

- REVIEW ARTICLE -

THE EFFECTS OF INDUSTRY CHARACTERISTICS ON ORGANIZATIONS

Alev ÖZER TOR GALÖZ¹

Abstract

This study aims to provide a hypothetical explanation for whether industry characteristics have a significant effect on organizational culture. It is attempted to present a model about how certain characteristics contribute to the formulation of cultures. This aims to hypothesize which industrial determinants can be developed from several identified industries and how these determinants can contribute to the organizational cultural dimensions. While doing this, the hypothesized relations will be further developed in order to be able to answer 'how' and 'why' there are relations and mediation analyses will be conducted for this. This can suggest practical insight for which industries have organizational members with specific cultural dimensions and the reasons of these effects via the mediating factors.

Keywords: Organization Theory, Organizational Culture, Industry Characteristics, Industrial Similarities.

JEL Codes: L1, L10, L22, L16, M10.

Başvuru: 12.11.2020 **Kabul:** 01.10.2021

*I would like to thank the reviewers for their valuable, constructive, helpful comments and suggestions to make this paper more understandable, faultless and comprehensive.

ENDÜSTRİ ÖZELLİKLERİNİN ÖRGÜT KÜLTÜRÜ ÜZERİNE ETKİLERİ: HİPOTETİK BİR ÇALIŞMA²

Öz

Bu çalışma, endüstri özelliklerinin örgüt kültürü üzerinde önemli bir etkisi olup olmadığı konusunda hipotetik bir açıklama sunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışmada, belirli özelliklerin kültürlerin oluşumuna nasıl katkıda bulunduğu dair bir model sunmaya çalışılmaktadır. Bu çalışma, çeşitli tanımlanmış endüstrilerden hangi endüstriyel belirleyicilerin geliştirilebileceğini ve bu belirleyicilerin örgütsel kültürel boyutlara nasıl katkıda bulunabileceğini varsaymayı amaçlamaktadır. Bunu yaparken "nasıl" ve "neden" yanıtı verebilmek için varsayılmış ilişkiler daha da geliştirilecektir ve bunun için arabuluculuk analizleri yapılacaktır. Bu, hangi endüstrilerin belirli kültürel boyutlara sahip örgütsel

¹ Dr. Öğretim Üyesi, İzmir Demokrasi Üniversitesi, İ.İ.B.F, İşletme Bölümü, İzmir, TÜRKİYE.
alev.ozer@idu.edu.tr ORCID: 0000-0002-0589-1231

² Makalenin genişletilmiş Türkçe özeti, çalışmanın sonunda yer almaktadır.

üyelerinin bulunduğunu ve bu etkilerin nedenleriyle ilgili uygulamaya dönük açıklamayı sağlayabilecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Örgüt Teorisi, Örgüt Kültürü, Endüstri Özellikleri, Sektörel Benzerlikler.*

JEL Kodları: *L1, L10, L22, L16, M10*

Bu çalışma Araştırma ve Yayın Etiğine uygun olarak hazırlanmıştır.

*Makalenin değerlendirme sürecinde emeği geçen hakemlere değerli, yapıcı ve yardımcı yorum ve önerileri için teşekkür ederim.

1. INTRODUCTION

Various studies support the view that task environments affect organizational values (Deal & Kennedy, 1982: 99; Porac et al., 1989: 399; Hofstede et al., 1990: 289, Phillips, 1994: 386, Christensen & Gordon, 1999: 399). Based on reviewing these studies, in this research, it is hypothesized, that certain industry characteristics strongly affect the value dimensions that build up the organizational culture, through different dynamics. Industry characteristic that are considered in this study are part of the characteristics of the task environment and include the competitor actors in the same industry. There is large support found for this hypothesis in the literature. Gordon (1991:398) hypothetically presented the argument, that organizational culture is strongly affected by the characteristics of the industry in which the organization functions. Within industries, specific cultural characteristics can be shared among organizations, and these can be highly different from the characteristics existing in other industries. Similarly, Weiss and Delbecq (1987:42) noted that industrial cultures can affect managerial behavior through organizational ones. Here, the extent to which organizational cultures reflect and share elements form the industry's dominant culture is a major research question. Moreover, Phillips (1994: 389) stated, that strategy theorists generally focus on the industry level of analysis and suggest that commonly held mindsets exist across organizations within industries and influence strategic decision making by members of those organizations. For example, Huff (1982) and Rumelt (1979) argued that shared 'strategic frames' for the structuring of uncertainty develop within the industries. Porter (1980: 301) similarly noted that shared assumptions about strategic variables build the basis for the competitive grouping of organizations. Fombrun and Shanley (1990: 236) also suggested that cognitive constructs are shared among organizations within a given industry. Grinyer and Spender (1979) asserted that an 'industry recipe' provides the context for strategic decisions and is used by managers across firms within an industry for strategic uncertainties. Spender (1989) described the industry recipe as the business-specific perceptions of a definable group of industry experts, which is quite like a local culture (Phillips, 1994: 387).

This study aims to hypothesize which industrial determinants can be developed from several identified industries and how these determinants can contribute to the organizational cultural dimensions. While doing this, the hypothesized relations will be further developed in order to be able to answer 'how' and 'why' there are relations and mediation analyses will be conducted for this. This can provide practical insight for which industries have organizational members with specific cultural dimensions and the reasons of these effects via the mediating factors. In other words, the main aim of this research is to hypothesize a classification of the industries with respect to key dimensions and to analyze the relationship between these industry dimensions and organizational culture dimensions. The eight industries to be considered with regard to the key industrial dimensions are as FMCG, healthcare, energy, banking/finance, automotive and online services.

There are four industry characteristics to be studied, which are intensiveness (capital/labor intensive); industrial dynamism (static/dynamic), technology involvement (high/low) and speed of industrial growth (fast/slow). These four characteristics are determined as a result of literature review. Similar industry differentiation-focused studies have made use of several industry dimensions. Chatman and Jehn (1994: 529) used technology and growth as industry determinants, while Dess et al. (1990) used entry/exit barriers (industry controls) and environmental volatility as the industry effects. With regard to the theory of population ecology, Aldrich (1979: 651) identified ecology dimensions as resources available, aggregate birth/death rates, capacity (munificence), complexity, homogeneity and stability (dynamism). Dess and Beard (1984: 55) considered environmental dynamism, complexity, munificence as the dimensions of organizational task environment. There are several studies focusing on the industry environment (Duncan, 1972; Kaufman; Tolbert, Horan, & Beck, 1980) and the three most cited dimensions are mainly: complexity, dynamism and growth extent (Gordon, 1991).

With regard to the culture dimension, Weiss and Delbecq (1987) grouped cultural dimensions into three categories as; regional characteristics, industrial culture and organizational manifestations. In this classification, industrial culture includes dimensions as: entrepreneurial/conservative, formal/informal, loose/tightly coordinated, cooptative/collaborative and regulating norms. Chandler and Rumelt (1974) revealed in their study, that increasing diversification contributes to decentralized structures (Gordon, 1991: 398). Besides, Tozkoparan and Susmuş (2001: 205) applied same dimensions for both manufacturing and service industries and measured their extents. They used the dimensions as internal/external focus, work/relationship orientation, security/risk, individual similarity/diversity, individual/collective rewarding, individual/collective decision making, centrality/diversification, planning/non-planning, stability/dynamism, simple/complex, formal/informal and cooperation/competition. As another example for industry characteristics, in their study on construction industry, Giritli and Oraz (2004: 255) argued that this industry has specific characteristics different from all other industries.

2. METHODOLOGY

2. 1. Organizational Culture

Literature review on organizational culture reveals that there is no one specific definition for culture and studies so far provided various definitions. According to Hofstede (1980), culture is the collective formatting of the mind that separates the members of one human group from another. It is the interactive aggregate of common characteristics that affect a group's response to its environment. Ogbonna and Harris (2002) defined culture as the common values, beliefs and assumptions shared within a group and helping to shape the ways of response to each other and to the external environment. Similarly, Sorge (2002) identified the characteristics of organizational culture as holistic, historically determined, relating to rituals and symbols, socially constructed, and difficult to change. Moreover, Schein (1984) argued, that the main underlying assumptions of the culture determines the initial formulations of means, goals, missions and strategies, of which only group members are familiar.

Why it is valuable to study the antecedents of organizational culture has a number of explanations with respect to the significance of culture. According to Schein (1999: 21), “culture is a powerful, latent, and often unconscious set of forces that determine both our individual and collective behavior, ways of perceiving, thought patterns, and values”. Detert et al. (2000: 852) stated that “a shared vision and shared goals are necessary for organizational success. All employees should be involved in decision making and in supporting the shared vision”. As argued by Saffold (1988: 547), “strong, powerful cultures have been hailed as keys to improved performance. Deal & Kennedy (1982) asserted that “strong culture has almost always been the driving force behind continued success in American business”. Strong cultures have been defined as homogeneous (Ouchi & Price, 1978), stable and more intense (Schein, 1984), thick and widely shared (Sathe, 1983), cohesive and tight-knit (Deal & Kennedy, 1983), characterized by congruent rule-based expectations (Schall, 1983), fully articulated and highly differentiated (Schein, 1985), and coherent (Weick, 1985)”.

The relation of organizational culture to environment is also largely held within the literature. The relation to industrial characteristics is implied in the sense that culture permeates the decision-making and problem-solving processes by affecting the means, manners and goals, underlining activities and providing motivation and satisfaction (Williams et al., 1993). Ashforth (1985: 838) pointed out that “culture determines both what features of organizational settings are considered relevant by members and also the standards used to evaluate these features”. There is also the view that a reciprocal relationship exists between organizational culture and the environment. Culture helps organizations to adapt to the environment through processes of sense making (Weick, 1976) and shaping internal processes of decision making (Shrivastava, 1985).

Culture is also commonly considered as a type of control mechanism (Halfhill, Betts, & Hearnberger (1989); Kilmann & Saxton (1991); Quinn & Rohrbaugh (1983)). In a similar vein, organizational culture affects behavior effectively (Faux, 1982) and helps to remove those who do not fit in that organization (Sathe, 1983). Moreover, Hatch (1993: 659) stated, that performance meetings, productivity reports and offices are acceptable ideas in a culture emphasizing control. Ideas about control, coordination, and responsibility exist almost in all frameworks of organizational culture. Organizations have different versions of control whether concentrated (usually at the top) or shared (Beyer, 1998; Hofstede et al., 1990; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). Where control is concentrated, there are formalized rules and procedures set by management, with the intention to guide the behavior of the majority (Smart & St. John, 1996).

In line with this research's study focus of culture, Gordon (1991) argued that the strategy literature has focused basically on industry influences, while the culture literature has emphasized more the influences of company founders. Accordingly, future research might be conducted on identifying the relative impact that founders versus industry characteristics have on culture formation as well as the later impact of the environmental change. Barthorpe et al. (2000) argued that studies by Hofstede (1980), Peters and Waterman (1982), and Kanter (1989) regarded culture within a broader perspective rather than mere individual organizations and included also industrial dimensions. For these reasons, this current study focuses on the industrial effects on organizational culture.

2.1.1. Organizational Culture Dimensions

Various studies in the literature have applied different typologies for organizational culture. Handy (1993: 67) developed four categories for organizational culture as club culture, role culture, task culture and existential culture. Similarly, Cameron and Quinn (1996) provided a classification as clan/group culture, adhocracy culture, market/rational culture, hierarchy culture. In their study, O'Reilly et al. (1991) provided various organizational culture dimensions such as innovation, attention-to-detail, outcome-orientation, emphasis on rewards, team orientation and decisiveness. Haffar et al. (2014) provided four types as group, hierarchical, developmental and rational culture with regard to flexibility/control and internal/external dimensions.

In this study, culture is regarded as the composition of the six dimensions developed by Hofstede, as process- vs. results-oriented, employee- vs. job-oriented, parochial vs. professional, open vs. closed system, loose vs. tight control and normative vs. pragmatic.

2.2. Industry Dimensions

The analyses of these industry dimensions mainly assert that organizations within specific industries can share some common characteristics and these commonalities can be grouped under specific dimensions. Huff (1982: 121) argued that an industry can be defined by shared metaphors or perceptions. Many studies (e.g., Chatman & Jehn 1994; Gordon, 1991) have

revealed that organizations within an industry share distinct cultural values and the commonalities between these companies are not random but arise from similar industry demands. In line with this, in her study on industry mindsets, Phillips (1994) focused on between-industry heterogeneity and within-industry homogeneity, proposing that industry-level common mindsets are established within each industry. Aldrich and Fiol (1994) mentioned about this industry effect as a cognitive type of legitimacy with an intra-industry level of analysis and stated that organizations develop knowledge base by encouraging homogeneity around a common design. Furthermore, in their study Porac et al. (1989) identified competitive groups as cognitive communities.

There is a large theoretical support for the idea of industry-based mindsets in the literatures of institutional theory, organization behavior, and strategy (Phillips, 1994). In his study, Gordon (1991) suggested that for an organization to survive, certain assumptions required by the industry are necessary to build on, and that certain values emerge from these assumptions. Christensen and Gordon (1999) mentioned the same point, that some cultural values and associated practices are possibly regarded as a precondition for survival in a specific industry. Gordon (1985) further argued that organizational cultures develop from the adaptation of organizations to the requirements of the environments. Since organizations in an industry share several common influences, there emerge similarities in their cultures as well. Pizam (1993) also revealed in his study that industries as mining, electronics, restaurants and hotels reflect common cultures within themselves.

In addition, Deal and Kennedy (1982) pointed to the effects of the environment on organizational culture and identified the environment with two factors as the degree of organizational activities and the speed of getting feedback on decisions and strategies. Weiss and Delbecq (1987) argued that differences between organizational cultures exist mainly across industries rather than among organizations within same industries. Furthermore, Gagliardi (1986: 119) stated that industry-driven assumptions create consistent value systems that prevent organizations from conflicting with these assumptions when developing strategies and structures. Besides, Reynolds (1986) found several cultural differentiations for organizations in various industries.

Spender (1989) suggested the existence of 'industry recipes', which are the shared responses to the managerial uncertainties in that specific industry. These recipes mostly consist of well-known assumptions that Schein (1992) described as the underlying values of the organizational culture (Christensen & Gordon, 1999: 401). Spender (1989: 39) was among the first ones calling the industrial characteristics that contribute to an understanding of industry culture as 'industry recipe'. The idea behind industry recipe helps to clarify the suggested relationship between the industry characteristics and organizational culture dimensions hypothesized in this study. As stated in Grinyer and Spender (1979: 117), based on Schutz's (1972) and Simon's (1962) leading statements, the industry's pattern of managerial belief can be called a 'recipe'. When this recipe can be made explicit, management develops a way of evaluating own judgments and beliefs with regard to a wider pattern considered reasonable by

others in the same industry. Hatten's work in the U.S. brewing industry is an example of the fruitfulness of such an industry-level analysis. Matthyssens et al. (2006: 752) have also compared five industries as printing, food ingredients, traffic management systems, truck and trailer and energy management systems and provided items for industry recipes as: price as competitive weapon, efficiency and scale, technology, commoditization, willingness to innovate and invest, reactive behavior, proactive behavior, power play in chain, marketing focus, cooperation between levels of supply chain, and service differentiation. The collective mindset for each industry can be methodologically identified. Here, the concepts of the dominant logic (Prahalad & Bettis, 1986) and the industry recipe (Spender, 1989) are referred to, which are widely shared by managers of different organizations in the same industry. Their mental models shape perceptions and influence decision-making processes and outcomes, which can be related to organizational culture (Matthyssens, et al., 2006).

A further support for the industry effects is found under the concept of industry macro-cultures. Generally, management theorists define organizational culture as relatively idiosyncratic, organization-related beliefs that are shared within an organization (Meyerson & Martin, 1987: 627). Abrahamson and Fombrun (1994: 730) described this as the major focus the field has with regard to organizational micro-cultures and distinguished it from what they termed 'inter-organizational macro-cultures', with which the relatively idiosyncratic, organization-related beliefs that are shared among managers across organizations is considered. Besides, Abrahamson and Fombrun (1994: 731) added that not only does the homogeneity of beliefs within an industry-level macro-culture inhibit adaptation by organizational members to their environments, but it also affects how inventions arise and how easily and completely they can disseminate. In this regard, it is important to elaborate this 'how' dimension, as in this current research. Ogbonna and Harries (2002: 39) argued in their study, by assessing separate change programs spaced ten years apart, that their research analyzed the similarities and differences in the rationale, form, substance and impacts of two separate culture change initiatives in the same macro-culture spaced ten years apart. Their analyses suggested a number of implications for organizational culture research. In particular, they argued that researchers examining organizational culture need to devote significantly greater attention towards studying the effects of industry macro-cultures. In their research, Abrahamson and Fombrun (1994: 732) had also referred to what is termed inter-organizational 'macro-cultures', that are shared beliefs by managers across organizations. More specifically, they proposed that value-added networks linking organizations into collectivities reflect the existence of possible homogeneous macro-cultures. These homogeneous macro-cultures influence the inventiveness of organizations and the diffusion of innovations among them and increase the similarity of member organizations' general profiles.

Several empirical studies provide support for the abovementioned ideas. Phillips (1994) also argued that industry mindsets have great potential for fruitful empirical research. Sorge (2002) stated that four of the six dimensions are affected by the job and market of the organization.

Accordingly, these four dimensions partly reflect the industry culture and an industry has certain occupations and maintains particular practices. For example, results of an empirical study yielded that most organizations in the manufacturing industries revealed as process-oriented; whereas service industry members scored results-oriented. Organizations adopting traditional technologies scored as parochial, while high-tech organizations scored as professional. Furthermore, organizations producing risky outcomes scored tight control, whereas those with innovative activities scored loose control. And finally, service organizations scored pragmatic while organizations with high regulations scored normative (Sorge, 2002). Moreover, in his study of three British industries, Spender (1989) provided a significant degree of homogeneity among the perceptions by managers in each industry. Similarly, in a study of environmental scanning in three industries, Hambrick (1982: 162) stated, that a common knowledge exists within an industry which is diffused through media available to and used by all executives within the same industry. More recently, studies revealed macro-cultures in various sectors, e.g., among small-city retailers (Gripsrud & Gronhaug, 1985); U.S. airlines (Marcus & Goodman, 1986); and steel manufacturers (Stubbard & Ramaprasad, 1988).

There are other different uses of industrial typologies in the literature. For example, in their study, Dess and Beard (1984) also focused on the size and composition of board of directors, executive recruitment and succession and also inter-organizational transactions as the dimensions of organizational task environment. For a comparative study, Daft et al. (1988) analyzed the sectors in the task environment and the sectors in the general environment as the environmental characteristics study. In this current research, we will focus only on the task environment and the environmental characteristics mentioned will refer to the ones in the task environment. While the study by Chatman and Jehn (1994) related industry differences to growth and technology, Christensen and Gordon (1999) argued that these cultural differences can be associated with broader industrial requirements. At this point, this study aims to focus on these relations more deeply with mediating variables.

2.3. Mediating Variables

A similar mediation analysis was conducted by Weiss and Delbecq (1987: 41), a mediating factor of characterization of industrial culture for the relationship between regional characteristics (geography, economics, politics, technology) and organizational manifestations such as policies, rituals, structures and management orientation, which are part of the organizational culture.

With regard to the level of innovation factor as a mediating variable, Pennings and Harianto (1992) stated, that innovation in organizations is a result of the practices and competencies which organizations have accumulated throughout their history. Similarly, Gordon (1991) stated, that industries which develop high growth rates adopt values of innovation and risk tolerance to benefit from possible growth opportunities. In line with these, Shaw et al. (2005) argued that differences can be discerned between industries (Phillips 1994, Christensen &

Gordon 1999) and these can also cause differences in innovation adoption in the same way that some studies identified industry culture as a factor for explaining differences in organizational performance.

Leadership type is also suggested as a mediating factor in this current study. The literature provides support for the argument that managerial/leader beliefs are important for 'how to do's. Mental maps of decision-makers and how those maps contribute to a particular interpretation (Porac et al, 1989: 399) can also be considered as a mediating factor for the industry-organization relations. In this regard, Porac et al. (1989) identified beliefs and identity to lead managers to define organizational boundaries and develop meaning for interactions within these boundaries. They showed how such beliefs both cause and result from specific choices about how to execute organizational functions, and suggested that such beliefs are reinforced by a mutual process in which organizational choices determine the flow of information back to decision-makers, and thus affect their perception of the industry to an already developed one. In a similar vein, Giritli and Oraz (2004) noted, that the environment in which leadership is executed also influences the leadership style of managers.

According to Naum (2001), large investments with complex decisions can require specific leadership styles, arguing that a participative leadership would be more appropriate than a directive type for a bureaucratic organization. Similarly, Nicholas (1990) argues that a less participative and more directing style can be more appropriate when there is high pressure and short time to complete a job. There is an assumption in the literature, that organizational decision-making and behavior derives from how the environment is perceived by the leadership applied in the organizations (Downey & Slocum 1975; Schmidt & Kochan 1977). Gordon (1991) argued that once an organization is established, basic necessary assumptions for its long-run survival are adopted by the employees and owners, and then is it these assumptions that build the organizational culture. Spender provided empirical evidence supporting the idea that important patterns of managerial perceptions exist at the industry level. For example, this is observed on the relative ease with which executives can work within an industry, but the greater difficulty when switching industries (Grinyer & Spender, 1979: 117). Porac et al. (1989: 401) interestingly presented in their study how the structure of the relevant industry both determines and is determined by managerial perceptions of the environment. As stated by Pablo (1999: 96), strategic management scholars noted that the decision criteria used and their influences on strategic decision making can differ for industries (Hitt & Tyler, 1991: 331), and also that industry 'recipes' (Spender, 1989) may add to the development of specific managerial orientations. Those recipes establish a framework for decision making, that define for specific industries, as to how the information should be interpreted and the relevance to be evaluated. These recipes and judgments (e.g., beliefs about risk taking (Donaldson & Lorsch, 1983) are critical to understand management's response to the environmental uncertainty (Spender, 1989). Dosi (1982) argued that economic, institutional, and social factors drive the development of technological paradigms within

industries. In this regard, level of technology can be proposed as a mediating variable in the relationship between the industry and the organization.

The level of regulations is also considered as a mediating variable in this current research design. In this regard, Christensen and Gordon (1999) articulated that “for instance, in order to compete effectively, organizations in an industry that is subject to a great deal of government regulation may be forced to respond by concentrating upon documenting and justifying activities. In this situation, there is so little variation among companies that a correlation of this cultural aspect with an external variable, such as performance, may be so constrained as to be indiscernible”. Besides, Cockrell and Stone (2010: 843) also conducted a mediation analysis on the relationship between industry culture and pseudo-knowledge sharing for the industries of finance, insurance, real estate and higher education.

Task complexity: For measuring task complexity, scale developed by Hitt and Middlemist (1978: 49) will be used for the industry as well, taking the following criteria into consideration:

- Complete personal discretion is given to employees in accomplishing the task.
- For doing most of the things required by the tasks, there are standardized procedures which must be followed.
- Most of the things in this job are routine and repetitive.
- The overall complexity of the objectives, assignments and tasks are quite high.

2.4. Industrial Characteristics Dimensions

2.4.1. Intensiveness

Labor intensive industries are generally regarded as low-technology manufacturing work. (e.g. Scott, 2006: 1520); whereas construction field is a major example for capital intensive industries (Giritli & Oraz, 2004: 255).

2.4.2. Industrial Dynamism

The static-dynamic dimension indicates the extent to which the factors of the environment remain the same for a long time or in a continuous change. Measurement for static/dynamic categorization was made by ‘asking respondents how often each of the factors that they identified as being important in decision making in their internal and/or external environment change’ and ‘by asking respondents of a given decision unit how often they consider new and different factors in decision making’. The response categories varied along the five-point Likert scale (Duncan, 1972: 316).

2.4.3. Technology Involvement

According to Chatman and Jehn (1994: 531), one of the most important commonalities among companies in the same industry is the technology in use. In line with this, Thompson and Bates (1957: 329) argued that as the technology applied becomes elongated, organization will have less control over the total technological process. Similarly, Pennings and Harianto

(1992: 359) stated that companies operating in industries with intensive technologies can have highly innovative cultures, as jobs would demand non-routine problem solving. Furthermore, “long-linked organizations have little demand for discretion, mediating organizations require some discretion in standardizing procedures, and intensive technologies require a great deal of discretion. Similarly, Hitt and Middlemist (1978) showed, that technological complexity increases from long-linked through mediating to intensive technologies” (Chatman & Jehn, 1994: 532). Accordingly, technology involvement is defined by Hitt and Middlemist (1978: 49) with three dimensions as time perspective, goal specificity and task complexity.

2.4.4. Growth Speed

As stated by Gordon (1985), industry growth can relate to organizational culture. For example, growth can influence organizational culture by increasing innovation and risk tolerance (Gordon, 1991). Studies by Harrison and Carroll (1991) and Zammuto and O'Connor (1992) revealed that industry growth should affect the extent to which organizations try to strategically manage complexities, which in turn are reflected in organizational culture.

3. RESULTS

The hypothesized relations in this study have been derived from a number of studies in the organizational culture area as stated previously. (e.g., Deal Kennedy, 1982; Porac et al., 1989: 399; Hofstede et al., 1990: 289) There are four models with regard to the four hypotheses that build up the relationship between the industrial dimensions and organizational cultural dimensions.

- 1) Intensiveness (capital/labor) → Leadership → Orientation (job/employee)
- 2) Environmental dynamism (static/dynamic) → Innovation → Control (tight/loose)
- 3) Technology involvement (high/low) → Task Complexity → Orientation (results/process)
- 4) Growth speed (fast/slow) → Regulations → Pragmatic/normative

As seen in the model, it is hypothesized in this study, that there is an assumed relationship between certain industry determinants and organizational values building up the culture.

H1: Industrial intensiveness determines organizational orientation of job vs. employee.

H1a: Organizations operating in capital intensive industries have job-oriented cultures.

H1b: Organizations operating in labor-intensive industries have employee-oriented cultures.

H2: Industrial dynamism determines organizational control culture.

H2a: Organizations operating in static industries have tight control cultures.

H2b: Organizations operating in dynamic industries have loose control cultures.

H3: Industrial technology-involvement determines organizational orientation of results vs. process.

H3a: Organizations operating in industries with high technology involvement have results-oriented cultures.

H3b: Organizations operating in industries with low technology involvement have process-oriented cultures.

H4: Industrial growth speed determines organizational perspective of pragmatic vs. normative.

H4a: Organizations operating in fast growing industries have pragmatic cultures.

H4b: Organizations operating in slow growing industries have normative cultures.

H5: Leadership type mediates the relationship between industrial intensiveness and organizational orientation.

H6: Innovation mediates the relationship between industry dynamism and organizational control culture.

H7: Task complexity mediates the relationship between industrial technology involvement and organizational orientation of results vs. process.

H8: The extent of regulations mediates the relationship between organizational perspective of pragmatic vs. normative.

There are studies on the existence of industry-specific cultures (e.g., Hofstede et al., 1990: 288; Chatman & Jehn, 1994: 527; Gordon, 1991: 401). Chatman and Jehn (1994: 528) mainly argued that “firms in industries characterized by intensive technologies should have cultures characterized by high levels of innovation, since projects require non-routine problem solving (Pennings & Harianto, 1992), and by a strong team orientation, since such ill-structured tasks are more likely to require that members collaborate to solve problems (e.g., Kanter, 1988). Opportunities for growth may, similarly, influence innovation (Gordon, 1985; Rosner, 1968) and a firm's desire to be unique or rare (Barney, 1986). For example, high growth rates increased innovation and flexibility among high- technology firms in Silicon Valley (Saxenian, 1990)”. In a similar study, Tepeci and Bartlett (2002: 159) developed a culture profile and then analyzed the relationship. Accordingly, “first, an instrument to assess organizational culture and individual values in hospitality organizations — the hospitality industry culture profile — was developed. Then, the instrument was used to measure the roles of organizational culture, individual values, and the fit between the two (person–organization fit) on hospitality employees’ job satisfaction and behavioral intentions”. This study considers the relationship between industrial characteristics commonly observed for several industries and organizational culture dimensions, by trying to provide theoretical explanations for how this relationship develops.

4. DISCUSSION

This study proposes that several industrial characteristics can affect organizations, their cultures, and orientations. According to the first hypothesis, the capital or labor intensiveness of its industry affects organization’s orientation to either job or employee. According to Dobrosavljević (2019), there is a need for more attention to the investigation of organizational

culture with regard to managing labor-intensive processes. Besides, the fifth hypothesis suggests that this relationship can be explained via the leader's behavior. In other words, this hypothesis suggests that in labor intensive industries, organizations adopt more employee-oriented cultures, and this happens through the employee-oriented management of the leader, as the leader behaves strategically. This is due to the expectation that managerial style in an employee-oriented culture would be caring for employees (Hofstede et al., 1990).

A reserach by Parveen et al. (2015) revealed that there is an association between innovation and organizational culture. The second hypothesis suggests that the dynamism of the industry contributes to the extent of adoption of control culture by an organization, and according to the hypothesis 6, this association can be explained with decreased or increased levels of innovation required. Accordingly, in dynamic environments where the speed of change is high, organizations would need to have looser control mechanisms so that employees would have more incentives to make decision and act, especially in change times and respond to the change more easily. Several studies within the literature (e.g., Caldwell & O'Reilly, 2003; Mumford et al., 2002) argue that when employees perceive discretion and feel control over their own work, they tend to produce more innovative outcomes. This study further suggests that the need for an increased innovation may lead to loose control culture for an organization, so that innovative practices continue. The mediating role of innovation here is that the transforming effect of dynamic industries on control behavior of organizations functions with the need to innovate.

According to the third hypothesis, the technology-involvement level of the industry affects the orientation of the organization to either results or process and the hypothesis 7 suggests that it is the complexity of the task competed by the organization, or common within the industry, that explains this relationship. Complexity is related with the nature of job, for example outputs (Scott, 2003). Accordingly, it is expected more complex tasks can contribute to a more results-oriented culture, and that high technology involved industries can lead to task complexity.

Hypothesis 4 posits that the speed of growth within the industry contributes to the development of an organizational culture of pragmatic or normative qualities. In companies within fast growing industries, employees are driven by common goals and united by strong bonds (Rashid et al., 2004). According to the last hypothesis of this study, to what extent the industry is regulated mediates this suggested relationship and explains the mechanism. Fast growing industries would lead to pragmatic organizational culture and low levels of regulations would mediate, as in pragmatic cultures, there are less rules and regulations due to the need to satisfy the changing customer needs (Raza et al., 2013).

All suggested hypotheses in this study are open for a following quantitative study. Future studies can be conducted to test the suggested relations between the constructs of the study. For a further quantitative study, intra-industry homogeneity and inter-industry distinctiveness

with regard to the specified industry dimensions should be the key concern for choosing the industries to be studied. In their industry-based study, Hofstede et al. (1990: 289) used industries as: electronics, chemicals, banking, transportation, trade and telecommunications. There are various dimensions applied in a number of other studies. For example, Williams and Seaman (2001: 447) used manufacturing, industrial and service-oriented sectors. To identify culturally relevant industry types, Christensen and Gordon (1999) applied their study to the industries of paper products, chemical products, primary metals, fabricated metals industry, industrial machinery, electronic, communications, electric and gas, depository institutions and insurance. In their mediation analysis study on the influences of industry culture, Cockrell and Stone (2010: 843) used industries of finance, insurance, real estate and higher education. For the between-industry heterogeneity, Phillips (1994: 387) used the differentiations as service/manufacturing; capital-intensive/labor-intensive; for profit/non-profit; private-public. Reynolds (1986: 335) applied his culture scales study to computer services (software), franchised restaurants and advanced technology industries. Furthermore, in their study on organizational culture, Tozkoparan and Susmuş (2001: 206) used production and service industries for comparison purpose. Moreover, there are studies on capital intensive – great deal of planning vs. less capital intensive – more innovative, national banks vs. foreign banks and private sectors vs. public sectors.

Major contribution of this study can be argued as being the first one relating several industry characteristics to organizational dynamics. This can help to explain why organizations operating within the same industry can build up a cluster and act in similar ways with regard to specific dimensions.

CONCLUSION

This study provides a theoretical explanation for the potential effects of industry characteristics on organizations and their cultures. It is hypothesized, that certain industry characteristics contribute to the formulation of cultural factors. Accordingly, it is contended that industrial capital or labor intensiveness can determine organizational orientation with regard to job or employee. Secondly, it is posited that dynamism of the environments where the organizations operate can shape organizations' control types whether tight or loose. Thirdly, technology involvement of the industry can affect the orientation of the organizations to either results or process. Finally, it is suggested that the growth speed of the industry can influence the organization about being either pragmatic or normative.

ENDÜSTRİ ÖZELLİKLERİNİN ÖRGÜT KÜLTÜRÜ ÜZERİNE ETKİLERİ: HİPOTETİK BİR ÇALIŞMA

1. GİRİŞ

Görev ortamlarının örgütsel değerleri etkilediği görüşünü destekleyen çok sayıda çalışma vardır (Deal ve Kennedy, 1982: 99; Porac vd., 1989: 399; Hofstede vd., 1990: 289, Phillips, 1994: 386, Chatman & Jehn, 1994: 527, Christensen & Gordon, 1999: 399). Bu araştırmalara dayanarak, bu çalışmada, belirli endüstri özelliklerinin farklı dinamikler aracılığıyla örgüt kültürünü oluşturan değer boyutlarını güçlü bir şekilde etkilediği varsayılmaktadır. Bu çalışmada ele alınan sektör özellikleri, görev ortamının özelliklerinin bir parçasıdır ve aynı sektördeki rakip aktörleri içerir. Literatürde bu hipotez için büyük destek bulunmuştur. Gordon (1991:398), örgüt kültürünün, örgütün faaliyet gösterdiği endüstrinin özelliklerinden güçlü bir şekilde etkilendiği argümanını varsayımsal olarak sundu. Endüstriler içinde belirli kültürel özellikler kuruluşlar arasında paylaşılacak ve bunlar diğer endüstrilerde var olan özelliklerden oldukça farklı olacaktır. Benzer şekilde, Weiss ve Delbecq (1987:42), endüstriyel kültürlerin, bireysel kültürler aracılığıyla kuruluşların yönetim davranışlarını ve uygulamalarını etkileyebileceğini belirtmiştir. Burada, örgüt kültürlerinin endüstrinin baskın kültürünü oluşturan unsurları ne ölçüde yansıttığı ve paylaştığı önemli bir araştırma sorusudur. Ayrıca, Phillips (1994: 389), strateji teorisyenlerinin genellikle endüstri analiz düzeyine odaklandıklarını ve endüstrilerdeki organizasyonlar arasında yaygın olarak benimsenen zihniyetlerin var olduğunu ve bu organizasyonlardaki bireylerin stratejik karar vermelerini etkilediğini öne sürdüklerini belirtti. Örneğin, Huff (1982: 120) ve Rumelt (1979: 199), endüstrilerde belirsizliğin yapılandırılması için paylaşılan “stratejik çerçevelerin” geliştiğini savundu. Porter (1980: 301) benzer şekilde, stratejik değişkenler hakkında paylaşılan varsayımların, organizasyonların rekabetçi gruplandırılması için temel oluşturduğunu belirtti. Fombrun ve Shanley (1990: 236) ayrıca bilişsel yapıların belirli bir endüstri içindeki organizasyonlar arasında paylaşıldığını öne sürmüştür. Grinyer ve Spender (1979: 116) ve Spender (1989: 24), bir “endüstri reçetesinin” stratejik kararlar için bağlam sağladığını ve bir sektördeki firmalar arasında yöneticiler tarafından stratejik belirsizlikler için kullanıldığını iddia etti. Spender (1989), endüstri reçetesini, yerel bir kültüre çok benzeyen, tanımlanabilir bir endüstri uzmanları grubunun işletmeye özgü algıları olarak tanımlamıştır (Phillips, 1994: 387).

2. YÖNTEM

Bu çalışma, endüstri özelliklerinin örgüt kültürü üzerinde önemli bir etkisi olup olmadığı konusunda hipotetik bir açıklama sunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışmada, belirli özelliklerin kültürlerin oluşumuna nasıl katkıda bulunduğuna dair bir model sunmaya çalışılmaktadır. Bu çalışma, çeşitli tanımlanmış endüstrilerden hangi endüstriyel belirleyicilerin geliştirilebileceğini ve bu belirleyicilerin örgütsel kültürel boyutlara nasıl katkıda

bulunabileceğini varsaymayı amaçlamaktadır. Bunu yaparken “nasıl” ve “neden” yanıtı verebilmek için varsayılmış ilişkiler daha da geliştirilecektir ve bunun için arabuluculuk analizleri yapılacaktır. Bu, hangi endüstrilerin belirli kültürel boyutlara sahip örgütsel üyelerinin bulunduğu ve bu etkilerin nedenleriyle ilgili uygulamaya dönük açıklamayı sağlayabilecektir.

3. BULGULAR

Bu çalışma, çeşitli endüstriyel özelliklerin organizasyonları, kültürlerini ve yönelimlerini etkileyebileceğini öne sürmektedir. Birinci hipoteze göre, endüstrisinin sermaye veya emek yoğunluğu, organizasyonun işe veya çalışana yönelimini etkiler ve beşinci hipotez, bu ilişkinin liderin davranışı ile açıklanabileceğini öne sürer. Başka bir deyişle, bu hipotez emek yoğun endüstrilerde örgütlerin daha çok çalışan odaklı kültürleri benimsediğini ve bunun liderin stratejik davrandığı için çalışan odaklı yönetimi yoluyla gerçekleştiğini ileri sürmektedir. Bu, çalışan odaklı bir kültürde yönetim tarzının çalışanları önemseyeceği beklentisinden kaynaklanmaktadır (Hofstede vd., 1990).

İkinci hipotez, endüstrinin dinamizminin bir organizasyonun kontrol kültürünün benimsenmesine katkıda bulunduğunu ve hipotez 6'ya göre bu ilişkilendirmenin, gerekli inovasyon seviyelerinin azalması veya artmasıyla açıklanabileceğini öne sürmektedir. Buna göre, değişim hızının yüksek olduğu dinamik ortamlarda, çalışanların özellikle değişim zamanlarında karar verme ve hareket etme konusunda daha fazla teşvik sahibi olabilmeleri ve değişime daha kolay cevap verebilmeleri için kuruluşların daha gevşek kontrol mekanizmalarına sahip olmaları gerekecektir. Burada inovasyonun aracılık rolü, dinamik endüstrilerin örgütlerin kontrol davranışları üzerindeki dönüştürücü etkisinin inovasyon ihtiyacı ile birlikte işlev görmesidir.

Üçüncü hipoteze göre, endüstrinin teknoloji katılım düzeyi, organizasyonun sonuçlara veya sürece yönelimini etkiler ve hipotez 7, organizasyon tarafından rekabet edilen veya endüstride yaygın olan görevin karmaşıklığı olduğunu öne sürer. bu ilişkiyi açıklar.

Hipotez 4, sektördeki büyüme hızının, pragmatik veya normatif niteliklere sahip bir organizasyon kültürünün gelişimine katkıda bulunduğunu varsaymaktadır. Bu çalışmanın son hipotezine göre, endüstrinin ne ölçüde düzenlendiği, önerilen bu ilişkiye aracılık etmekte ve mekanizmayı açıklamaktadır.

4. TARTIŞMA

Çalışma, tanımlanmış çeşitli endüstrilerden hangi endüstriyel belirleyicilerin geliştirilebileceğini ve bu belirleyicilerin örgütsel kültürel boyutlara nasıl katkıda bulunabileceğini varsaymayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu yapılırken, ilişkilerin “nasıl” ve “neden” olduğuna cevap verebilmek için varsayımsal ilişkiler daha da geliştirilecek ve bunun için aracılık analizleri yapılacaktır. Bu, hangi endüstrilerin belirli kültürel boyutlara sahip organizasyon üyelerine sahip olduğu ve bu etkilerin sebepleri için aracı faktörler aracılığıyla

pratik bilgiler sağlayabilir. Başka bir deyişle, bu araştırmanın temel amacı, sektörlerin kilit boyutlara göre bir sınıflandırmasını varsaymak ve bu endüstri boyutları ile örgüt kültürü boyutları arasındaki ilişkiyi analiz etmektir. Temel endüstriyel boyutlar açısından incelenecek ve analiz edilecek sekiz sektör, hızlı tüketim malları, sağlık, enerji, bankacılık/finans, danışmanlık, imalat, hizmet, otomotiv ve çevrimiçi hizmetler olarak planlanmaktadır. Bu çalışmadaki tüm öneriler, sonraki nicel bir çalışmaya açıktır. Araştırmanın yapıları arasında önerilen ilişkileri test etmek için gelecekte araştırmalar yapılabilir. Daha ileri bir nicel çalışma için, belirtilen endüstri boyutlarına ilişkin endüstri içi homojenlik ve endüstriler arası ayırt edicilik, çalışılacak endüstrilerin seçiminde temel endişe olmalıdır.

Çalışmanın en önemli katkısı, çeşitli endüstri özelliklerini örgütsel dinamiklerle ilişkilendiren ilk çalışma olduğu söylenebilir. Bu, aynı sektörde faaliyet gösteren kuruluşların neden bir küme oluşturup belirli boyutlara göre benzer şekilde hareket edebildiklerini açıklamaya yardımcı olabilir.

Bu çalışmada önerilen tüm hipotezler, bir sonraki nicel çalışmaya açıktır. Araştırmanın yapıları arasında önerilen ilişkileri test etmek için gelecekte çalışmalar yapılabilir. Daha ileri bir nicel çalışma için, belirtilen endüstri boyutlarıyla ilgili olarak endüstri içi homojenlik ve endüstriler arası ayırt edicilik, çalışılacak endüstrilerin seçiminde temel endişe olmalıdır.

SONUÇ

Bu çalışma, endüstri özelliklerinin organizasyonlar ve kültürleri üzerindeki potansiyel etkileri için teorik bir açıklama sunmaktadır. Bazı endüstri özelliklerinin kültürel faktörlerin formüle edilmesine katkıda bulunduğu varsayılmaktadır. Buna göre, endüstriyel sermayenin veya emek yoğunluğunun, iş veya çalışan açısından örgütsel yönelimi belirleyebileceği ileri sürülmektedir. İkinci olarak, kuruluşların faaliyet gösterdiği ortamların dinamizminin, kuruluşların sıkı veya gevşek kontrol türlerini şekillendirebileceği varsayılmaktadır. Üçüncüsü, endüstrinin teknoloji katılımı, kuruluşların sonuçlara veya sürece yönelimini etkileyebilir. Son olarak, endüstrinin büyüme hızının organizasyonu hem pragmatik hem de normatif olma konusunda etkileyebileceği ileri sürülmektedir.

REFERENCES

- Abrahamson, E. & Fombrun C. J. (1994). Macrocultures: determinants and consequences, *Academy of Management Review*, 19(4).
- Aldrich, H. E. & Fiol C. M. (1994). Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation, *Academy of Management Review*, 19(4).
- Ashforth, B. E. (1985). Climate formation: Issues and extensions, *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 837-847.
- Barthorpe, S., Duncan, R. & Miller C. (2000). The pluralistic facets of culture and its impact on construction, *Property Management*, 18(5).
- Beugelsdijk S., Koen, C. I. & Noorderhaven N. G. (2006). Organizational culture and relationship skills, *Organization Studies*, 27.
- Boter, H. & Holmquist C. (1996). Industry characteristics and internationalization processes in small firms. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 11(6).
- Caldwell, D. F., & O'Reilly III, C. A. (2003). The determinants of team-based innovation in organizations: The role of social influence. *Small Group Research*, 34(4), 497-517.
- Chatman, J. A. & Jehn K. A. (1994). Assessing the relationship between industry characteristics and organizational culture: how different can you be?, *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3).
- Christensen, E. W. & Gordon G. G. (1999). An exploration of industry, culture and revenue growth, *Organization Studies*, 20.
- Cockrell, R. C., & Stone, D. N. (2010). Industry culture influences pseudo-knowledge sharing: a multiple mediation analysis. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 14(6).
- Daft, R. L., Sormunen, J., & Parks, D. (1988). Chief executive scanning, environmental characteristics, and company performance: an empirical study. *Strategic Management Journal*, 9(2), 123-139.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: the rites and rituals of organizational life*. Addison-Wesley.
- Dess, G. G., Ireland, R. D. & Hitt M. A. (1990). Industry effects and strategic management research, *Journal of Management*, 16(7).
- Dess, G. G. & Beard D. W. (1984). Dimensions of organizational task environments, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29(1). DOI: 10.2307/2393080
- Detert, J. R. Schroeder, R. G., & Mauriel, J. J. (2000). A framework for linking culture and improvement initiatives in organizations, *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4).
- Dimaggio, P. J. & Powell W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields, *American Sociological Review*, 48(2).
- Dobrosavljević, A. (2019). Managing the creative and labor-intensive business processes of the apparel industry. *Tekstilna Industrija*, 67(4), 58-66.
- Dosi, G. (1982). Technological paradigms and technological trajectories: a suggested interpretation of the determinants and directions of technical change, *Research Policy*, 11(3).

- Duncan, R. B. (1972). Characteristics of organizational environments and perceived environmental uncertainty, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(3).
- Fombrun, C., & Shanley, M. (1990). What's in a name? Reputation building and corporate strategy", *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(2), 233-258.
- Gordon, G. G. (1991). Industry determinants of organizational culture, *Academy of Management Review*, 16(2).
- Gagliardi, P. (1986). The creation and change of organizational cultures: A conceptual framework, *Organization Studies*, 7.
- Giritli, H. & Oraz G. T. (2004). Leadership styles: some evidence from the Turkish construction industry, *Construction Management and Economics*, 22.
- Grinyer, P. H. & J. C. Spender (1979). Recipes, crises, and adaptation in mature businesses, *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 9 (3).
- Haffar, M., Al-Karaghoul, W., & Ghoneim A. (2014). 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).
- Hambrick, D. C. (1982). Environmental scanning and organizational strategy, *Strategic Management Journal*, 3 (2), 159-174.
- Handy, C. (1993). Understanding organizations. UK: Penguin.
- Harrison, J. R. & Carroll G. R. (1991). Keeping the faith: A model of cultural transmission in formal organizations, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36.
- Hatch, M. J. (1993). The dynamics of organizational culture, *Academy of Management Review*, 18(4).
- Hatten, K. J., & Schendel D. E. (1977). Heterogeneity within an industry: firm conduct in the US brewing industry, 1952-71, *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, 26(2).
- Hitt, M. A., & Middlemist, R. D. (1978). The measurement of technology within organizations, *Journal of Management*, 4(2), 47-67.
- Hitt, M. A., Hoskisson, R. E., Johnson, R. A. & Moesel D. D. (1996). The market for corporate control and firm innovation, *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5).
- Hitt, M. A., & Tyler, B. B. (1991). Strategic decision models: integrating different perspectives, *Strategic Management Journal*, 12(5), 327-351.
- Hofstede, G., Neuijen, B., Ohayv, D. D., & Sanders, G. (1990). Measuring organizational cultures: a qualitative and quantitative study across twenty case, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(2).
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: international differences in work-related values. Sage Publications.
- Huff, A. S. (1982). Industry influences on strategy reformulation, *Strategic Management Journal*, 3(2).
- Iverson, R. D., & Deery, M. (1997). Turnover culture in the hospitality industry, *Human Resource Management Journal*, 7(4), 71-82.
- Jaeger, A. M. (1983). The transfer of organizational culture overseas: an approach to control in the multinational corporation, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 14(2).

- Jelinek, M. (1977). Technology, organizations, and contingency, *Academy of Management Review*, 2(1).
- Kondra, A. Z. & Hurst D. C. (2009). Institutional processes of organizational culture, *Culture and Organization*, 15(1).
- Matthyssens, P., Vandenbempt, K. & Berghman L. (2006). Value innovation in business markets: breaking the industry recipe, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 35(6).
- Meek, V. L. (1988). Organizational culture: Origins and weaknesses, *Organization Studies*, 9(4).
- Meyer, J. W. & Rowan B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony, *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2).
- Meyerson, D. & Martin J. (1987). Cultural change: An integration of three different views, *Journal of Management Studies*, 24(6).
- Mumford, M. D., Scott, G. M., Gaddis, B., & Strange, J. M. (2002). Leading creative people: Orchestrating expertise and relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(6), 705-750.
- Naum, S. (2001). People and organizational management in construction. Thomas Telford.
- Nicholas J. M. (1990). Managing business and engineering projects-concepts and implementation. Prentice Hall.
- Ogbonna, E. & Harris L. C. (2002). Managing organizational culture: insights from the hospitality industry, *Human Resource Management Journal*, 12(1).
- Ouchi, W. G., & Jaeger, A. M. (1978). Type Z organization: stability in the midst of mobility, *Academy of Management Review*, 3(2), 305-314.
- Pablo, A. L. (1999). Managerial risk interpretations: does industry make a difference?, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 14(2).
- Parveen, S., Senin, A. A., & Umar, A. (2015). Organization culture and open innovation: A quadruple helix open innovation model approach. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 5.
- Pedersen, J. S. & Dobbin F. (1997). The social invention of collective actors on the rise of the organization, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(4).
- Pennings, J. M. & Harianto F. (1992). Technological networking and innovation implementation, *Organization Science*, 3(3), *Focused Issue: Management of Technology*.
- Phillips, M. E. (1994). Industry mindsets: exploring the cultures of two macro-organizational settings, *Organization Science*, 5(3).
- Pizam, A., Pine, R., Mok, C. & Shin J. Y. (1997). Nationality vs. industry cultures: Which has a greater effect on managerial behavior?, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 16(2).
- Porac, J. F., Thomas, H., & Baden- Fuller, C. (1989). Competitive groups as cognitive communities: the case of Scottish knitwear manufacturers, *Journal of Management Studies*, 26(4).
- Porter, M. E. (1980). Competitive strategy: techniques for analyzing industries and competition. New York.

- Rashid, Z. A., Sambasivan, M., & Rahman, A. A. (2004). The influence of organizational culture on attitudes toward organizational change. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(2), 161-179.
- Ray, C. A. (1986). Corporate culture: the last frontier of control?, *Journal of Management Studies*, 23(3).
- Raza, A., Mehmood, S. & Sajjid, K. (2013). Impact of organizational culture on employee performance, *Mustang Journal of Management & Marketing*, 3, 120.
- Reynolds, P. D. (1986). Organizational culture as related to industry, position and performance: a preliminary report, *Journal of Management Studies*, 23(3).
- Rumelt, R. P. (1979). Evaluation of strategy: theory and models, *Strategic Management: A New View of Business Policy and Planning*, 196-212.
- Saffold, G. S. (1988). Culture traits, strength, and organizational performance: Moving beyond 'strong' culture, *The Academy of Management Review*, 13(4).
- Schein, E. H. (1984). Coming to a new awareness of organizational culture, *Sloan Management Review*, 25(2).
- Schein, E. H. (1999). Sense and nonsense about culture and climate, Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Scott, W. R. (2003). Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Scott, A. J. (2006). The changing global geography of low-technology, labor-intensive industry: clothing, footwear, and furniture, *World Development*, 34(9).
- Shaw, N. E., Burgess, T. F., De Mattos, C., & Stec, L. Z. (2005). Supply chain agility: the influence of industry culture on asset capabilities within capital intensive industries, *International Journal of Production Research*, 43(16), 3497-3516.
- Sorge, A. (2002). (Ed.) Organization. (Thomson Learning).
- Spender, J. C. (1989). Industry recipes. (Basil Blackwell).
- Tepeci, M. & Bartlett A. L. (2002). The hospitality industry culture profile: a measure of individual values, organizational culture, and person-organization fit as predictors of job satisfaction and behavioral intentions, *Hospitality Management*, 21(2).
- Thompson, J. D. & Bates F. L. (1957). Technology, organization, and administration, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2(3).
- Tozkoparan, G., & Susmus, T. (2001). Üretim ve hizmet sektörü işletmelerinde örgüt kültürüne ilişkin karşılaştırmalı bir uygulama, *Ege Academic Review*, 1(1), 202-223.
- Üsdiken, B. (1983). Interorganizational linkages among similar organizations in Turkey, *Organization Studies*, 4.
- Weiss, J. & Delbecq A. (1987). High-technology cultures and management: Silicon Valley and Route 128, *Group & Organization Studies*, 12(1).
- Williams, J. J. & Seaman A. E. (2001). Predicting change in management accounting systems: national culture and industry effects, *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 26(4).
- Williams, A., Dobson, P., & Walters M. (1993). Changing culture: new organizational approaches. Institute of Personnel Management.

Zammuto, R. & O'Connor, E. (1992). Gaining advanced manufacturing technologies' benefits: the roles of organization design and culture, *Academy of Management Review*, 17.

KATKI ORANI/ CONTRIBUTOR RATE	AÇIKLAMA / EXPLANATION	KATKIDA BULUNANLAR / CONTRIBUTORS
Fikir veya Kavram / <i>Idea or Notion</i>	Araştırma hipotezini veya fikrini oluşturmak / <i>Form the research hypothesis or idea</i>	Alev Özer TORGALÖZ
Tasarım / <i>Design</i>	Yöntemi, ölçeği ve deseni tasarlamak / <i>Designing method, scale and pattern</i>	Alev Özer TORGALÖZ
Veri Toplama ve İşleme / <i>Data Collecting and Processing</i>	Verileri toplamak, düzenlenmek ve raporlamak / <i>Collecting, organizing and reporting data</i>	Alev Özer TORGALÖZ
Tartışma ve Yorum / <i>Discussion and Interpretation</i>	Bulguların değerlendirilmesinde ve sonuçlandırılmasında sorumluluk almak / <i>Taking responsibility in evaluating and finalizing the findings</i>	Alev Özer TORGALÖZ
Literatür Taraması / <i>Literature Review</i>	Çalışma için gerekli literatürü taramak / <i>Review the literature required for the study</i>	Alev Özer TORGALÖZ