



Front Page

[Authors](#)

[Empirical Research](#)

[Ideas With Merit](#)

[Leader Action Tips](#)

[Literary Review](#)

[Student Research](#)

[About the Journal](#)

[Submissions](#)

[Publishing Assistance](#)

[Contact Us](#)

[News Feed](#)

Search

All Categories

[Advanced Search](#)

Current Issue:

**Volume: 8
Issue: 2**

ISSN: 1533-7812

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

Last Updated: Jun 10, 2010 - 10:17:07 AM

The relationship between organizational culture and sovereignty of merit principle in Iran National Company of petrochemical industry

By Seyed Rea Borghei, Gholamreza Jandaghi, Hossein Khanifar, Maryam Eslampour
Volume 8 - Issue 3
May 20, 2010 - 2:32:35 PM

[Email this article](#)
[Printer friendly page](#)

Introduction

It is needed in new world today that organization for their survival should search for new ways. One of these factors which help the organization in this aim is meritocracy. This happening is not accomplished in vacuumed. Other factors also have roles in this process; especially the culture of every organization may make the basic of sovereignty of merit principle because the unique culture of every organization shows the way of understanding and give meaning to event for individual.

One of the basic reasons for non effective of human resource is not to pay attention to the merit principle in the country; meritocracy in our country is unclear and non familiar.

The study of offices in our country shows the obstacles of make the meritocracy in organization and the roots of this situation are cultural, historical and are laws structures and organizational culture [5].

In another analysis, reasons which are in Iran organizational culture and make the meritocracy the big problem refers to law refuse culture, personal benefit oriented and responsible refuse [4]

Hofstede describe the organizational culture as unity mind plan and the totality with historical roots and social structures which consist of be lives and manners which happen in different levels and shows it in wide situation of organizational specification [4].

Meritocracy means having the ability and deserves and is based on this assumption that everybody has the ability of doing something in some case and the organization management should be able to discover these talents and adjust them with proper jobs [4].

Sovereignty of meritocracy needs some principle with them in organization, develop, progress and growth will happen. These principles are also called equality of opportunity and inequality of result studies showed that that even in developed country there some abstract at the development of meritocracy sovereignty. Kiangs ton on his studies conclude that meritocracy factors such as level of education, ability on justice do not have any role in process of gaining the social basics [16]. On the level of organization also Michael Hyter reported that his observation as manager's counselor at some organization shows development opportunity, success and fame don't base on meritocracy especially in evaluation system [15]. In Iran despite efforts in this field, yet convince of policy makers, decision makers and people didn't happen. For example Tasdighi's research [3], Babai [1], simar Asl [7], kebriai and et al [8] mention the cultural reason as abstract of meritocracy. Hobbi's research also shows that some changes of manager's view point of meritocracy are needed [4]. Layers of organizational culture and different of it from point of view of some scientist such as French, Schein, Hatch off and finally Hofstede shows that each of them have some similarity and differences which can used in measure of organizational culture.

This essay is not searching for knowing and changing of organizational values but around the basic value of organization, different practical ways are used which by knowing them the manager can make the high aims of organizational culture forms of Hofseted are proper. In Hofstede's theory, organizational culture explained by different factors which are practical. Different parts of this factor are in below figure [14]. In other case study of theoretical principle of meritocracy sovereignty revealed that usage necessary of meritocracy is based on scientific management especially Taylor's school of scientific management and Max Weber theory and the bureaucracy movement based on deserve. These principles based on theories which show the equality of opportunity for growth, self control, pay the prize which is relation to individuals' effort and feel of responsibility to work. This basic begins from entrance of organization and employee of him to hold and development. For this reason the measurement of meritocracy sovereignty are mentioned in these two organizational situations.

Studies show that in the country the relationship between organizational culture and meritocracy is not evaluate. But between organizational culture and other organizational factors such as clever management firm, benefits, productiveness and work responsibility are some relation which their results show the importance of organizational culture. Hofstede and et al found that there is a relationship between processes oriented organizational culture and professional view [14].

Mr. Donna Garcia revealed that meritocracy sovereignty has the positive unity with religious believes [12]. Filip and Mckeown showed that culture principle has important meaning in organizational changes.

It is one of the most important factors in knowledge oriented economy [20]. The aim of this study is to know the relationship between organizational cultures with the amount of meritocracy sovereignty. For reach to the mentioned

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH Latest Headlines

[No Child Left Behind: School Processes Associated with Positive Changes, Collaborative Partnership, and Principal Leadership](#)

[Leadership in Tunisian Higher Education from the Perspective of the EFQM Excellence Model](#)

[Teachers Identify and Support At-Risk Gifted Students](#)

[Language and Care: Tensions for Japanese Teachers and Foreign Students in Japanese Schools](#)

[Paying students for grades: Is it sustainable and should it be?](#)

[CONSISTENCY OF OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE BETWEEN COUNSELLED AND UNCOUNSELLED SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN NORTHERN CROSS RIVER STATE](#)

[GLOBALISATION, GOOD GOVERNANCE AND DEMOCRACY: THE INTERFACE](#)

[A Principal's Dilemma: Instructional Leader or Manager](#)

[RTI in a Middle School Culture: Fitting and Tailoring the Approach Through Leadership](#)

[Distributed Leadership Influence on Professional Development Initiatives: Conversations with Eight Teachers](#)

aim, These questions are asked. What is the relation between process oriented – Result oriented of organizational culture and meritocracy sovereignty? What is the relationship between employed oriented – job oriented of organizational culture and meritocracy sovereignty? What is the relation between practical – professional factors of organizational culture with meritocracy sovereignty? What is the relation between open system factors of organizational culture with meritocracy sovereignty? What's the relationship between loose control – tight control factors of organizational culture with meritocracy sovereignty? What is the relationship normative- pragmatic factor of organizational culture with meritocracy sovereignty? What is the relationship normative – pragmatic factor of organizational culture with meritocracy sovereignty? Among all of organization factors which one has more relationship with meritocracy sovereignty?

Method

The main important things between them are unity. The statistical societies of this research are all employees of Mobin petrochemical company of Boshar province that their numbers are 350 individuals. In this study the accidental cluster sample is used. 106 persons are selected as sample group. The number of $n = (z^2pq) / d^2$ from the sure level of 95 percent and the allowed error of %8 and also the amount of $p (p=0/5) n=150$ individual. Because $n=150$ in contracts with 350 society is bigger $n=150$ in this study the research tools for gathering the information are organizational culture and meritocracy question are. The research tools A) the organizational question of Hofstede is from his research in 20 units of 10 organization from Denmark and Poland and the interview from 1295 manager and employed. This question are is in original language and has 43 question in whole. To Hofstede and et al this question such as principle, heroes and sample [14]. The six mentioned factors are measured according to the final result. The questions are phrase start with this saying. "Where I work" and the answer give the answers with five degree of comparison; very disagree, disagree, no idea, agree and very agree. The original questions are translated to Persian by researcher and the main version and the translated version was given to the university teacher assistance. After the scientific explanation, the main Persian version with original version gives to the counselor and assistance and their idea also given. For evaluation of the question are the practical and appear that are used. In this way they appear text the management expert's means the counselor and university teacher study the kind of questions and confirm them. After confirmation these question are mentioned as the standard ones. For this aim the khobregan question are prepared. For practices of this question are 18 number of khobregan confirm it and with the %50 of the number 5 questions adds. The percent of different case are. process oriented (%73), employee oriented (%70), practical view (%72), open system (%76), easy control (%55) and law oriented (%54) which show the unity among the questions.

B) The meritocracy principle questions are taken from the study of Davey and et al which is from Garcia doctoring essay [12]. The name was: the understanding way of meritocracy question are. the main form of question are phrase is in explanation which the answerer say the answers in 5 degree comparison: very disagree, disagree, without idea, the main version and the Persian version give to the university teachers and counselor and their scientific idea take and mention in Persian version for its evaluation both appear and practical text are used. In appear texts the experts of management field means guidance teacher and counselor study the kind of questions and confirm them. After confirmation of appearance of questions, the quality of the evaluate. For this purpose the questions are of khobregan is prepared. The practical of this question are among 18 individuals of khobregan with %50 was confirmed.

Finding

Table 1 shows descriptive properties of gender, education, age, job grade and the work experience of participants. 88/6 percent of group member were male and 11/4 percent of workers were female. The majority of personnel's have B.A. The Mean of ages of them was 30.60. The majority of workers have 11/65 job grade with standard deviation of 2/55. The mean work experience of group member is 5/34 year and the standard deviation is 4/95 year.

Table 1: Demographics descriptive properties of Samples

		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	93	6/88
	Female	12	4/11
	Total	105	100
Education	Diploma	11	8/10
	Upper Diploma	11	8/10
	Bachelor	74	5/72
	Master of art and uppers	6	9/5
	Total	102	100
		Mean	Standard Deviation
Age		60/30	95/5
Job Grade		65/11	55/2
Tenure		34/5	95/4

Table 2 shows the Means and standard deviations of organizational culture and meritocracy sovereignty. According to the possibility of gain the scores between 1 to 5 for each factor, the mean of factors shows that organizational culture employee oriented and the factors of easy control and practical view is under the mean. The amount of meritocracy sovereignty is also under medium.

Table 2: the Means and Standard deviations of organizational culture and Meritocracy

Factors	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.
Process Oriented – Result Oriented	94	06/3	51/0	80/1	67/4
Employee Oriented – job Oriented	97	68/3	55/0	30/2	80/4
Practical – Professional	103	71/2	73/0	1	50/4
Open system – closed system	104	19/3	67/0	17/1	50/4
loose control – tight control	103	77/2	67/0	50/1	50/4
Normative – Pragmatic	102	45/3	45/0	17/2	67/4
Meritocracy sovereignty	104	78/2	38/0	13/2	87/3

Table 3: Correlation coefficient of organizational culture and Meritocracy

	Meritocracy sovereignty
Process Oriented – Result Oriented	* 466 /0
Employee Oriented – job Oriented	* 582/0 -
Practical – Professional	* 486/0
Open system – closed system	* 536/0 -
loose control – tight control	20/0
Normative – Pragmatic	004/0

*. P > 01/0. N= 105

Table 3 shows correlation between process oriented factors with amount of meritocracy sovereignty $r=0/47$ and is significant at the level of in this case whenever the company is result oriented in organizational culture, The meritocracy sovereignty increase. Table 3 shows that the negative unity $r=%58$ is meaningful between employee factors and the amount of meritocracy sovereignty. In this case when the company is work oriented, according to the organizational culture, the meritocracy sovereignty decreases. Also between practical view factor with meritocracy sovereignty there is positive unity of $r=%48$ which is meaningful to statistic at in this case whenever the company is .professional oriented in organizational culture, The meritocracy sovereignty increase

Table 3 there is a negative unity between open system factor and the amount of meritocracy sovereignty $r=0/54$, which at the level is meaningful. In this case whenever the company is closed system at organizational culture, the meritocracy sovereignty will decrease. According to the table 3 the unity of $r=%20$, it is not meaningful the relationship between easy control factor with meritocracy sovereignty. At the end there is no relationship between law oriented and meritocracy sovereignty ($r=%4$).

stage	interred variables	R	Ad. R ²	ΔR ²	ΔP	F	Sig.	a	B	t	p
1	Employee Oriented – job Oriented	58/0	34/0	34/0	001/0	93/37	01/0	18/4	25/0 -	55/3 -	001/0
2	Process Oriented – Result Oriented	65/0	42/0	08/0	01/0	98/25	01/0	18/3	17/0	26/2	027/0
3	Open system – closed system	67/0	46/0	04/0	05/0	80/19	01/0	54/3	13/0 -	18/2 -	033/0
4	a							54/3		48/8	000/0

For evaluate that which factors of organizational culture predict the meritocracy sovereignty at company the multiple study with step-by-step way was done which its result are in table 4. According to this table the employee oriented factor comes first at the process and has unity with meritocracy (R=0/58). In this process the coefficient of this factor is $R^2=0/34$ which shows that this factor has 34 percent of variance of meritocracy sovereignty. This factor has the line meaningful relation ($p=0/001$ and $f=37/93$) and the B ($p=0/001$, $T=3/55$) shows this factor which predict the employee oriented.

In the second step the changing factor of process oriented enter the Regression process and its coefficient increase (R=0/42). In this cycle 0/08 of prediction has the meaningful relationship with meritocracy sovereignty.

In the third step, the open system factor enter to this process and the unity amount of employee oriented and process oriented will increase to R=0/67 and the average coefficient reaches to $R^2=0/46$ which shows about the same results.

Discussion

In process oriented versus result oriented the management of company pay attention to the process oriented and also its results. In easy control factor versus tight control, the company is easy taking to the daily tasks. In practical factor versus to professional factor, the workers of company tend to local view of culture. Finally according to the meritocracy sovereignty it is under mean. Before any action in the society the employee should adapt these processes till they have the time to be progressed.

This result shows that result oriented of organizational culture has the positive correlation to meritocracy sovereignty. This finding has unity with of Stede and Pitrez and Waterman idea. They believe that strong cultures are result oriented. There is a negative unity between employee oriented and meritocracy sovereignty. This means that whenever the company become work oriented, the meritocracy sovereignty decreases. The third question of study revealed that professional oriented of organizational culture has the meaningful relationship with meritocracy sovereignty. These findings are the same with Merton, Ouchi, Hofstede and Verbeke studies [21]. The result of fourth question which is based on negative relationship of closed system with meritocracy sovereignty is also adjusted in these researchers. There isn't any relationship between easy control and meritocracy sovereignty.

The result of fifth question is that there is not any meaningful relationship between organizational control factors with meritocracy sovereignty. As this kind of organizational culture focus on the individual manner, it is not surprising that there would not by any logic relationship between these different factors the result of this study in important of organizational culture half of meritocracy sovereignty and it was the main specification of such a culture.

In the job oriented versus employee oriented the employee oriented was more important because the managing system of every organization should care about the employee and pay affection to their personal problem. In the factor of process oriented versus result oriented, results showed that, the result oriented make the meritocracy sovereignty it means that purpose and employee's work is more important than the work process. The factor of open system versus closed systems showed that open organizational culture is more successful at reach to the meritocracy sovereignty. It means that management system and employee are flexible at the acceptance and solve the mistakes. This study showed that local oriented versus professional and law oriented versus practical oriented need more study. Some external study had some problems in these factors. They divided them as responsibility, customer oriented and law oriented. For example refer to essay of 21 in this study. Also Goldner divided the manager to two classification of local and global which it is necessary that the ideas of Goldner should be mentioned in the next study.

: منابع

- 1- Babaei, Mohammad-Ali. (2005). **Arzyabi sharayete saze manhaye dolati baraye erteghaye zanan be mashaghele modiri yati**. Majmoe maghalate avalin hamayeshe tosea shayestesalari dar saze manh. Jahade daneshkahi daneshkadeye ravanshenasi va olumterbiyati daneshkahe Tehran. Entesharate Shive, pp 297-316. [In Persian].
- 2- Piu, Hiksun, Hittinger. (1999). **Nazariye pardazane clasik saze man**. Tarjomeye: Borghaei, Seyed Reza. Qom, Entesharate Mojtamaye Amozeshe aliye Qom. [In Persian].
- 3- Tasdighi, Mohammad-Ali. (2005). **Mavaneye shayeste salari dar saze manhaye dolati Iran va rahkarhaye an**. Majmoe maghalate avalin hamayeshe tosea shayestesalari dar saze manh. Jahade daneshkahi daneshkadeye ravanshenasi va olumterbiyati daneshkahe Tehran. Entesharate Shive, pp 341-366. [In Persian].
- 4- Hobbi, Mohammad-Bagher. (2006). **Tahiye siyathaye tervije farhanke shayeste salari**. Dabir Khaneye shoraye aliye enghlabe farhanki, komisiune farhanki. [In Persian].

- 5- Dehghanan, Hamed. (2005). **Modiriyat bar mabnaye shayesteghi (zaroratha va rahkarha)**. Faslnameye majles va pazhuhesh, 13, No 53. [In Persian].
- 6- Seyed Mosavi, Mirsajad, (1999). **Barasiye shayeste salari dar nezame edariye Iran**. Payannameye karshenasi arshad, Reshteye hoghogh omomi, Daneshkahe shahid Beheshti, Daneshkadeye hoghogh. [In Persian].
- 7- Simar-asl, Nastaran, (2005). **Barasiye mavane va mahdodiyathaye shayestesalari dar barkhi saze manhaye Irani va pishnahade rahakarhaye monaseb jahate tarvij**. Majmoe maghalate avalin hamayeshe tosea shayestesalari dar saze manh. Jahade daneshkahi daneshkadeye ravanshenasi va olumterbiyati daneshkahe Tehran. Entesharate Shive, pp 385-400. [In Persian].
- 8- Kebriyai, Ali, & et al(2005). **Mavane toseaye shayestesalari dar az didkahe karkonane daneshkadehhaye olum pezeshki Zahedan**. Majmoe maghalate avalin hamayeshe tosea shayestesalari dar saze manh. Jahade daneshkahi daneshkadeye ravanshenasi va olumterbiyati daneshkahe Tehran. Entesharate Shive, pp 401-408. [In Persian].
- 9- Moshabeki, Asghar, (2005). **Modiriyate raftare saze mani**. Tehran, Entesharate Terme, Chape 3. [In Persian].
- 10- Nikbakhsh, Mohammad Ali, (2003). **Rabeteye bine sakhtare sonati va shayestekiye miyane afrade dar saze manhaye dovlati shahre Kerman**. Payannameye karshenasi arshad, Reshteye modiriyate dovlati, Daneshkahe azade vahede Kerman, Daneshkadeye adabiyat va olume ensani. [In Persian].
- 11- Beck, C. and Beck, E. (1986), "The manager's open door and the communication climate" , Business Horizons, 15±20, January±February.
- 12- Garcia, Donna, (2001), "The Perceptions of Meritocracy Inventory: Assessing Beliefs in the Association between and Merit Dissertation for Master of Arts", the university of Guelph.
- 13- Hofstede, G. (1995), " **Allemaal andersdenkenden. Amsterdam: Contact. [1991] Cultures and organizations**", Software of the Mind. London: McGraw-Hill.
- 14- Hofstede, Geert; Neuijen, Bram; Ohayv, Denise Daval; Sanders, Geert, (1990), "Measuring Organizational Cultures: A Qualitative and Quantitative Study Across twenty cases", Administrative Science Quarterly; 35, 2; pp 286-316.
- 15- Hyter, Michael C., (2007), "Meritocracy-Responding to the Myth", Was Originally Published in The Handbook of Business Strategy, Vol.5, No.1, pp.41-43.
- 16- Kingston, Paul W., (2006), "How Meritocratic is United States? ", Research in Social Stratification and Mobility, Vol.24, pp.111-130.
- 17- Merton, R. (1957), "Social Theory and Social Structure", the Free Press, New York.
- 18- Ouchi, W., (1981), "Theory Z: How American Businesses can meet the Japanese Challenges".
- 19- Peters, T.J. and Waterman, R.H., (1982), "In Search of Excellence" , Harper and Row , New York.
- 20- PHILIP, GEORGE. MCKEOWN, IAN. (2004), "Business Transformation and Organizational Culture: The Role of Competency", IS and TQM, European Management Journal Vol. 22, No. 6, pp. 624–636.
- 21- Verbeke, Willem, (2000), a revision of Hofstede et al.'s (1990), "organizational practices scale. Journal of Organizational Behavior J" Organiz. Behav. 21, 587-602.

© Copyright 2010 by Academic Leadership

[Top of Page](#)