sanz-Valle, R. (2019). Studying the links Nongo, E. S. & Ikyanyon, D. N. (2017). The Influence of Corporate Culture on Employee O'Neil, J. W., Beauvais, L. L., & Scholl, R. W. (2017). The use of organizational culture and structure to guide strategic behavior: An information processing perspective. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 2(2), 816.
- Obiwuru, T. C., Okwu, A. T., Akpa, V. O. & Nwankwere, I. A. (2018). Effects of Leadership Style on Organizational Performance: A Survey of Selected Small-Scale Enterprises in Ikosi-Ketu Council Development Area of Lagos State, Nigeria. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(7), 100-111
- Ojo, O (2018). Impact Assessment of Corporate Culture on Employee Job Performance. *Business Intelligence Journal*, 2(2).
- Omukaga, A. (2018). Effects of organizational culture on employee performance at AON limited [Unpublished Master's Thesis], University of Nairobi.
- Oredo, J., Njihia, J., & Iraki, X. N. (2017). The role of organizing vision in cloud computing adoption by organizations in Kenya. *American Journal of Information Systems*, 5(1), 38-50.
- Porcu, L., Barrio-García, S. D., Alcántara-Pilar, J. M., & Crespo-Almendros, E. (2017). Examining the mediating role of integrated marketing communication on the relationship between adhocracy culture and brand advantage. In G. Christodoulides, A. Stathopoulou, & M. Eisend, *Advances in advertising research (Vol. VII): Bridging the gap between advertising academia and practice* (pp. 281-295). Wiesbaden: Springer Gabler
- Rahid, Md., Sambasivan, A., & Johari, J. (2017). 2) The influence of corporate culture and organizational commitment on performance. *Journal of Management Development*. 22(8), p 708-723

- Simons, R, Dávila, A & Kaplan, R 2018, *Performance Measurement & Control Systems for Implementing Strategy: Text & Cases*, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River.
- Skyttner, L. (2017). *General Systems Theory: Ideas & Applications*. World Scientific.
- Sohal, A. S. (2017). Change management through leadership: The mediating role of organizational culture. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 25(4), 723–739.
- Spade, D. (2018). Organizational culture chart. The Science Council. (2018). *Our definition of a professional body*. Retrieved from <https://sciencecouncil.org/about-science/our-definition-of-a-proessional-body/>
- Tseng, S. (2019). The correlation between organizational culture and knowledge conversion on corporate performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 14(2), 269-284.
- Woikicki K., (2019), “Flexibility and Adaptability of the System of Study: Underrated Aspects of Quality in Higher Education, in *Quality Review in Higher Education*, (eds: E. Wnuk-Lipifiska, M. W6jcicka), TEPICS Publ. House, pp. 223-250, Warsaw
- Yesil, S., & Kaya, A. (2018). The effect of organizational culture on firm financial performance: Evidence from a developing country. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 81, 428-437
- Zhang, Z., & Zhu, X. (2017). Empirical Analysis of the Relationship between organizational culture and organizational performance. *Paper presented at the National Conference on Information Technology and Computer Science*, Lanzhou, China