Valences of the Diagnosis and Identification Methods of the Cultural Phenomenon in Romanian Tourism Agencies

Carmen Cristina Albu, Phd. Student
University of Transilvania
Faculty of Economics Sciences and Business Administration
Braşov, Romania

Abstract: The crisis set off by the big financial companies showed the entire world that, in order to function in an optimal manner, capitalism needs a new frame, which takes different forms, and they talk about durable development, about human rights and equitable commerce. All these instruments are aimed to be practices implanted into organizations in order to make them more ethical. More and more authors are beginning to consider organizational ethics not as an action involving the establishment of a professional ethics code or of artifacts, but as a profound internal culture. Ethics and organizational culture represent, on the other hand, instruments that can raise the employees' motivation in accomplishing their own objectives. The ethics of the company must be highly compatible to its employees' moral profile. This study aims to identify methods and instruments used in conceiving and managing organizational culture, and mostly the diagnosis ones. The presentation's purpose is to identify its main characteristics and pointing out the potential they have in order to be used in a well-defined context. Starting from this objective, our paper suggests the devising of an instrument which can portray at its best the context of Romanian mountain tourism.

JEL classification: M21, L80, L83

Key words: ethics; tourism; commerce; organizational culture; methodology

1. Introduction

More and more authors started to believe that organizational ethics is less of an action that implies the creation of a code of professional ethics or of artefacts and more of a profound internal culture. Schein and Sims support the idea that ethics is a profound organisational culture business, in which morals have the tendency to dominate the decisional frame. The study of the most intimate level of organisational culture is considered to be extremely interesting in its tentative to appreciate (*evaluate*) the ethics of an organisation. Organisational culture and ethics represent, on the other hand, instruments that can call up employees to accomplish their own objectives. The challenge then moves to the field of individual values and individual morale, which represents the main mechanism through which culture interferes in the change (*transformation)* process, influencing the organisation's efficiency in an indirect and complex manner. The organisation's ethics must be vastly compatible with the moral profile of its employees.

This study propounds the analysis of methods and instruments used in the actions of creating and managing organizational culture, mainly in diagnosing it. The purpose of this presentation is to identify their main characteristics and to highlight their potential in order for them to be used in a well defined context. Starting from this objective, the paper

also propounds the choice of instruments that could detect as well as possible the cultural context of Romanian mountainous tourism.

2. THEORETICAL ACCUMULATIONS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE CONCEPT

The speciality literature abounds in numerous definitions of organizational culture. A useful selection is offered by Brown (1998) and Martin (2009). According to one of these definitions, organizational culture represents "a set of shared values and beliefs, which confers certain meanings to the members of the organization and also offers them behavior rules within the organization" (Davis, 1984). Also, "in a specific situation, the set of meanings that emerges makes the group distinct by its beliefs (ideology), activities (norms and rituals), language and other symbolic forms through which the members of the organization create and support the way in which they see the world and themselves in this world. Their development is the result of a common history, personal interactions and the characteristics of the environment of the group" (Smircich, 1983). A generally accepted definition of organizational culture considers that it "includes the system of values, symbols and beliefs shared by the members of the group, including the representations of these values, symbols and meanings as material objects and ritualized practices. The idea of culture includes also the habits and traditions, the history – mythical or actual –, mutual beliefs, norms and expectancies, common meanings and /or significations associated with objects and rituals" (Sergiovanni, Corbally, 1984). Culture may be defined as "representing a set of beliefs shared by all the members of the organization" (Sathe, 1985).

On the other hand, in order to identify why members of an organization behave in a certain way, the values which govern behavior must be analyzed. When values are identified, one may observe that they represent only the manifestation of cultural values. In order to truly understand a culture and to discover accurately a group's values, it is absolutely necessary to discover the implicit assumptions (instinctive/ non-verbalized), which determine the way in which the group perceives, thinks and feels" (Schein, 2002).

Nystrom (1990) defines organizational culture in a way accepted by many specialists in this field. Thus, organizational culture is viewed as a synthesis of values, norms, beliefs and assumptions adopted by a group of individuals who activate in an organization. The organizational climate is associated to the organizational culture: "the feelings, attitudes and behavior tendencies which characterize life in an organization and which can be operationally measured through the perceptions of its members".

The great difficulty that accompanies the concept is related to the fact that cultural traits (*features)* are not always evident, but manifests themselves indirectly, through "fingerprints" that signal their characteristics. For a cultural indentification one needs to interpret these signals and forward hypotheses over the nature of cultural traits (*features)*.

According to Hofstede (2002), managers perceive culture as "a collective programming of the mind, which distinguishes members of a human group from another group ... the interactive aggregation of common characteristics which influence the response of a human group to its own environment".

Viewed from a cognitive perspective, culture is perceived as a shared system of knowledge and beliefs. Smircich (1983) claims that "...human mind generates culture through a finite number of rules". From this point of view, organisations are regarded as knowledge systems. They can be described as cognitive organisations, whose members are committed to continually attempting to knowing the organisation and knowing themselves in relationship to it.

Organisational culture is a new concept, which suscitates to this day many debates and has determined delimitations in the world of specialists. The adepts of *systemic approaches* consider culture as a management variable, an instrument which can be sed to raise the organisation's performance. The systemic approach may be summarized by the position "the organisation has a culture", as well as one may sat that it has a management control system, a structure and a strategy. The *anthropological approach* reaches the conclusion that cultural significance may be interpreted in cultural terms.

Mainly perceived through its functionalist dimension, Schein's model has the advantage that it is simple and clearly presents the organisational culture phenomenon, so that it can be compared to an iceberg whose visible surface only represents an insignificant part of reality.

The realization of a consensus around Schein's definition and model may also reflect the fact that researchers in organisational sciences show a clear preference towards a functionalist approach to organizational culture. Schein (1985, 2002) defines organizational culture as "an assembly of basic hypotheses through which a group has learned that it is able to solve problems of internal and external adaptation, which has functioned well enough to be considered valid and which is, moreover, transmitted to new comers as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to any of these problems".

The originality of this definition resides in the fact that the author insists on the notion of "basic hypotheses" and not on values, norms or behavior rules, unlike many of the other researchers. For Schein, the difference consists of the fact that "in time, values, norms and rules may become indubitable, and thus they transform into basic un-negotiable hypotheses". Schein introduces the fundamental notion of *organizational culture depth*. When norms, values and rules have become basic hypotheses, he mentions that "members of a group become certain that their way of perceiving, thinking and feeling is the correct one. Strangers who don't accept these suppositions are either mad or from another planet". At this level, organizational culture is no longer conscious. A manager who wishes to reach this dimension will face a series of challenges. Schein's definition is accompanied by a model regarded as a reference frame in recent works from the field of organizational culture.

The model presents organizational culture on three distinct levels, leaving from the most accessible and noticeable dimension, artefacts, to the most profound and most implicit one, basic hypotheses.

Artefacts represent the highest level of organizational culture, in which organizational structures and processes may be observed and experienced and it may be defined easier as what an outsider sees and understands when coming in contact to the organization, respectively dress codes, working environment, warmth of work spaces, employees' enthusiasm, etc. Schein includes in the category of artefacts all that refers to actors' behavior, which allows one to take into account the behavior norms specific to the strategic endeavours, management practices and symbols.

Common (shared) values are represented by official values and common norms, beliefs and justifications that support artefacts, but which in reality are often in conflict with noticeable behavior. These values, claims Schein, may emanate from the leadership itself. By analyzing the gap which may exist between the actors' behavior and the values they should respect, the author was able to conclude that there is an even deeper and more elementary level of organizational culture.

Basic hypotheses. Schein insists upon the fact that they represent an implicit dimension of organizational culture, the most profound and its basic, a level that operates outside any conscience and which is available when a group wishes to explain its artefacts.

Schein's model claims that the most elementary and fundamental dimension of organizational culture is the one that corresponds to basic hypotheses. As a result, a researcher who wishes to develop an instrument of diagnosis for organizational culture may position himself in the frame of one of the three levels of the model. Also, research may be structured according to these levels, and the methods used to diagnose organizational culture have an impact on the studied model.

In order to identify the mechanism through which individual values (basic hypotheses) influence the mobilization of the staff and organizational performance, becoming an important instrument for managers, we believe that a deeper analysis of this phenomenon is necessary.

Individual values can be defined as general principles that orient actions and human reason in their private life as well as in their professional life. They are intimately related to the notion of good or bad that an individual has, about what must come naturally. Equality among people, respect and human being's dignity are examples of values. Values influence attitudes and human behavior. Thus, a person who respects equality among people will not be comfortable in an organization that treats a part of the personnel better than the rest of the employees. The perceiving of injustice will determine the emergence of an attitude that risks modifying behavior, which means decreased efficiency or maybe even resignation. An opposite situation will facilitate the emergence of a positive behavior.

The influence of values in the working environment becomes especially obvious when there is a congruency of values that is when individuals state they are satisfied with working with other people who share similar values. Research has proven the hypothesis according to which emplyees are more satisfied when their leaders share their values of fulfillment, helping each other, honesty and responsibility.

3. EXPLORATORY STUDY REGARDING THE CHOICE AND TESTING OF DIAGNOSIS METHODOLOGY OF THE CULTURAL PHENOMENON AT S.C. ARO S.A. BRASOV

The diagnosis of organizational culture is largely appreciated in speciality literature. Marcinkoniene and Këkale (2007) include this theme in the wider context of the necessity of understanding organizational culture. A major reason of the diagnosis is that it may help to understanding better what is happening inside the organization and allows the planning of change when things go wrong. Following this logic, the diagnosis of cultural organization takes place firstly for a better understanding of the situation, in order to act upon it afterwards. Levin (2000) believes that the evaluation of organizational culture is a timely topic in organizational development and that two different perspectives dominate speciality literature.

The first perspective supports the use of quantitative methids, especially questionnaires, in order to measure a pre-defined assembly of universal aspects of culture. O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell (1991) take measurements at the level of certain elements, such as innovation, opportunity and tolerance, and Levin (2000) believes that these methods allow making comparisons between more branches of the same organization. Their potential is interesting also when it comes to planned cultural changes because they allow a comparison on a longer period of time (Marcinkoniene and Këkale, 2007).

The second perspective claims, in turn, that the use of questionnaires is too superficial and pleas for using *qualitative methods* in order to explore the depth and

nuances of each culture and to appreciate its unicity (Levin, 2000). From this plain affirmation one can infer that the quantitative methods may be more favorable for the diagnosis of the most explicit dimensions of organizational culture, in contrast with the qualitative methods.

The two perspectives do not take into account another part of the speciality literature, which claims that the diagnosis of organizational culture may use a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods called triangulation. Some authors consider the combination between these two approaches to be the best method to study organizational culture.

3.1 Quantitative methodology

A large part of the speciality literature that deals with this methodology has used questionnaires, a means that seems to be preferred in the case of this methodological approach. Some studies contain a diagnosis that situates itself at the level of artefacts and have a problem related to the organizational change. On the other hand, Allen and Dyer (1980) suggest the diagnosing of norms that fall into the category of Schein's artefacts model, through a questionnaire composed of fifty "Is there a norm here related to…" type of questions to which employees must express their level of agreement or disagreement. Authors envisage the utility of this approach to indentify where incongruities are, thus the disfunctionalities from the organization. The next step is re-establishing in a functional position what has been diagnosed as inexistent, but necessary.

Cooke and Rousseau (1998) resumed the instrument developed by Cooke and Lafferty (1983) in order to take stock simultaneously of the culture in the t=0 moment and in the moment it wishes to arrive (t+1). Then an action plan is decided for the organization to reach its intended situation. The two suggest an evaluation that situates itself at artifact level, because it cuts out reality in twelve behavior styles, comprising also affiliation, conventional, dependent and competitive styles. Studies never claimed they can answer all questions, but they only took into account artefacts in organizational diagnosis. One may claim that in the case of organizational culture change may occur only at this level, a hypothesis that was also made public by other authors (Schneider, 1988; Marcinkoniene and Këkale, 2007). By extension, one may understand that a deeper level of organizational culture cannot be changed, at least not deliberately or aimingly.

Many researchers have not adopted a functionalist perspective, such as Allen and Dyer (1980), Cooke and Rousseau (1988). Goll and Zeitz's research (1991), which focuses on a dimension connected to the common values of Schein's model, only wanted to try to diagnose the ideology of an organization. The authors tackle the idea that their results may be used to verify a possible connection between organizational ideology and performance only when they reach to conclusions.

The quantitative diagnosis of organizational culture has as objective the measuring of the compatibility of individual and organizational values. As well as in the case of O'Reilly et. all. (1991), one suggested the administration of a diagnosis instrument composed of two questionnaires, in which the answer choices are similar but envisage on one hand what individuals believe, and on the other hand, what they perceive about the organization. Denison (1995) does not agree to O'Reilly et. all's study and considers it would be more adequate to problems related to organizational climate. Denison claims actors are more interested in levels more than in the surface of organizational culture and that they use strictly quantitative methodologies, closing to the field of research of

organizational climate, whose research objective is the perception of practices and procedures inside the organization by its members.

The studies and researches presented above may be classified in a double-entry table which offers, on one hand, information on the used diagnosis method and, on the other hand, on the diagnosed level of culture, the utilized model being Schein's. According to one or another authors' names we may find the diagnosis methodology used, and underneath it and between parentheses, what they accomplish. The quantitative approach was also used to diagnose the two superior cultural levels (artefacts and common values).

The use of quantitative methods in diagnosing organizational culture has raised controversies among researchers, whose interests were different. They allow comparison between the two moments, $t\square$ and t_1, between two organisations, from an organizational change and compatibility between organisations or organisations and people point of view. In all cases, the diagnosis seems to be made at the level of the two dimensions situated at the surface of organizational culture, artefacts and sometimes common values. Such a frequency at the level of the two dimensions can be based on the postulate supported by many authors (Schneider, 1988; Marcinkoniene and Këkale, 2007), according to whom organizational culture cannot change except at these levels. If the elements that support these dimensions were explored, i.e. the basic suppositions, one would be able to answer the question why some cultures cannot be truly changed. This idea is encountered at Jaeger (1987), who lauches the hypothesis that the fundamental values of organizational culture are the degree of culture, where one must have perfect correspondence.

Dupuis (2007) has done research in the same direction and claims that "the instrumentalization of culture is one of the characteristics of managerial approach. The objective is often that of using culture as an instrument to change a company. The results of this managerial tendency were not very conclusive. Firstly, organizational culture does not change easily. Most of the time the attempts of changing it were vague and the slogans were empty of meaning and had no effect whatsoever on the organization. Moreover, managers are not always willing to invest time and resources to really transform the values and methods of the organization".

Another problem inherent to using quantitative methods in diagnosing organizational culture is the emergence of a halo effect, particular to using questionnaires and surveys of any kind. It is recommended to increase the amount of people interviewed in order to minimize this effect.

In 2004 Schein identified another limit of using questionnaires, claiming that these can measure the climate, but not culture, because it is not possible to know beforehand the dimensions that need to be introduced in the questionnaire. One may conclude that triangulation, understood as a combined use of a qualitative, then quantitative method, may help to overcome this limit.

3.2. Qualitative methodology

Unlike the specific situation of quantitative methodology, not many authors have used the qualitative methodology to evaluate an organizational culture. If Schein is a leader in this field, Levin (2000) considers that a diagnosis at the level of basic hypotheses, mainly instinctive, cannot be made through questionnaires. According to the same author, only a qualitative method would help in indentifying them. Levin (2000) and Schein support the use of the clinical approach, a methodology that needs a deep observation of a phenomenon to get to its source. In the first phase basic hypotheses of a culture are studied

starting from the most visible manifestations, and then a deeper exploration is necessary in order for the basic suppositions to be actualized.

Both researchers believe that the evaluation must be made by an outsider to the organization, someone who has a fresh vision of culture. Although Levin (2000) admitted initially that the qualitative method has certain limits, i.e. it is not coherent from a theoretical point of view, he acknowledges the utility of his methodology for a consultant during a planned change, because it allows one to understand which cultural aspects may become brakes or levers during such a change.

The analysis of scientific literature involved in the field of the evaluation of the organizational culture through a qualitative methodology highlights the fact that the latter is one of the keys that allows acces to the deepest and most implicit level of organizational culture. It can be used also at realizing the only diagnosis of the dimensions situated in the upper levels of organizational culture and is the most recommended in transverse evaluations, which combine the ethnographic approach and the clinical approach and which proposes to start from artefacts in order to get to basic suppositions (Schein, 1999; Levin 2000).

Many authors realized that a qualitative methodology does not reveal to the researcher what to look for, nor does it allow comparing, which explains the fact that the works regarding the diagnosis of basic hypothesis through the qualitative method are quite few and inconclusive. Levin (2000) suggests the diagnosing of the organizational culture in five quadrants, but this is situated at artefacts' level, because it talks about symbols, rituals, norms and management practices. Although the semistructured interview allows the interviewer to dig deeper into each dimension, the researcher is not able to identify the basic hypotheses of the organizational culture.

3.3. Triangulation

Triangulation is a "multi-method approach, which gets its name from a navigation technique that uses more points of reference in order to precisely locate an object", and which surpasses the inherent limits of the use of quantitative method (Duncan, 1989). Several complementary methods are used by this methodology in order to obtain reliable information regarding this phenomenon. Triangulation will combine two-three techniques to collect information, such as quantitative and qualitative ones, but being careful to alternate them all the time. Duncan emphasizes the fact that triangulation is not a new analysis technique in the study of culture, because it has been used by anthropologists, sociologists and specialists in organizational behavior. It manages to eliminate many of the specific limits of the other two methods (table no. 1).

Table no. 1- The differences between quantitative and qualitative methods in the study of the cultural phenomenon in organisations

Criteria of differentiation specific to methods	Qualitative	Quantitative
Objective	Full description	Classification and estimates to explain a phenomenon
Approach	Inductive	Deductive
Axis	Subjective (individual interpreting)	objective (accurate measurements)
Researcher's role	The evaluator is an instrument	the evaluator uses instruments
Nature of data	words, images, objects	figures and statistics

| Generability | low | high |

Many papers use triangulation in the study of organizational culture. A part of them, less recent, realize a diagnosis that situates itself at artefacts' level, and the most recent make a diagnosis at the level of common values. Duncan and Glaser mention that they make use of the triangulation technique. Duncan uses three techniques successively to collect information about certain facts and opinions specific to organizational culture, especially those which refer to the heroes that embody the values of an organization. The three techniques are silent (passive) observation, in which the observer is visible for the subject, self-administred questionnaires and individual meetings. Without suggesting a systematic list of the specific elements of organizational culture, the author claims that this method is useful for managers in their effort to get to know this important and complicated concept. The differences registered when analyzing the questionnaires and during the meetings have determined the author to formulate the postulate according to which subcultures appear within the same organization.

Glaser obtains a diagnosis of organizational culture by combining a questionnaire (Organizational Culture Survey), through which climate, dedication, communication, suvervising are measured within individual meetings. In this research, though, the research phase is missing, the author discussing some of the components of culture that he had deduced by studying the theory. Duncan and Glaser have reached the conclusion that the actors of the organization do not all have the same perception over the starting dimensions and conclude that there are more subcultures. The two studies have a major limit, because they reach a diagnosis at artifact level and conclude that different perceptions show the existence of subcultures. They do not go further in order to investigate if these contradictions appear as a consequence of profound differences at the level of the most intimate postulates or wether it is only a surface differentiation.

Hofstede, Denison and Mishra (1995) and House (2004) use triangulation, too, obtaining a finer diagnosis at the level of common values. Hofstede's study propounds to explain the cultural differences between twenty entities of an organization situated in several countries through six axes and using concepts from the field of organisations' sociology. The successive use of primary data, of long meetings (that allow acces to values) and the questionnaires (which allow a review of perceptions and daily practices by actors) determine the authors to postulate that the basic of organizational culture is not made of common values, but of daily practices. Moving even further, they postulate by extension that these practices depend on the nature of organisations. This dimension si the most important, because it affects the employees on a daily basis.

By admitting that the arrival of a new manager, with his new values, changes daily practices, authors superpose the postulate that common values act as determiners of daily practices, which are in fact artefacts. House used questionnaires for intermediary managers, obtaining after processing them an information base consistent to the practices and values of each culture.

Beside the questionnaires, researchers have organized discussion groups and conducted important research about the cultural characteristics of every country, analyzing secondary data. This study allowed the updating of aproximatively one hundred attributes of leadership, which allowed the extraction of six archetypes. Denison and Mishra (1995) made some case studies followed up by questionnaires in order to verify their postulate which stated that a certain number of commun values (dedication, consistency, adaptability

and mission sense) are responsible for the organizational efficiency, and the conclusion was affirmative.

Despite all the efforts of triangulation regarding the organizational diagnosis, the scientific acknowledgement of the most profound dimensions of organizational culture has not progressed visibly.

In an important part of their studies, authors used at first questionnaires before interviews, and in another part they did not take advantage of the benefits conferred by the use of qualitative and quantitative methods in order to move further in the diagnosing of organizational culture, dealing with both artefacts and common values.

In Denison's opinion (1996), the epistemological bases of research in organizational culture require the approach of the basic hypotheses – which is the most profound, and thus the least accessible, level. This is why he pleas for the use for qualitative methods, which, according to him, distinguish this research field from that of the climate of organizational culture. In a strict interpretation of the author's argument, none of these studies would be part of the research field of organizational culture. This field is the object of numerous confusions, and the studies which make a diagnosis of organizational culture by the quantitative method are difficult to exclude.

3.4. The complementarity of the diagnosis methods of the cultural phenomenon

Tourism is a field of activity whose specificity cannot be questioned, as it is easily accepted by the whole business environment, as well as by the population. Most differences are related to the branch of activity, which means offering services to the population or to different societies. The presence of a large number of employees in front of the clients and their behavior compels a tourism organization to manage its own cultural phenomenon with a lot of care, and to ensure all necessary conditions to raise the motivation, satisfaction and dedication of the staff.

The consequences that the management of organizational culture has over the attitude and behavior of the staff are easier to notice in tourism organisations and they may promote a more or less favorable image for its clients, and the consequences over its results will manifest almost instantly. Our study has focused, in a starting phase, on one of the important societies in mountainous tourism, S.C. ARO PALACE S.A. Brasov.

The objectives of this study regards the comparison between the contributions that are brought by the quantitative and qualitative methods in identifying the cultural phenomenon in mountainous tourism agencies (societies) from our country, in the attempt to better its contribution in motivating the human factor and the increase of performance in a sector that is still far from its true potential. To be more exact, two specific objectives are envisaged here, respectively:

- the analysis of the coherence of the results obtained by applying the quantitative questionnaire and semidirective meetings, starting from the hypothesis that this coherence exists;

- the analysis of the way in which qualitative nondirective or semidirective meetings allow the enrichment of the interpretation of data and information obtained through a qualitative method.

The data collection took place at first by personally handing in Person's questionnaire (2001), which aims at the identification of the cultural norms of the society, to a test sample team of fourteen employees. This test sample did not follow all the scientific rules, because our purpose was to observe and validate the combined use of the qualitative and quantitative methodologies, in order to highlight as many of the basic

hypotheses which determine the emergence of certain attitudes as possible, and, further on, of some work behavior patterns. Also, the chosen test sample team belongs to the commercial sector, that is staff from the reception desks (7) and staff from the restaurant (7), directly involved with public relations.

The chosen questionnaire was tested in advance, as to make sure the questions are well understood by the interviewed personnel. The questions were mostly closed questions, with two or more choice answers, from which the subjects were to choose the desired variant. The closed questions with two choice answers are adapted to the observing of simple indicators, well defined, concrete, specific to certain formal or factual problems and less indicated when discussing subjective problems. The answers were collected during a week, enough time for the respondents to understand and fill in the questionnaire in the most favorable circumstances.

The results showed lower sbasics at norms such as "team spirit" (38,0%), "colleague care" (36,5%) and "trust in the internal climate of the society" (31,6%). As observed, the obtained results refer to referential values, to the ethics that the society wishes its employees to respect, offering important information in this respect, but without offering information about the reason for this attitude or behavior.

The second part of the intercession targeted the qualitative side and consisted of fourteen meetings with the subjects of the same test sample team, but after aproximatively at a month's distance from the applying of the quantitative intercession. This period of time is enough to avoid the interviewed persons, still remembering their previous answers, to try and justify these answers during the face-to-face interviews, fact that would have invalidated the research under the aspect of the coherence of results. Subjecting the same individuals to the two enquiry methods is not justifiable unless their answers can be well disconnected and are plausible for the research's object.

During the meetings the respondents were subjected to a questionnaire with semi-open questions, whose answer is not suggested by the researcher, or open questions, well adapted to a study of complex variables, whose thematic content had been subjected to an analysis method. In order to obtain correct information these meetings took place outside the work program, at the respondents' work place, being well known that a familiar, habitual space offers a trusting atmosphere and creates the conditions for obtaining correct and complete information about the studied phenomenon.

Asking open questions brought up a number of difficulties. One of the risks was that the answer may be reinterpreted when written down, or a post-coding is necessary and this reduces the substance of the answer and introduces the researcher's subjectivism.

The analysis of the answers offered interesting explanations about the individual values that support or, on the contrary, are the source of resistence in the society's ethics. Our analysis focused on the cultural components indentified through the questionnaire method at which the obtained sbasics were not situated at the desired level by the society, respectively the team spirit, colleague care, innovative spirit and trust in the internal climate of the society.

As to the relatively low sbasic of the team spirit, the processed data of the meetings reveal the fact that altruism, self-denial and repect, self-control and responsibility are instrumental values (Rokeach, 2006) closely connected to each other and at their bottom lay basic hypotheses such as authentic friendship, respect towards others, wisdom and the wish to prove oneself.

Colleague care, another problem cultural norm, registered such a low value because individual values such as social gratitude, wisdom and the wish of being happy are not to be found in the necessary amount needed to support it.

Inovative spirit, represented by imagination, intelligence and independence, is closely related to individual values such as liberty, inner peace and logic. Regarding the trust in the internal climate of the society, the test sample team mentioned the clarity of methods and procedures, politeness, good will, autonomy and accepted as basic hypotheses work comfort, peace (tranquility) and social recognition.

4. Conclusions

The comparison of the results obtained by applying the two methodologies highlights the fact that they mutually complete each other regarding their utility in the management of organizational culture. The quantitative method, which uses statistic surveys based on questionnaires, offers important information regarding the attitudes and behavior of the staff of the society and especially a quantification of most referential values that are pursued by it in the cultural phenomenon. In this manner one can indicate accurately the problem norms of the society and where it must focus in order to improve the situation. The qualitative method, supported by interviews/ face-to-face meetings based on semi-open or open questions, goes even further in what concerns the indentification of individual values, respectively of basic hypotheses that start, or, on the contrary, slow down a certain favorable behavior towards the society.

The merit of the quantitative methodology is connected to the fact that it offers clear hints over the organizational norms with problems, but which can be corrected by the qualitative methodology. The latter will identify fundamental reasons and will offer all the information needed for adopting efficient solutions to the management of organizational culture.

References

1. Allen, R. F., & Dyer, F. J. — A tool for tapping the organizational unconscious. Personnel Journal, 59(3), 1980

2. Brown, A.D. — Organizational culture. London: Financial Times Management,1998

3. Cooke, R.A., Rousseau, D.M. — Thinking and behavorial styles: Consistency between self-descriptions and descriptions by others. Educational and Psychological Measurement, no.47,1987

4. Davis, S. — Managing corporate culture. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1984

5. Denison, D.R. — What is the difference between organizational culture and organizational climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigms wars, Academy Of Management review, vol 21, nr.3,1996

6. Denison, D.R., Mishra, A.K. — Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness, Organization Science, Vol. 6, nr.2,1995

7. Duncan, W.J. — Great ideas in management: lessons from the founders and foundations of managerial practice, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco,1989

8. Dupuy, A., Marey, P. — Shifts and twists in the relative productivity of skilled labour, Econometric Society, Norh American Summer Meetings, working paper series, Econometric Scoiety, New York, 2004

9. Goffee, R., — Why should anyone be led by you?, Harvard Business Review,

	Jones, G.	September- October,2000
10.	Hofstede, G.	The pitfalls of cross-national survey research: A reply to the article by Spector et al. on the psychometric properties of the Hofstede Values Survey Module 1994. Applied Psychology an International Review, 51, 2002
11.	House, R.J.	Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies. SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, 2004
12.	Levin, D.Z.	Organizational Learning and the Transfer of Knowledge: An Investigation of Quality Improvement, Organization Science, 11(6), 2000
13.	Marcinkoniene, R., Kekäle, T.	Action research as culture change tool, Baltic Journal of Management, Vol. 2 , nr.1, 2007
14.	Martin, D.	Inteligența emoțională și climatul emoțional. Elemente ale succesului organizațional. Revista de psihologie organizațională, Volumul IX, Nr. 3-4, 2009
15.	Nystrom, H.	Organizational innovation, in West M. A., Farr J. L. (Eds.) Innovation and Creativity at Work: Psychological and Organizational Strategies. Chichester: Wiley, 1990
16.	Robbins, S., Judge, T.	Comportements organisationnels, 12e edition, Pearson Education, 2006
17.	Schein E.	*Organizational culture and leadership,* 3rd ed. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2002
18.	Schneider, S.C., De Meyer, A.	Interpreting and responding to strategic issues: the impact of national culture. Strategic Management Journal, 12(4), 1991
19.	Schermerhorn, J.R. Jr., Hunt, J., Osborn, R.	Basic Organizational Behavior 9e. John Wiley and Sons, 2006
20.	Vărzaru M., Roșca C., Roșca I.	Resurse umane. Management și gestiune, Editura Economică, București, 2005