From Science to Practice: Organizational Psychology Bulletin

Enriching the workplace by scientifically integrating psychology and organizational life

Contents:

From the Editors:

Welcome to the second Issue of *From Science to Practice: Organizational Psychology Bulletin (OPB). OPB* invites students, practitioners, and emerging scholars of Organizational Psychology to share with colleagues and the public applied articles on current topics in the field. Core contributors to this bulletin are students enrolled in the Master of Science in Organizational Psychology at Vanguard University of Southern California. Our bi-annual bulletin publishes selected papers representing the work of students as they immerse themselves into the field, analyze current empirical literature, and make connections between the science of Organizational Psychology and practical applications. The bulletin also welcomes papers from practitioners in the field, and students and emerging scholars from other institutions.

The set of papers selected for this issue reflects our program's commitment to responsible, evidence-based organizational practice, and our respect for both organizational outcomes and employee interests. Tawnya Rybarczyk and Shellie Nguyen discuss how organizational culture, organizational leadership, and sound approaches to creating cultures can both promote performance and sustain employee well-being and commitment. Tawnya Rybarczyk specifically focuses on the roles of CEOs and consultants in organizational culture interventions, and warns of poorly conceived and executed interventions. Shellie Nguyen focuses on cultural characteristics that are likely to facilitate organizational success.

Bethanie Hartung focuses on telework, its role in facilitating employee satisfaction, and its potential advantages and disadvantages. Finally, Paris Clark discusses potential detrimental effects of misuse or overuse of technology on employee outcomes, and what organizations can do to protect their employees.

We encourage our readers to participate in conversation about these and other topics in Organizational Psychology. Please see our Call for Proposals for more details. In addition, we would love to hear from you through your letters to the editor.

EDITOR
Ludmila N. Praslova, Ph.D.
Vanguard University of Southern California; lpraslova@vanguard.edu

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Eric Rodriguez, MBA
Vanguard University of Southern California; eric.rodriguez@vanguard.edu

CALL FOR PAPERS:

From Science to Practice: Organizational Psychology Bulletin (OPB) welcomes articles which summarize recent empirical research findings relevant to the field of organizational psychology and suggest practical applications on the basis of research evidence. Articles must be written in simple, yet professional language, and be accessible and relevant to organizational practitioners and members of the general public interested in improving organizational life. In addition to 1000-2000 word (not including references) lead articles, we accept brief reports (300-500 words) on current topics in organizational psychology research and application, and 100-300 Letters to the Editor, which may include reflections on our articles or suggestions for further research and article topics. Please submit manuscripts in APA format. lpraslova@vanguard.edu

Should CEOs be the driving force behind Organizational Culture Change?

Tawnya Rybarczyk

CEOs are seeking the services of consulting firms, often because they are seduced by the consultants' promise of increasing organizational performance by changing the culture of the organization. Culture change has become a thriving industry as companies spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on culture change programs. But is this money well spent? Do formal culture change initiatives driven by the CEO actually change the culture of an organization?

First, it is important to understand what organizational culture is and how it develops. An extensive body of work by Edgar Schein provides much insight into this question. An organizational culture takes shape when employees as a group encounter issues and problems and work to restore balance and reduce conflict (Schein, 1990) creating a set of shared values, beliefs and behaviors (Altaf, 2011). The longer a group of employees remain together, the stronger the culture (Schein, 1990). Organizational culture is not simply handed down by a CEO in a memo to employees. Instead, it develops over time as the employees learn which behaviors work and which ones don't. The culture is reinforced as new employees learn the culture by observing others' behaviors and adapt their own behaviors accordingly (Schein, 1990).

The consultants have it right when they say that the organizational culture impacts how an organization performs. Amal Altaf's study conducted in 2011 showed a link between an organization's culture and an organization's performance. Employees have a direct impact on how well a company performs and its ability to meet its goals. Businesses perform better when employees are dedicated and committed to their job and the company (Altaf, 2011). The opposite is also true – if an employee isn't dedicated or committed, the organization's performance will surely suffer. Knowing that employees and organizational culture are central to an organization's success, it makes sense that executives want to try and create the ideal organizational culture. Yet, many times their efforts fail.

The promise and pitfalls of culture change. Beer, Eisenstat, and Spector highlighted some of the challenges of change programs in the 1990 article titled "Why Change Programs Don't Produce Change." After studying culture change programs implemented at six major organizations, the authors found that the culture change programs initiated by CEOs failed more often than they succeeded (Beer et al., 1990).

_____

About the Author
Tawnya Rybarczyk is a student at Vanguard University of Southern California Master of Science Program in Organizational Psychology.
DOI: 10.19099/fstp.091501

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Tawnya Rybarczyk at
tawnya.rybarczyk@vanguard.edu

It's not enough to bring in a new leader and expect the culture to simply change. This was demonstrated at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1995 (Ruvolo & Bullis, 2003). When the culture of the military academy was considered to be too academic and not warrior-like enough, a new leader was hired that modeled the warrior culture that was desired. This leader had no academic background and no understanding of the current culture of the academy. Within ten months, faculty morale plummeted, productivity dropped, and turnover of faculty increased. One year into his role, this new leader was removed from the position (Ruvolo & Bullis, 2003).

Another example of a failed leader-driven change initiative is demonstrated in the undertaking to implement Lean Six Sigma (LSS) at 3M. When Jim McNerney was hired as the new CEO in 2001, he attempted to implement LSS at 3M much as it had been implemented at his former company, GE (Canato, Ravasi, & Phillips, 2013). However, McNerney failed to first understand the culture that already existed at 3M. When the employees felt that the strict process controls behind LSS were in direct opposition to the current culture of innovation (characterized by risk taking and tolerance for mistakes), the new LSS practices did not take hold across the organization and LSS was only effective in the short-term (Canato et al., 2013).

In both of these examples, leaders attempted to impose a new culture on the organization – and neither leader understood the current organizational culture of their company or the complex dynamics of its culture. This lack of knowledge significantly impaired their culture change efforts. Both leaders and employees form the organization's culture. A leader's behavior has a strong influence on the organizational culture and impacts how employees respond to change (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006). Employees will be resistant to change if a leader does not know how to motivate employees to change behavior (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006). But it takes more than just motivating employees to change behavior. A successful change initiative requires that employees show a high level of commitment and are able to work together as a team to identify and solve problems (Beer et al., 1990).

With the overabundance of business and management books that provide conflicting advice on culture change, it is no wonder that executives turn to consultants for guidance and direction (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2006). However, the results are not always "as expected". Consulting firms conduct their own research and highlight their clients' success stories in their marketing materials and use this "evidence" to justify their fees. Yet, consulting firms make money whether or not their programs work. Most firms do not tie compensation for their services to actual results (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2006). In many cases, consulting firms end up creating more opportunity for themselves when the initial plan fails or creates other issues and they are hired to fix what is now broken (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2006). There is little objective research that evaluates whether expensive change programs transform culture, whether the transformation is beneficial, or whether that transformation is maintained over the long-term.

So, what works? Can a CEO drive and reshape a culture? On the one hand, executives invested in the success of the change will more likely model

the desired behaviors and hold others accountable for the same. On the other hand, research shows that executive behavior is not enough. So, what is an executive to do if the organization needs a shift in its culture in order to improve performance? Executives definitely have a hard and delicate task to perform. First, it is important to weigh the risks and rewards of a culture change program as it is expensive and depends on the support and cooperation of employees (Hill, Kolanowski, Milone-Nuzzo, & Yevchak, 2011). Any attempt to change a culture may cause at least a short-term negative impact on an organization's profitability – and without the certainty that the culture will actually change (Busse, 2014).

Second, executives must fully understand the dynamics of the current culture – including its strengths and weaknesses – before designing a plan to change it. If the dynamics of the current culture are not known and understood, then it becomes guesswork as to what changes will work and which ones will not. As Schein (1990) asserts, groups form a culture based on how they react to shared experiences, issues, and problems. If individuals are unique, then a group of individuals is unique – and the culture is unique as those individuals experience issues, conflict, problems and work together to restore balance (Schein, 1990).

Third, executives need to look for objective data to back up the claims of the change model being proposed before engaging the services of a consulting firm to assist with this process. Pfeffer and Sutton urge leaders to adopt "evidence-based management" (2006, p. 78). Such data-driven decision making also calls for clearly defining the

results, determining how success of the change initiative will be measured, and adapt the strategy according to those results.

Is it possible for a CEO to change or reshape an organizational culture and is the money being spent on consulting firms to change organizational culture worth the investment? CEOs can change and reshape an organization's culture, but it won't happen by executive order, as was discovered by 3M and the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Employees are key and the focal point of any change initiative. As for whether or not the consulting firms are worth the fees they charge, the jury is still out, and understanding and monitoring of data specific to each intervention is essential.

References

Altaf, A. (2011). The Impact of Organizational Culture on Organizational Effectiveness: Implication of Hofstede Cultural Model as Organizational Effectiveness Model. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, 6*(1), 161-174.

Beer, M., Eisenstat, R. A., & Spector, B. (1990). Why Change Programs Don't Produce Change. *Harvard Business Review, 68*(6), 158-166.

Busse, R. (2014). Corporate Culture, Organizational Change and Meaning at Work - Linking Human Resources with Business Ethics. *Human Systems Management*, *33*(1/2), 47-50.

Canato, A., Ravasi, D., & Phillips, N. (2013). Coerced Practice Implementation in Cases of Low Cultural Fit: Cultural Change and

Practice Adaptation During the Implementation of Six Sigma at 3M. *Academy Of Management Journal*, *56*(6), 1724-1753.

Hill, N. L., Kolanowski, A. M., Milone-Nuzzo, P., & Yevchak, A. (2011). Culture Change Models and Resident Health Outcomes in Long-Term Care. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, *43*(1), 30-40.

Kavanagh, M. H., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2006). The Impact of Leadership and Change Management Strategy on Organizational Culture and Individual Acceptance of Change During a Merger. *British Journal of Management*, *17*S81-S103.

Pfeffer, J. & Sutton, R. I. (2006). Management Half-Truths and Nonsense: How to Practice Evidence-Based Management. *California Management Review*, *48*(3), 77-100.

Ruvolo, C. & Bullis, R. (2003). Essentials of Culture Change: Lessons Learned the Hard Way. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 55*(3), 155-168.

Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational Culture. *American Psychologist, 45*(2), 109-119.

Technology and work that never ends: Detaching from the "electronic leash"

Paris Clark

In the so called "good old days", conversations that were started before leaving the house were put on hold to rush out the door for work. After work, the chair was pushed under the desk at five in the evening and the lights were turned off, it was common to unplug and go home; knowing that whatever was left unfinished would be there the next day. Boundaries between work-life and home-life were clearly defined and easy to adhere to.

Things are much different today than they were twenty years ago, to say the least. The ability to be connected at all times has blurred the boundaries between home-life and work-life. Technology is so commonplace and readily accessible that it seems to follow people everywhere. It's as though an electronic leash keeps employees continuously tied to their work. It's been argued that all of the technological advances can increase efficiency and productivity. But does the increased efficiency and productivity come at a cost?

Some would say that advances in technology have even made things easier. Imagine being at home and caring for a sick child while maintaining communication with work. Others would say that in spite of the occasional positive, there are many more negatives. The ever-present technology that demands our attention creates distractions and stress. In some workplaces, it may even reduce productivity. The possible relationship between technology and how it affects people has been the subject of numerous published research articles.

One such study conducted by Park and Jex (2011) looked at the effects of communication and information technology (CIT; emails, mobile phones) use on work-family interference. Work-family interference can be defined as blurring the lines between work-life and home-life. The research of 281 office workers provided findings suggesting that creating boundaries between work-life and home-life can be beneficial for an employee's psychological work-family interference. "As rapid advancements in CIT are expected to continue to blur the work and home domains, work-home boundary management using CIT becomes an even more salient issue for employees, employers, and researchers".

After this first study was conducted, Park, Steve, and Fritz (2011) added to the research to further study the importance of employees' need to detach from work. The researchers surveyed 431 alumni of a United States university and asked questions relating to psychological detachment, work-home segmentation preference and the use of communication technology at home. Park et al. (2011) defined segmentation as a strategy for balancing work and personal life.

_____

About the Author
Paris Clark is a student at Vanguard University of Southern California Master of Science Program in Organizational Psychology.
DOI: 10.19099/fstp.091502

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Paris Clark at
paris.clark@vanguard.edu

They hypothesized that segmenting work and non-work roles can help employees detach and recover from work demands. The study concluded that employees with a strong preference for segmenting work from home experienced greater psychological detachment during non-work time. They further found that those who saw others at work practicing a healthy work-home segmentation, reported higher levels of psychological detachment from work when outside of working hours.

Creating boundaries associated with communication and information technologies, i.e. cell phones and laptops, may be necessary to limit the stress that is felt when there is too much integration of the two. The expectation is to always be on. When employees go home, it is difficult to mentally turn off work and resist the urge to check emails and respond to them while attempting to spend "quality time" with family members.

How does this expectation affect our psychological state, and can boundaries be set to mitigate the stress and anxiety that accompany our need to always be available? Park et al. (2011) suggest that "Active segmentation by constructing impermeable technological home boundaries may be a helpful strategy for an employee who has difficulty "switching off" from work during non-work hours". Further results from their study showed that lower use of technology after work hours was associated with higher psychological detachment, i.e. turning off work when at home. It is further suggested that the creation of boundaries or segmentations can be established by communicating the boundaries to others in the workplace. It is acceptable to communicate boundaries with coworkers. If boundaries are not communicated, the lines will be blurred and coworkers will not respect those boundaries.

Another area of technology that is the subject of recent research by Thornton, Faires, Robbins, and Rollins (2014) of the University of Southern Maine, is mobile phones. The findings of their study entitled: The Mere Presence of a Cell Phone May be Distracting, was published in the Journal of Social Psychology. Thornton et al. (2014) concluded that there is a negative impact on work performance simply by having a cell phone nearby. To test this behavior, Thornton et al. (2014) and his team conducted two separate studies.

The first study was held in a laboratory setting. The participants were told that they would be taking several timed tests and attention and accuracy was imperative. Two people were "tested" together but with their backs to each other. For one participant, a cell phone was inadvertently left on the table. For the other participant, there was no cell phone left on the table. Both participants were asked to take a series of tests, some easier than others. The second study used the same measures but was performed in a classroom setting. All students in the manipulation group were asked to place their cell phones on the table while the tests were taken. In the control group, there was no mention of a cell phone. In both studies, the participants with the cell phone showed lower performance on more difficult tasks with the presence of the cell phone. Performance was not negatively impacted when the tests were easier and less cognitively demanding.

Research demonstrates that the active use of cell phones, whether talking or texting, is distracting and may contribute to diminished performance

when multi-tasking. Thornton et al. (2014) explain that the mere presence of the cell phone as being "capable of creating a distraction from the immediate task or situation at hand". If the mere presence of a cell phone at work can be distracting and may lead to decreased productivity, employers would be wise to take a look at their policies regarding cell phone use. If a policy does not exist, research seems to support the need to implement a policy.

In conclusion, technology is advancing faster than one can keep up with it. The fact that technology is so readily available throughout the entire day, has created issues with work life stealing into family time and family life seeping into the workday. Work-family interference creates distraction and can have a negative psychological effect. One answer proposed by the research to help those that experience stress associated with work-life interference is to create boundaries. Creating more boundaries around CIT use, and "getting off electronic leash" will help reduce stress. Ideally, creating a distraction- or interruption-free environment for work and family will likely be beneficial to the family and also increase work productivity.

References

Park, Y., & Jex, S. M. (2011). Work-home boundary management using communication and information technology. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *18*(2), 133-152.

Park, Y., Fritz, C., & Jex, S. M. (2011). Relationships between work-home segmentation and psychological detachment from work: The role of communication technology use at home. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *16*(4), 457-467.

Thornton, B., Faires, A., Robbins, M., & Rollins, E. (2014). The mere presence of a cell phone may be distracting: Implications for attention and task performance. *Social Psychology*, *45*(6), 479-488.

Work Flexibility, Telework, and an Evolving Workplace

Bethanie Hartung

Two and a half decades ago, the idea of working from anywhere but an office was novel. Today the internet allows to work from virtually anywhere at any time. Technology has changed the way in which people live life; it allows the rapid exchange of mass amounts of information from essentially anywhere instantaneously. Because of the rapid changes in technology, businesses have had to evolve to meet the demands of the shifting and emerging global society. An increasing number of businesses are adopting flextime, home office, or telecommuting programs. Many employees are opting to take advantage of these models. Because of the rise of employees working remotely it is important to evaluate the effectiveness of these models as compared to traditional office settings –taking into consideration variations among individuals and organizations.

First, it is important to define and understand what telecommuting is. In an earlier study by Pamela Knight and Jerry Westbrook (1999) telecommuting was defined as "employees who work predominantly outside of their home office, but are associated with a traditional office and may use a traditional office for some administrative support and to hold physical meetings." Essentially, telecommuting grants an employee within an organization the flexibility of working from home or elsewhere while allowing access to the physical office as well. Harpaz (2002) stated that an individual who telecommutes or works remotely can "structure his/her tasks and working life in many ways – dependent on the nature of the work, the organization, the customer-base, etc. The degree of remoteness is highly variable".

Telecommuting: Factoring in the Individual. Research indicates that along with the nature of the business or company, personality plays a key role in an individual's likelihood to adapt to and succeed at telecommuting. Some people are more apt to be productive under this model, whereas others work best with a specific and supervised schedule. Some individuals simply lack the ability and motivation to work independently. For example, an exploratory study by Gainey and Clenney (2006) found that personality played a role in flextime and telecommuting. The study measured the five basic dimensions of personality: extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, openness to experience, and conscientiousness. Results suggested that the trait most significantly related to the success of an individual in telecommuting was openness to experience. This finding implied that those who scored higher on openness to experience were more likely to be willing to try out various working arrangements such as telecommuting.

_____

About the Author
Bethanie Hartung is a student at Vanguard University of Southern California Master of Science Program in Organizational Psychology.
DOI: 10.19099/fstp.091503

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Bethanie Hartung at bethanie.hartung@vanguard.edu

Extraversion was also found to play a role in an individual's desire to choose or excel in telecommuting situations. Not surprisingly, extroverts were not the best match for remote working arrangements; extraverts value spending time around coworkers and/or clients regularly throughout the work week.

Research also found demographic differences relevant to individual's likelihood of telecommuting. Factors that contributed to a higher inclination towards telecommuting included number of children or dependents, such as elderly parents, marital status and age. Since telecommuting allows those with family obligations to work from home on a more flexible time schedule, it was unsurprising that the study found that older workers who were married and with children favored the option of telecommuting (Feldman & Gainey, 1997; Gainey & Clenney, 2006).

Telecommuting: Advantages. Although there are many advantages to telecommuting, some of the most supported by the research are autonomy and independence, time management, and reduction in travel time and associated stress.

Autonomy & Independence. In general, people value autonomy. By working from home, an individual is affiliated with an organization, but operates on a schedule arranged around personal life demands. Employee autonomy and independence facilitate a sense of responsibility and control. As long as work is getting done effectively and efficiently, the schedule does not matter. Individuals are able to manage their own time, ideally cutting out distractions and wasted time. Furthermore, by cutting out wasted time, employees have more time to

participate in hobbies or activities with family and friends.

Time Management. Many people in the workforce are faced with company politics, interruptions from coworkers, or other distractions that limit their ability to be as productive as possible. The option of working remotely offers individuals the ability to work comfortably from home or elsewhere with the potential of less distraction. Tunyaplin, Lunce, and Maniam (1998) summarize research which found that when away from the office, employee productivity increased between 15% and 30%, because people were able to focus on work with fewer interruptions.

Reduced Travel Time & Stress. Many employees face stress associated with commuting to and from work, often spending hours doing so. In the case of many working parents, getting to work on time must be balanced with getting children to daycare or school (Mokhtarian, Bagley, & Salomon, 1998). Studies have shown a decrease in work tardiness, absenteeism, and sick days with the incorporation of remote work settings. Additionally, stress levels and travel expenses decrease while time for leisure increases (Harpaz, 2002).

Telecommuting: Disadvantages. Research generally points to the many advantages of telecommuting. However, some of the most bothersome disadvantages across research are isolation and lack of belonging, lack of work-life separation, self-discipline issues, and lack of professional support and career development.

Isolation & Lack of Belonging. One major disadvantage of telecommuting is isolation and

lack of belonging. Older studies in the social sciences, notably by Freud (1930), Bowlby (1969), Baumeister and Leary (1995), found that belonging to a group is a basic need of individuals. Without positive and challenging group experiences on a regular basis, well-being and work effectiveness decrease (Feldman & Gainey, 1997). Numerous studies site that employees, when asked, would only choose to work from a home office a couple days a week because of a fear of social isolation. In fact, Tunyaplin, Lunce, and Maniam (1998) found that over 75% of respondents felt this way regardless of where their current workplace was. This suggests a need for belonging and interaction within a work setting, although there are individual differences in the strength of this need (Feldman & Gainey, 1997).

Work/Life Separation & Over-Availability. Although technology has allowed more flexibility in the workplace, it has also placed more demands on the individual to be available 24/7. Employees, regardless of the day or time of day are expected to be responsive at every work-related call. It is very difficult for some people to separate work and home life when they do business from home. It is important that employees working from home institute boundaries or establish a set space to work. Furthermore, some people when working from home are more apt to become addicted to their work and not know when to call it quits. This can potentially damage family or social life, increase stress levels, and decrease overall well-being (Harpaz, 2002).

Self-Discipline issues. One of the benefits of telecommuting is the autonomy and independence that goes along with it; yet it can also be a disadvantage. Some people are not as

disciplined as others and procrastinate on their work. It is also easy to become preoccupied with social events, hobbies, or other distractions when not working from an office.

Lack of Professional Support & Career Advancement. Another big concern for people working from home is the lack of exposure and interaction. This could hinder their ability to be promoted or advance in their job. Perin (1991) found a relationship between visibility and apparent participation of an employee and opportunities of promotion (Harpaz, 2002). Not being in an office regularly impedes an employee's ability to interact directly with supervisors or managers which could lead to missed training or development opportunities.

Telecommuting: The Continued Future of Business. Research provides strong evidence of benefits of telecommuting to organizations, in the form of higher productivity. It is also beneficial to individuals. At the same time, it is important to remember to carefully select individuals most suited for telecommuting, and to balance it with some "face time". Judicious use of telecommuting will help ensure the greatest success for both employers and employees.

References

Feldman, D. C., & Gainey, T. W. (1997). Patterns of telecommuting and their consequences: Framing the research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review, 7*(4), 369-388.

Gainey, T. W., & Clenney, B. F. (2006). Flextime and telecommuting: Examining individual perceptions. *Southern Business Review, 32*(1), 13-21.

Harpaz, I. (2002). Advantages and disadvantages of telecommuting for the individual, organization and society. *Work Study,51*(2), 74-80.

Knight, P. J., & Westbrook, J. (1999). Comparing employees in traditional job structures vs telecommuting jobs using herzberg's hygienes & motivators. *Engineering Management Journal, 11*(1), 15-20.

Mokhtarian, P. L., Bagley, M. N., & Salomon, I. (1998). The impact of gender, occupation, and presence of children on telecommuting motivations and constraints. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science (1986-1998), 49*(12), 1115.

Tunyaplin, S., Lunce, S., & Maniam, B. (1998). The new generation office environment: The home office. *Industrial Management + Data Systems, 98*(4), 178-183.

Organizational Culture, Leadership, and Success: cultural characteristics of thriving organizations

Shellie Nguyen

Thousands of businesses are started every day around the globe with few surviving the first few years; of these, only a handful achieves long-term success (Patil, Grantham, & Steel, 2012). A prosperous business is characterized by a number of factors such as strategic marketing (Brooksbank, Garland, & Werder, 2012), successful business networks (Besser, & Miller, 2011), shared vision, transformational leadership, advanced technology, product innovations, proactive operations (Liu, 2013), and so on. The foundation to such qualities is a healthy company culture coupled with culture-minded leadership. Unfortunately, to the detriment of organizations, many leaders often underestimate the importance and its key role in organizational success (Schein, 1996).

Organizational Culture Defined. Organizational culture integrates perspectives from social psychology, sociology, and anthropology. It is essentially "a pattern of basic assumptions that a group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration (Schein, 1983, p.14)." Subsequently, any new associates to a company are typically expected to fall in line with established beliefs (Schönborn, 2010).

Organizational Culture – An Organizational Practicality. An organization's culture determines how internal entities interact with and behave amongst one another and how the organization and its employees can reach out and connect with external forces (Nieminen, Biermeier-Hanson, & Denison, 2013). In

research and application, organizational culture was demonstrated to have an impact on job satisfaction, employee retention, organizational effectiveness (Azanza, Moriano, & Molero, 2013), organizational sustainability, employee perceptions (Aksoy, Apak, Eren, and Korkmaz, 2014), organizational collaborative network (Weare, Lichterman, & Esparza, 2014), ethics, underlying assumptions, organizational values, and norms of behaviors (Cambell & Göritz, 2014). Leaders who attempt to strategize and put in place modern management processes without thinking of a complementary organizational culture risk adverse effects on performance (Tabaghdehi & Salehi, 2015).

With a cost of turnover running from 70% to 200% of salary of each lost employee (Abbaspour & Noghreh, 2015), it is judicious for leaders to maximize retention by creating a culture that gives rise to happiness and motivation. Organizational culture and job satisfaction/employee retention have become a

_____

About the Author

Shellie Nguyen is a student at Vanguard University of Southern California Master of Science Program in Organizational Psychology.
DOI: 10.19099/fstp.091504

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Shellie Nguyen at shellie.nguyen@vanguard.edu

known and accepted association (Azanza et al., 2013), making it sensible for companies to keep turnover at a minimum by keeping employees fulfilled. In a study of 400 bank employees, Abbaspour and Noghreh (2015) showed that there is a compelling relationship between job satisfaction and organizational culture. Because shared values and beliefs ultimately drive employee commitments to one another and to the organization, the concept of organizational culture as practicality and reality needs to become a part of the mindset of management (Abbaspour & Noghreh, 2015).

Even though each culture is as unique as the works of individual artists, there are some shared underlying characteristics that leaders can consider promoting in organizational culture. Schönborn (2010) used an explorative study on organizational culture and success to identify such underlying cultural characteristics.

The study used an online questionnaire covering multi-level corporate cultural issues. The survey was administered to 2,873 employees across 46 companies. Results identified some "success-related driving forces (Schönborn, 2010, p. 240):" (1) the company and leaders keep employees motivated and satisfied, (2) the company is firmly embedded in tradition, (3) employee health is actively supported, (4) practices are based on ethical and principles, (5) experienced employees are favored, (6) there is leeway for employees to develop innovative ideas, (7) going beyond personal limits not required, while development in encouraged, (8) the company allows personal use of company equipment, (9) the company provides clearly-worded vision, and (10) different working methods are allowed (Schönborn, 2010).

Schönborn (2010) also stresses the importance of competence-providing and competence-oriented environment, and concluded that an organizational culture that produces success tends "to value higher in corporate citizenship and responsibility, an explicit orientation toward competence, involvement, and job satisfaction of the employees (Schönborn, 2010, p.240)." On the other hand, a culture that produces less success tends to stress formalization of processes and routine (Schönborn, 2010, p.240)."

References

Abbaspour, A., & Noghreh, A. (2015). Examine the relationship between organizational culture and job satisfaction of tourism bank employees in Iran. *International Journal of Academic Research*, *7*(1), 63-68.

Aksoy, M., Apak, S., Eren, E., & Korkmaz, M. (2014). Analysis of the effect or organizational learning-based organizational culture on performance, job satisfaction and efficiency: A field study in banking sector. *International Journal of Academic Research*, *6*(1), 301-313.

Azanza, G., Moriano, J. A., & Molero, F. (2013). Authentic leadership and organizational culture as drivers of employees' job satisfaction. *Revista De Psicologia Del Trabajo Y De Las Organizaciones*, *29*(2), 45-50.

Besser, T. L., & Miller, N. (2011). The structural, social, and strategic factors associated with successful business networks.

Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, *23*(3/4), 113-133.

Brooksbank, R., Garland, R., & Werder, W. (2012). Strategic marketing practices as drivers of successful business performance in British, Australian and New Zealand golf clubs. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, *12*(5), 457-475.

Campbell, J., & Göritz, A. S. (2014). Culture corrupts! A qualitative study of organizational culture in corrupt organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *120*(3), 291-311.

Nieminen, L., Biermeier-Hanson, B., & Denison, D. (2013). Aligning leadership and organizational culture: The leader–culture fit framework for coaching organizational leaders. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *65*(3), 177-198.

Patil, R., Grantham, K., & Steele, D. (2012). Business risk in early design: A business risk assessment approach. *Engineering Management Journal*, *24*(1), 35-46.

Schein, E. H. (1983). The role of the founder in creating organizational culture. *Organizational Dynamics*, *12*(1), 13-28.

Schein, E. H. (1996). Culture: The Missing Concept in Organization Studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *41*(2), 229-240.

Schönborn, G. (2010). Value performance: On the relation between corporate culture and corporate success. *Zeitschrift Für Psychologie/Journal of Psychology*, *218*(4), 234-242.

Tabaghdehi, S. L. H., & Salehi, M. (2015). Evaluating the relationship between the organizational culture and the human capital of faculty members of universities. *International Journal of Academic Research*, *7*(1), 351-355.

Weare, C., Lichterman, P., & Esparza, N. (2014). Collaboration and culture: Organizational culture and the dynamics of collaborative policy networks. *Policy Studies Journal*, *42*(4), 590-619.

Beep-Beep, I am Trying to On-Ramp: Women Returning to the Workforce

Susan A. Lindsey

While both women and men can choose to leave work for a while and focus on other areas of their lives, this is more prevalent among women (Mainiero & Sullivan 2005). Mainiero and Sullivan (2005) have discovered that women's career histories seem to be more relational in nature; women seem to make decisions about their career choices after they have considered the impact that their decisions will have on other people in their own lives. Some examples of why women decide to off-ramp or step-out include the desire to meet family needs, such as caring for an elderly parent, extended maternity leave, childcare responsibilities, and even relocation due to a spouse's job transfer.

Women that have chosen to off-ramp or take a break from their career path find on-ramping back into the workforce quite challenging. Cabrera (2007) suggests that two of these perceived barriers were the difficulty of explaining long periods of unemployment and a lack of respect for women who have taken time off from their careers. Other barriers include the lack of job skills, low networking possibilities, and low self-esteem. Cabrera (2007) discovered that women might be able to reduce some of these barriers by starting the planning for re-entry into the workforce the day that they step-out.

Research suggests that during a break from a career it is vitally important for a woman to stay well connected with others (especially with other women) and to continue to enhance her education by taking advantage of learning opportunities, attending seminars and training, or going back to school (Eby, Butts, Lockwood, 2003;

Cabera, 2006). Mentoring is one such way for women to stay connected with other women.

> "Mentoring relationships in which women are mentored by other women provide the mentees with both psychosocial and career development benefits. Mentoring relationships in which women are mentored by men are more often based on career development, lack of relational component important to many women, and fail to provide role models with which women can identify." (Schwiebert et al., pg. 251,1999)

In addition, re-entry programs designed uniquely for women are very much needed (Lovejoy & Stone, 2012). These programs serve an important purpose by helping to build a woman's eroded confidence, and provide them with much needed career counseling, skill set matches, and job training.

_____

About the Author

Susan A. Lindsey is a student at Vanguard University of Southern California Master of Science Program in Organizational Psychology. DOI: 10.19099/fstp.091505

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Susan A. Lindsey at susan.lindsey@vanguard.edu

Women's return to the workforce is often more than just a return to their previous careers; it is a

redirection. In a study conducted by Lovejoy and Stone (2011), 54 at-home mothers were interviewed to find out why most of them tended to redirect into different career paths after stepping-out of their previous careers for a period of time. The majority of the women in the study reported that they now desire a career that would combine both motherhood and work. Moreover, due to a lack of flexibility in their previous jobs, "only a handful of women planned to return to their previous employers" (Lovejoy & Stone, pg. 639, 2011). Half of the women that were interviewed stated that they intended to start a new occupation and leave their former professions all together. Findings of this study showed that during their career hiatus these women became more involved in female-dominated professions like teaching; this was due to their involvement in their children's schools and volunteer work (Lovejoy & Stone, 2011). One of the moms in the study elaborated about her shift in careers:

> "Former lawyer Maeve Turner's involvement in her children's progressive school fostered her interest in getting a master's degree in early childhood education, which she saw as a way out of the legal profession to which she was no longer committed: 'My soul isn't in it anymore. I don't feel identified with it. It's just not who I am anymore'." (Lovejoy & Stone, pg. 644, 2011)

Maeve Turner's excerpt displays the reality of many highly educated women returners that desire to redirect into a different career before they step back into the workforce after a break.

Help along the way. One valuable way to facilitate women's return to a career could be a Woman's Career Re-entry Center on a college campus. The use of female mentors or "Career Coaches" within a Woman's Career Re-entry Center would be an invaluable tool that would help to motivate, encourage, and re-direct women returners. It could be a place to find much needed skill development, education, confidence, networking, as well as mentoring. On a macro-level, the community as a whole could indeed benefit from having a larger pool of women returners with improved confidence and updated skills who are ready to enter well-respected organizations (Greer, 2013).

References

Cabrera, E. F. (2007). Opting out and opting in: Understanding the complexities of women's career transitions. *Career Development International, 12*(3), and 218-237.

Eby, L. T., Butts, M., & Lockwood, A. (2003). Predictors of success in the era of the boundaryless career. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*(6), 689-708.

Greer, T. W. (2013). Facilitating successful re-entries in the united states: Training and development for women returners. *New Horizons in Adult Education & Human Resource Development, 25*(3), 41-61.

Lovejoy, M., & Stone, P. (2012). Opting Back In: The Influence of Time at Home on Professional Women's Career Redirection after Opting Out. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *19*(6), 631-653.

Mainiero, L. A., & Sullivan, S. E. (2005). Kaleidoscope careers: An alternate explanation for the opt-out revolution. *The Academy of Management Executive, 19*(1), 106-123.