

COMPARATIVE RESEARCH ABOUT THE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE IN RESEARCH UNITS BELONGING TO THE NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF LA PLATA (UNLP)

Góngora, Norberto

Instituto de Investigaciones Administrativas
Facultad de Ciencias Económicas
Universidad Nacional de La Plata
La Plata - Buenos Aires - Argentina
gongora1@infovia.com.ar

Nóbile, Cecilia

Instituto de Investigaciones Administrativas
Facultad de Ciencias Económicas
Universidad Nacional de La Plata
La Plata - Buenos Aires - Argentina
cinobile@gmail.com

Reija, Lucía Soledad

Instituto de Investigaciones Administrativas
Facultad de Ciencias Económicas
Universidad Nacional de La Plata
La Plata - Buenos Aires – Argentina
lucia.reija@gmail.com

Reception Date: 11/16/13 - Approval Date: 12/18/13

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to describe and compare organizational culture partially corresponding to two Research Units (Research Center A and B) belonging to the National University of La Plata (UNLP).

The methodology is to determine the types of organizational culture under study. The cultural types referred include: Paternalistic Culture, Apathetic Culture, Anomic Culture Integrative and Demanding Culture, which arise from the crossing of two major dimensions: organizations focus on results and organizations people Orientation.

From here you have identified the characteristics of each cultural type present in Research Centers, determining that both share a further Integrative Culture. This finding is particularly important because nearly 120 organizations that are part of this project, only 9.5% have dominant Integrative Culture.

Also, analyzed quantitatively some of the consequences of Integrative Culture in people who work in them.

KEYWORDS: Organizational Culture; Integrative Culture; Research Units.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been a great development of the phenomenon of internationally organizational culture, but with a prescriptive sense that generated the idea of the existence of a better culture worthy of imitation. However, later research showed how inaccurate this idea is (Góngora, 2008).

In Argentina, the research in the field of organizations has been limited (Góngora and Nóbile, 2008), and this includes the issue of organizational culture.

In this sense, this paper tries to present partial results of research carried out in two Research Units of the National University of La Plata under the accredited teachers Incentive Program Researchers approach to culture and organizational climate project Research Centers from UNLP, developed at the Institute of Administrative Research, Faculty of Economic Sciences of the National University of La Plata.

The project was oriented at the following objectives: i) to conduct an assessment of the organizational climate and culture in the research centers of the National University of La Plata, ii) to correlate the dimensions of organizational culture and climate in Research Centers of the National University of La Plata, performing a comparative analysis between them.

In this paper we only address some aspects related to the organizational culture of research centers studied. The detail of them is described in the theoretical framework and methodology.

This work is organized as follows: firstly briefly presents the theoretical framework used, then the methodology developed for the study to continue with the results set forth. In the final part of the work the general conclusions of the study, arrivals from the analysis of the results obtained in both organizations develop.

As mentioned above, in this paper due to space partial quantitative results will be presented.

Objective

The aim of this paper is to describe and compare the existing culture in Research Centers under analysis.

DEVELOPMENT

I. Theoretical Framework

In a first approximation it is possible to define organizational culture as the set of norms, beliefs, values, customs, rituals, languages, artifacts, and basic assumptions existing in an organization. Many authors have defined this concept, leading to different approaches or perspectives to address it.

Pfeffer (2000) notes that culture is a body or governing tradition learned what you need to know, think and feel to meet the standards to become a member. When applied to organizational environments, culture is considered as shared rules governing cognitive and affective aspects of the members of an organization, and the means by which they shape and express aspects of particular relevance as the meanings, assumptions, norms and values.

Meanwhile, Matsumoto (1996) describes it as a set of attitudes, values, and beliefs shared by a group of behaviors, but different for each individual, transmitted from one generation to another.

From the organizational point of view, Hofstede (1999) analyzed the mental models related to organizational culture. This is manifested through symbols, heroes and rituals, practices and values as at different levels of depth, which cannot be seen with the naked eye. This author uses the computer language to explain how culture operates. The computer has a hardware that can be seen, but operates using software that cannot be seen. A person has a body that can be seen and mental orders that cannot be seen. Moreover organizations have elements that can be seen, as employees, and the mental software shapes culture. From this perspective, culture is learned, not inherited.

For Schein (1985) culture is:

“A pattern of basic assumptions invented, discovered or developed by a given group as they learn to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has exercised sufficient influence to be considered valid and therefore to be taught to group new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel these problems” [Schein, E., 1988, p. 25-26]⁽¹⁾

This author also adds an interesting insight into the process of cultural formation. When a group of people shared a significant amount of important experiences over time there originates a shared vision of the world around them and their place in it. Therefore, for the emergence of a particular culture is needed, at least, the existence of a group and that it has a sufficient number of shared experiences to reach this shared vision.

O'Reilly and Chatman, mentioned by Pfeffer (op. cit) defined culture as a system of shared values (that establish what is important) and norms that require attitudes and be appropriate for the members of the organization behavior (as feel and behave).

Smircich (1983) distinguishes between culture as a variable, as something an organization has, and culture as a result of the organization. In turn, he considers two types of variables, an independent, external to the organization (culture of the society) and an internal (outcome performance and representations of individuals of organizations).

In turn, authors like Val De Pardo (1997) identified some common characteristics that defined the culture and are present in the above definitions:

- Being intangible: culture is manifested through behaviors and norms.
- Relying on individual perception: the objectivity cannot be dependent on the perceptions of the subjects.
- Not to be measured accurately: indicators allow only one approach to the concept.
- To be known by all who are affected: this point does not mean that it is accepted by them.

Martin et. al. (2004), express three different perspectives on what is culture:

1. The approach to integration: This perspective raises the need for organizational cultures to show cohesion, uniformity, high degree of consensus, consistency and uniformity of thought and behavior. It is considered that this culture is desirable and achievable, and is considered a tool to unify the values and norms of behavior that may be useful to generate loyalty, commitment, productivity and financial efficiency. Companies who have consistently played vigorous cultures. Here's how a strong culture which is used to guide a high commitment is recommended, resulting in higher productivity and therefore higher returns. It is assumed that the manager, the employer has the ability to create and establish cultures strongly unified, articulated through the formulation of a vision, mission and values. This scheme, suggest that there may be conflict and ambiguity in organizations this was an anomaly. Over the years it was researched and concluded that it was not true that having a strong culture generated better results.

Reviewing the literature, there are two types of cultures trying to raise ideal types:

- On one hand we have Quinn, Rohrbaugh, Daft (2000) and others distinguish between decentralization and flexibility, centralization and control.
- On the other hand, we have Blake and Mouton (1984) to distinguish between results Orientation and guidance to people.

2. The focus of differentiation: This position basically states that interpretations of events that generate cultures are complex and internally differentiated, and the general agreement in organizations occurs only within the boundaries of subcultures. Basically it says that the only way to understand culture is to lower the lens and look deep into the interactions between people and domestic sectors of organizations. Some authors argue that there may be no talk of culture in the organization, but a sum of its subcultures. The only way to know the cultures is penetrating deep inside the organization. So, not only is it positive or for attractiveness of organizations, but its ugly face, the symbolic aspects of culture and dysfunctional observed. There are horizontal subcultures, which are related to the classical differentiation of occupations and workplaces, and vertical subcultures relate to distinctions that have to do with employee groups, professional subcultures, composed of different ethnic origins, groups, etc. In addition to attention to subcultures countercultures, reflecting a set of ideas, beliefs and values, that oppose the dominant culture is provided.

3. The focus of the fragmentation and ambiguity: The authors of this approach argue that the treatment of the study of organizational cultures is inconsistent. The interpretation of culture is multifaceted and complex; there is a lack of consensus, lack of consistency, ambiguity, uncertainty and contradiction. It argues that power is diffused throughout various levels of the organization, producing a steady stream of trade. It is noted that there are few guidelines for managing the change process, which is contradictory. Moreover the concept of ambiguity associated with the culture presents another major dilemma, since the definition of cultural practices is difficult, because both the concept of culture as the practices associated with this are very ambiguous.

4. Norberto Góngora (2008), taking into account the findings of Hofstede (1999) believes that there is a fourth approach, the interdependence and diversity, which stresses the importance of mutual influence between organizational culture and pop culture. This perspective raises basically that organizations are not islands and to understand their culture, we must bear in mind the cultural context in which they operate. Each person carries within himself thought patterns, feelings and action potential he has learned throughout his life. This is called mental programs that shape the culture. The individual may deviate from these mental programs and react creatively, but it is very difficult unlearned. Mental programs originate in the communities in which it has grown.

Another important aspect to be analyzed in a study of organizational culture is the specific, present and desired vision of the members of the organization on the following points:

1. Boss Style
2. Perceptions of change
3. Salaries
4. Planning
5. Availability of information
6. Error handling
7. Perception of performance Speeds
8. Types of tasks performed
9. Possibility of change
10. Success Criteria
11. Stress at work
12. Desire to stay in the organization
13. Respect the rules
14. Preference for the size of the organization
15. Preferences for organizational awards
16. Fear existing
17. Trust and other organizational aspects

Taking up the ideas of Hofstede (1999), the author brings together symbols, heroes and rituals under the name of practice. Then, consider that the core of culture consists of values, which show a contrast between a positive and a negative. In turn, it also marks four dimensions that make differences in organizational cultures that are presented below with their corresponding relationship with the points to study of culture:

- Power distance and social inequality: inequality is the extent to which some members have more power than others, and greater ability to influence the behavior of others. Power distance is conceived as the degree to which members of organizations expect and accept that power is distributed unequally.

From another perspective power distance is perceived by the subordinate for the person who placed hierarchically above. Assuming that in every organization there is at least a minimum of unequal distribution of power, which is essential to avoid anomic situations, the dimension Power Distance allows us to measure and diagnose intra-organizational power relations. In general terms we can say that the organizations have low levels of Power

Distance the subordinate relationship - boss has a feature more balanced distribution of power. When this happens, expectations begin to develop by the subordinate to be consulted by your boss in various aspects related to decision making and, in parallel, in the lower existence of discriminatory privileges. The superior ideal that emerges from this relationship is a democratic or integrative boss.

In contrast to what was mentioned above, in organizations with high levels of Power Distance there is a heavy reliance on lower hierarchical levels of the highest respect. In these cases, subordinates expect discretionary decisions taken by their superiors. There are also symbols of status and privileges as the degree of hierarchy. The superior ideal corresponds to benevolent or paternalistic autocratic type.

For its determination the following is taken into account:

1. Fear: refers to how fearful reviewers feel the organization to express disagreement with their superiors.
2. Current Style Bosses: differs if bosses have predominantly authoritarian or participatory trends.
3. Boss desired Style: reflects the preferences of the respondents referred to the desired style of leadership in organizations.

The total power distance is the numerical expression of the index proposed by Hofstede and is the arithmetic result of the dimensions stated.

In this work we understand that the power distance defined refers to the rising of power distance.

- Relationship between the individual and the collective: societies can be individual, when the bond between people each addresses itself. They can also assess collectivism in which individuals are integrated into highly cohesive groups that protect them for life in exchange for unwavering loyalty.

In this case it was unable to accurately reproduce the Hofstede individualism indicator but has been replaced by others with some approximation.

At this point the relationship between organization-individualism is the ratio between the individual Orientation and the Organization Orientation. In this aspect obtaining more than one indicates that the individual over the raw organizational means that the values of the people within the organization favor are more linked to the organization's relations with individual aspects.

Each Orientation is obtained by adding in each case, the following values¹:

Table N° 1: Values associated with the Individual and Organizational Orientation

A. Orientation to individual	B. Orientation to the Organizational
<p>A.1. Orientation to subsistence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having job security. - Having the opportunity to increase their income. - Feeling like you do and learn on the job will allow you to get another job elsewhere. 	<p>B.1. Task Orientation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make it a little routine, creative work. - What is expected of you is well defined, that is clear. - The physical enjoyable work environment.
<p>A.2. Orientation to the projection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have growth opportunity in his career. - Feeling that what you do in your organization will leave a mark that others will follow in the future. - To continually learn new tasks and skills. 	<p>B.2. Orientation to social relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having a good working relationship with your direct supervisor. - Working in a group of people to cooperate with each other.
<p>A.3. Egocentric Orientation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perform tasks involving a challenge and through which you can get a personal achievement. - Having little stress at work. - Be consulted by direct superior in decisions that affect the work you performed. - Have enough freedom to decide on how to organize their work. - That is valued what you do in the organization and how to do it. 	<p>B.3. Orientation to the institutional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That their work is important to the organization where you work. - That their work is important to the community. - Working in a large organization, prestige.
<p>A.4. Extrinsic Orientation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have enough free time for your personal life. - That his work allows him to live in a nice neighborhood for you and your family. 	

Source: Own Elaboration

- Entrepreneurship Orientation or guidance to the conservation or preservation: there are social differences in behaviors that correspond to each sex. In some societies, social gender roles are highly differentiated, that's what is known as masculinity. There are other societies where this differentiation of values and male and female roles are performed, but these are overlapping, that is known as femininity.

Given that the terms must be adapted to the cultural reality of each country it has been referred to this indicator as a guide to development (associated with masculinity) and Orientation preserving (associated with femininity).

Within the values that are linked to entrepreneurship are:

¹ This matter will be treated in another document, being prepared, which studies the values of the Research Institutes

1. Remuneration: An opportunity to increase their income. (Ability to obtain higher incomes).

2. Rating: It is valued what you do in the organization and how to do it. (Get the recognition you deserve when you do a good job).

3. Promotion: Have growth opportunity in one's career. (Having the opportunity to advance to higher positions).

4. Challenge: Perform tasks involving a challenge and through which you can get a personal achievement. (Having a stimulating work that achieves a sense of personal accomplishment).

Within the values associated with preservation are:

1. Head: Having a good working relationship with your direct supervisor.

2. Cooperation: Working in a group of people to cooperate with each other. (Working in a spirit of cooperation).

3. Area or residence: that work allows you to live in a nice neighborhood for you and your family.

4. Job Security: Having job security.

• Tolerance for uncertainty: In this sense it is similar to what Hofstede posed but as there have been no other elaborations there are three possibilities to rise this index. Hofstede suggests that the control of uncertainty relates to the differences in the level of tolerance in situations of uncertainty that people have of a society. There are differences in the extent to which individuals feel threatened and this creates anxiety and stress for unknown or uncertain situations, so the author suggests a combination of three elements: the stresses, the standard Orientation and preference tenure in the organization. For Isidoro Felcman, this indicator has been added to three other elements, but excludes Stress.

- Given the existence of the two indicators differ in some respects we have developed a third where the previous two are combined. It is made up then of:
- Stress: It takes the approach used by Hofstede referred to feel nervous at work.
- Orientation to the rule: It is oriented to the perception that people have of the need to comply with the rules of the organization regardless of any situation.
- Preference spent in the organization: Refers to the time you would like to continue working in the organization.
- Best favorite work: Refers to the type of labor relations preferred by respondents specifically all work together and not differentiated or rewards people individually or

whether personal initiatives are encouraged and rewarded to stand

- Preferred remuneration system: Refers to the preferred remuneration for the respondents: go up the ladder, individual awards, group awards, etc.

Later Hofstede (1999) added:

- Short-term Orientation: characterized by elements such as respect for tradition, respect for social position and obligations, the social pressure for not being less than the partner, etc.

- Long-term Orientation: characterized by the adaptation of traditions to a modern context, respect for the obligations and position within certain limits, austerity and economy of resources, etc.

All this makes it hold that external influences have to do with the culture of the organization. For this reason the interdependence or interpenetration arose. Organizations are not islands or closed systems. The culture of an organization is strongly influenced by the environment in which it works.

In other studies, Hofstede identified six dimensions that reflected practical differences²:

- Process Oriented versus Results Orientation: contrast media concern about the importance for the objectives. While in process-oriented cultures, people are viewed as individuals who avoid risks, they limit working and are perceived as individuals who are comfortable in new challenges every day limiting effort in the results-oriented cultures, and make maximum effort. Strong cultures are associated with a culture that focuses on results.

- Employee Orientation opposed to Work Orientation: contrasts concern for people to worry about work. In employee-oriented cultures, they feel that their problems are taken into account, the organization responsible for their welfare and that important decisions are made in groups. In a work-oriented culture the employee feel great pressure to perform tasks.

- Corporatism versus Professionalism: in the corporatist cultures ordinary people believe it is normal that they consider their social and family environment, however, in professional cultures individuals believe that their personal life is only relevant to them.

- Open vs. Closed System: in open cultures, employees believe that the organization is open to new employees. In closed cultures, it is considered that people and organization are closed and secretive, both to outsiders and their members.

² This matter will be treated in another document, being prepared, which studies the variables and others referred to Confidence and other internal dimensions of each cultural category.

- Strict control vs. Lax control: with lax control units, individuals feel that not to think about the costs that times are approximate and there are frequent jokes. On units with strict control, they are concerned about the costs, there is great punctuality and jokes that are rare.

- Policy Making versus Pragmatism: normative units perceive their task as the implementation of inviolable rules, while pragmatic units are guided by the market.

The dimensions described are not prescriptive. That something is good or bad depends on where you want to go, depending on the policy option.

II. Methodology

To carry out the research we chose the case study. Following Stake is an 'instrumental case study', which allows a general understanding of the issues raised and has the advantage of the possibility of deeper social information, especially, the social relationships involved in reality.

He specifically worked on two research centers of the National University of La Plata, which we call Centre A and Centre B. In the next section a description of each will be made.

To do this, a survey was used. It is believed that the use of this technique including closed questions with other control makes it easy to operationalize concepts and rapid identification of suitable indicators for the study of organizational culture. The survey also offers the inherent benefits of using this type of methodology, such as the possibility of interviewing numerous contingents of people, generalizable to the universe under probability samples, it's clearly descriptive of a reality that is assumed to be stable, among others.

The survey used for diagnosing organizational culture is based on a conceptualization developed in 1995 by Isidore Felcman and Norberto Góngora, which has since been used in numerous research and studies for the analysis of culture in private companies and public organizations. It comprises semi-structured and open questions from the theoretical contributions of Warren Bennis, Edgar Schein, Heert Hofstede and Daniel Denison. It also incorporates a level of culture called cultural types, which in turn includes concepts originally developed by Robert Blake and Jane Mouton (1984) and Bill Reddin.

Table Nº 2: Cultural Types

People Orientation	Paternalistic Culture	Integrative Culture
	It is associated with the care of the welfare of members of the organization, loyalty among the people, the responsiveness to the demands of employees, high levels of security functions, complacency toward authority, the family atmosphere and friendly and good communication between the different hierarchical levels.	Implies the existence of both individual and group strategic direction, vision, commitment, consistency, teamwork, adaptability to change, fluid internal communication and a high concern for performance.

<p style="text-align: center;">Apathetic Culture</p> <p>It is characterized by excessive caution in the administration, the tendency to write rather than talk, conservatism, adherence to rules and regulations, etc. It is strongly aligned with models of bureaucratic management.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Demanding Culture</p> <p>It is one in which the emphasis is on an employment relationship that could qualify as demanding and inflexible, essentially based on the setting of targets and the requirement of compliance. This internal competition and insensitivity to the needs of others is encouraged.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Anomic Culture</p> <p>It occurs as a synonym for lack of interest and involvement, indifference to people's behavior, state of uncertainty and confusion, etc. It has the feeling of being adrift.</p>	
Result Orientation	

Source: Own Elaboration

The methodology is based on identifying the culture of the Centers according to five types: Paternalistic, Apathetic, Anomic, Integrative and Demanding, which arise from the crossing of two major dimensions. The first is people Orientation, which refers to the concern in the organization for the welfare or status of members of the organization, the second is the focus on results, based on the concern of the organization obtaining results and achieving goals. See attached chart.

Determining the organization of each Research Centre, current and future, culture is performed based on the average responses of the following variables:

- I. Features of supervisor
- II. Perception of change
- III. Remuneration system
- IV. Planning
- V. Availability of information
- VI. Error handling
- VII. Perception of performance Speed
- VIII. Types of tasks performed
- IX. Possibilities for change
- X. Success Criteria

To determine the variables there are questioned respondents on alternative decision criteria. Each response corresponds to an ideal type of culture.

Besides, the variables considered by Hofstede are analyzed, that contribute to understanding the culture of an organization:

- Stress at work
- Desire to stay in the organization
- Respect the rules

Preference for the size of the organization
Existing Fear
Current boss style
Power distance
Tolerance for uncertainty

Additionally and as a first approximation a comparison of the culture of the Research Institutes analyzed was performed the results of 120 organizations of the most varied types, the database is being studied in another research project. This culture related variables of the two research institutes and a comparison with the results of this was done overall averaged.

III. Description of the Analysis Units

Research Centers selected match the intention of addressing the culture of two organizations that share certain characteristics and differ in others, which contributes to a more thorough comparative analysis. The research also, in addition to the organizational culture, relieved justice and organizational climate.

The work done in the first center, called the Center A, is related to the natural sciences, while B is the center with computers, discipline with a strong training professionalism unlike the first whose base is research.

III.1 Characterization Center A

The Center is dedicated to research of inland waters. It has a history of over 40 years since its founding and belonged to the National University of La Plata. It has worked for more than 35 years in the system of institutes of the National Council for Scientific and Technical Research (CONICET), thus maintaining a double dependency: UNLP-CONICET.

The transfer of results is aimed at providing the basis for maintaining the quality and biodiversity of aquatic environments as well as for sustainable utilization thereof. Many of the activities include the identification, diagnosis and prescription of effective solutions to problems in aquatic environments.

It has 20 researchers and 16 professional technicians from the Career of Personnel Support CONICET, 18 interns who belong to CONICET, the Research Commission of the Province of Buenos Aires and the National University of La Plata and 12 national and international trainees. It also has 5 research associates from different Universities Abroad.

This Institute has formed a large number of human resources having defended more than 40 doctoral theses and with a scientific production of more than 900 research papers published in national and international refereed journals.

For the purposes of this study, 31 surveys were surveyed, representing 57% of the permanent staff of the Institute. The general characteristics of the respondents are listed below:

- Gender: 14 belong to male, 17 female and 1 did not answer.
- Age: most are between 51 and 60 years (11 cases), then between 31 and 40 years (9 cases), 7 have 30 years or less, 2 are in the range of 41 to 50 years and 2 are 61 years or more.
- 26 are categorized in the CONICET.
- 14 are categorized at the National Incentive Program.
- 9 research areas or lines were detected, belonging to 21 respondents. Of the remaining 2 tasks developed in the administrative area, 1 Library and 7 did not respond.

III.2 Characterization Center B

The Center B is dedicated to research and development in computer and since its inception has a clear focus on technology transfer to society. It also establishes agreements and technology transfer agreements with companies and public and private agencies for Analysis, Design and Implementation of Computer solutions.

It has worked for over 25 years in the field of UNLP first depending on the Faculty of Sciences and Informatics, once this academic unit was created. It has developed more than 20 research projects, it has published over 70 articles in refereed national and international papers, it has been advocated in their field, more than 18 graduate theses, and holds more than 25 intellectual property records.

Currently working in the Centre B are about 50 people, including teachers - researchers, scholars, postgraduate students and advanced students.

As part of this study, there were 39 responses obtained from researchers whose characteristics are:

- Sex: 30 (76.92%) were males and 9 were females.
- Age: 13 (33.33%) are 30 years old or less, 12 (30.77%) are between 31 and 40 years old, 9 (23.08%) are between 41 and 50 years old, 4 are between 51 and 60, and 1 is 61 or more.

- Regarding the level of education, it is seen that of the 38 responses, 6 (15.38%) have not yet completed their university studies, 15 (38.46%) have a full university level, 4 (10.26%) have a specialization, and 4 others are masters; 2 respondents have a PhD and 7 others respond, provided some interesting information about their formation.

- Regarding the employment status of the respondents within the Institute under analysis, 8 (20.51%) have staff in charge, 10 (25.64%) are middle managers, 4 (10.26%) belong to management, 2 (5.13 %) are part of senior management, 10 (25.64%) answered other, and 5 did not respond.

IV. Results

Analysis of the characteristics of the organizational culture of the centers surveyed in this research and a brief explanation of some additional variables are provided below.

IV.1 Comparison between A and B Center

▪ Cultural Types

There follows, in a comparative way, the results regarding both types of cultural research centers. As highlighted in the theoretical framework, the typology developed by Felcman and Góngora to characterize the cultural characteristics of organizations was used.

Table Nº 3: Cultural types – Present and desirable (Amounts expressed in percentage)

Cultural Types	Present		Desirable		Org. Average 120 (current)
	Center A	Center B	Center A	Center B	
Paternalistic	17.50	24.73	7.23	9.01	21.86
Apathetic	19.07	17.75	8.11	8.83	25.94
Anomic	19.85	7.43	3.73	2.73	18.32
Demanding	21.37	25.00	21.21	24.72	18.83
Integrative	22.21	25.09	59.73	54.71	15.02
Total answers	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Own Elaboration

According to this typology, both institutions possess an integrative culture. This culture is characterized by an appropriate combination of high levels of people-oriented and high Orientation results, which involves strategic direction, vision, commitment, consistency, teamwork, adaptability to change, fluid internal communication and a high concern for performance, both individually and in groups. In such cultures, it's about learning from mistakes rather than punishes them and takes advantage of conflicts.

This fact is important because, according to data from nearly 120 organizations that we

analyzed those with a dominant Integrative Culture are only 9.5% of the total.

In Center B one observed greater agreement in the responses than in the A, but in both also appear in different cultural types Features: A Center of Demanding and Anomic Culture, while the B Demanding and paternalist.

Regarding the desirable culture, greater agreement in both centers is observed, since in both, most of its members want to continue as at present (Integrative culture) and some prefer closer to a Demanding culture.

With respect to the average of 120 organizations and overall, it is clear the particularity of this type of institution, a research center of a public nature, as most of the organizations responding to a culture of Apathetic type, involving Paternalistic, i.e., which are characterized by a mean Orientation of people and the results, tending to be characterized as bureaucratic, in the weberian mode; the features of the second type is more culturally oriented to people than to outcomes, prioritizing the welfare of their members.

Generally when members of organizations of any cultural type are interrogated about his predilections, there is significant consensus on the desirable culture. About 120 organizations in 95% of cases, its members prefer or wish to work in organizational cultures Integrative entities.

▪ **Additional Variables**

Variables selected to complement the analysis of organizational culture, this time are presented in a table where the value assumed at each center and the overall observed already mentioned³. Then, a brief comparative analysis of each is developed.

The Strain, Respect for rules and Fear variables are measured through indices obtained from the Likert scale used in the survey, where 1 represents the option strongly agree and 5 Strongly disagree. The exception is the preference for size whose maximum value is 4 for choice Strongly Disagree. Regarding Permanency basket also contained 4 options, which gave a choice between certain number of years or until I retire, this being the maximum value.

As for the current style of the head, is exposed as a percentage of responses, being the sum of both styles 100%. The other two indices, tolerance Power distance and uncertainty are calculated in a particular way, the explanation lies in the 'Theoretical Framework' and its measurement is a percentage from 0% to 100%.

³ For this paper we selected these variables but in the other documents we developed the results of other variables and dimensions.

Table Nº 4: Additional Variables - Comparative

Additional variables	Center A	Center B	Overall average
Stress at work	2.35	2.23	2.63
Desire to Stay	3.42	3.58	3.08
Respect the rules	2.65	3.08	3.034
Preference for the size	2.36	2.14	2.76
Existing Fear	2.23	2.36	2.77
Current Style Boss	27.59	26.32	56.44
Autocratic			
Current style boss	72.41	73.68	43.56
Participating			
Power distance	21.56	22.75	41.77
Tolerance for uncertainty	41.12	42.83	46.07

Source: Own Elaboration

- Stress at work: When asked about how often you feel nervous or tense at work the members of the respective research centers, the results obtained from the surveys are not very different. While in center A the index Stress at work is 2.35 at the Centre B was 2.23.

Taking into account that the theoretical average is greater than 3 and more nervous and tense value is professional at work; both centers have a voltage level below the average. In this case, the B Center is below of average than the center A.

If we compare these results with the general average of the organizations surveyed, which yields a strain rate of 2.63, we see that they lie even below this average with a difference of 0.28 for the Center A and unlike 0.4 for Center B.

This means that both centers are working with a low degree of tension or stress.

For work we are doing at this time and are not yet published this regard, Tension or Stress is positively correlated, for example, by fear, to work under pressure, with the desire to leave the organization, etc.

- Desire for permanence: to interrogate members of Research Centers the time they wish to remain in the institution, both have similar results, with 3.42 for the center A and 3.58 for B.

Whereas the theoretical mean for this response is 2, in both research centers, the responses were above it. On the other hand, if we consider the overall average organizations, which yielded an index of 3.08, this also presents results above average, but is less than the present rate centers, so we could say that the desire for permanence is very strong in the organizations under study.

The desire to stay in the organization⁴ can be linked to organizational commitment or concern to have trouble for labor reinsertion if someone leaves the current occupation.

Let us hypothesize that should it be referred to the first option in these cases.

However by the specialties of each Research Centre the second option may also influence especially at Center A where members are difficult to be absorbed into the manufacturing area.

Also keep in mind that both centers are embedded within the system of National Universities -and the Center A is also within the set of centers under the CONICET-, and in these cases it is judged that their work is important to the community and these situations we can say that there is a desire to stay in the organization.

The same phenomenon has already been raised in the case of public hospitals (Góngora N. and Nóbile C., 2009).

- As to the rules: the indices obtained for this question were dissimilar; the Centre A presented an index of 2.65, while the center B of 3.08. The theoretical average of this question was 3, so we note that the B is above center, whereas the center A is below.

The results would indicate to us that, on one hand, in the center A it deprives ritualistic and bureaucratic mentality, on the other hand, center B had a pragmatic view.

The overall average organizations is 3.034, so it is above average and verified that the center B even has a higher rate than the overall average.

- Preference for the size of the organization: members of the research centers are questioned about their preference for working in a large and successful company instead of a small but successful organization. We must remember that the maximum for this question is 4 being the meaning of this number is total disagreement with the statement, and a minimum of 1 whose meaning is in full agreement with the statement.

The results shown by surveys to research centers are 2.36 points for the center A and 2.14 for B. Both indices Centre would be above the theoretical average of 2 points, which show a tendency in that both centers prefer working in small but successful organizations, but the overall average organizations surveyed is 2.76, higher the rate centers.

It is remarkable the change produced in the country in size preferences of organizations where it is desirable to work.

40 years ago there was a desire to enter working in large and successful organizations but now there is a taste for work in small and successful entities. Obviously this trend does

⁴ We can say that in 120 organizations analyzed having the possibility to work on the main value for the persons who work according to Hofstede's classification.

not exclude research institutes.

However, studies determined that there is a positive correlation between the size of the organization of research and development and production of individual scientific output. This has led to some CONICET and National Universities to implement policies aimed at encouraging institutional concentration to increased size. It must be assumed that in addition to the inertial resistance to changes, segmentation may occur by the size of the institutions where scientists work.

You can also note that in Science and Technology size preference should be associated to the type of research carried out.

In our case, the Centre A aims to basic research and there is also a preference for organizations of less size, while the Center B is closer to the technological development.

- Existing Fear: is researched in this case, how often members of the centers are fearful of expressing disagreement with their superiors. In the case of Centre A, the index was 2.23, and for B of 2.36 Center.

Given that the theoretical average for this point is 3, and considering that the higher the index is the largest existing fears, we can see that fear is not significant in the centers, but in the center B evidenced a greater fear.

The overall average organization is 2.77, and while it is below the theoretical mean it is greater than the rates obtained for the research.

The results are as expected and that fear is very difficult to develop research work at least in the Western world.

- Current boss style: in this case we asked about the current style of the head, with the options of autocratic or participative response. As shown in the table presented, in both centers predominate the participatory head style (72.41% at Center A and 73.68% in the Central B). In this case we found a significant difference from the overall responses of organizations; they said to submit an autocratic boss 56.44% and 43.56% participatory boss.

Similarly as in the previous point, it is very difficult to conduct research with an authoritarian boss. Perhaps in this case you have to revalue situational theories of leadership contingencies, because if you have to lead a group composed of individuals who are highly motivated and high technical and professional qualifications, a head that leaves some freedom to act and about being a facilitator of working conditions will possibly be the most suitable.

- Power distance: in this case we note that the index of the center of A is 21.56% and

the index of the center of B is 22.75%. This index should be analyzed in the light of the indices presented above of Fear and current style heads and a special index of the desired style heads.

Whereas the overall average is 41.77%, an important difference between this figure and the one presented in the research is verified.

Hierarchical Distance to be a composite of several dimensions is quite unknown, even for administrative professionals (Góngora N., 2012).

As already stated that the Hierarchical Distance is the perception of the subordinate about the person who placed hierarchically above, may have to distinguish between Ascending Hierarchical Distance and Descending Hierarchical Distance. The phenomenon posed by Hofstede, as already stated, refers to the hierarchical distance Ascendant, but it seems to be seen in the future, Descending Hierarchical Distance that refers to the attitudinal profiles of some people by socioeconomic status, intellectual, cultural, tradition, family, hierarchical or its media exposure, or other criteria that the person in question and part of society gives importance and that leads them to assume that they are above the other members of an organization or social sector.

In the case of research, this may have Bosses with a great academic reputation and in some cases social, who can hardly qualify as both positive Ascending and Descending Hierarchical Distance.

- Tolerance for uncertainty: this evaluation is also made up of other indices, as presented in the theoretical framework. Unlike the previous section, the results are similar between the centers, with the Center A 42.12% and 42.83% Center B, and these, in turn, did not differ significantly from the overall average of 46,07%.

CONCLUSION

A first important aspect that has emerged in our work is related to the current culture by research centers surveyed. In both centers, the culture was observed as the predominant Integrative, which showed us the existence of an Orientation toward people and toward outcomes simultaneously. This feature of the centers differed markedly with the overall average of the 120 organizations under study, which would indicate that the way we work and labor relations in the research centers of the fairly common or regular forms filed away by the other organizations.

Following this line of thought, we can see that in the case of center B, the Demanding culture is almost as important as the Integrative culture (Integrative culture 25.09% and Demanding culture 25%). From this we can discern that while there is guidance to the people in the center B, the results Orientation tend to be stronger, since there is a great importance of the objectives and the requirement for compliance.

On the other hand, in the center A, it also becomes important in Demanding cultures (with 21.37%) and Anomic (with 19.85%). These data allow us to observe that the center A, the objectives are also important, but on the other hand, the high presence of anomic culture would indicate that staff is in a state of indifference or disinterest.

Considering the desired culture in both organizations trends are more homogeneous, presenting, first, a preference for Integrative Culture (from 59.73% to Center A and the 54.71% for the Center B) and secondly, by Demanding culture (21.21% for the Centre A and 24.72% for the Center B). A note that the Centre has a stronger preference for the B Integrative Culture, issue that could be related to the existence of a higher current Anomic culture would indicate a greater inclination for culture change from certain individuals within the organization.

Regarding the analysis of additional variables, the conclusions we arrive are relate to:

- In both centers the index at Work stress is below the theoretical media and is even lower than the overall average organizations.
- The index related to the desire to stay in the organization, revealed that members of the research centers have a strong preference to remain in their respective organizations, which largely exceeds the theoretical mean and average organizations. This can in turn relate to the prevalent cultural types that present-Integrative-culture that makes members of the centers motivated to stay in them.
- Regarding the respect for the rules, the results, as mentioned above, were disparate. While at Center A deprive a bureaucratic mentality and ritualistic, Center B would have a pragmatic view. We could also establish a relationship with the index of the center A and culture it presents.
- Both research centers showed a preference for working in small but successful organizations, although the observed rates were lower than the overall average organizations.

- In general, members of research centers do not feel afraid to express disagreement with their superiors, which we would indicate an organized into teams or groups of people work, which, to a greater extent can express their views. This could also link with the dominant culture Integrative both.
- In the previous index, we can see that in both organizations under study participatory styles of heads prevail, which would also allow people to express their opinions without fear.
- In turn, making indexes Fear and Actual Head Style, we can analyze the rate of Hierarchical Distance. This index presents relatively low numbers in both centers, being lower in the center than in the center B A. This would indicate that less hierarchical distance would be related to less fear and Participatory Heads.
- Finally, the index of tolerance to uncertainty had similar results in the two research centers.

Unlike the research of Culture in Hospital Services where each service had a different culture and even the same specialty services in different public hospitals also had dissimilar cultures (Góngora N. Nobile C., Cicatelli F. and Maroscia C. 2011). In this case there are more cultural similarities between the two cases studied, even when differentiated internal cultural dimensions are observed.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

(1) SCHEIN, E. (1988). La cultura empresarial y el liderazgo. Buenos Aires, Editorial Plaza Janes, p. 25-26.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Please refer to articles Spanish Bibliography.

BIOGRAPHICAL ABSTRACT

Please refer to articles Spanish Biographical abstract.