

AIMC 2017
Asia International Multidisciplinary Conference

**THE RANKINGS OF INVOLVEMENT AND CONSISTENCY IN
LINE WITH ACADEMIC RESEARCH ETHICS**

Farhad Balash (a), Shirin Ghooja (b)*, Ayat Saadat Talab (c)
*Corresponding author

(a) IEPSR, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran, efarhaddevelopment@gmail.com
(b) Visiting Researcher, IEPSR, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran, shirin.ghooja1980@gmail.com
(c) IEPSR, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran, saadattalab2009@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper aims to show the cultural constraints for developing research ethics among faculty members. Ethical research seems influenced by academic culture in the organizations. University as an organization, needs its own specific research ethics and culture. In this study, the researchers applied Denison Organizational Culture as a suitable model to see the impact of different aspects of the model on research ethics in an Iranian state university. The researchers named four aspects of the model as involvement, consistency, adaptability and mission. In this study, the researchers applied the quantitative approach, Fredman non – parametric measurement, using a researcher-made questionnaire. The researchers further used purposeful sampling method and chose fifty-five faculty members in Human Sciences as the respondents of the study. The conclusion of this study illuminates that among the four traits of Denison Organizational Model, involvement and consistency have the highest ranks among other traits as to highest attribution to research ethics.

© 2018 Published by Future Academy www.FutureAcademy.org.UK

Keywords: Research Ethics, Organizational Culture, Faculty Member.



1. Introduction

Human's attitude toward societies have always led him/her to organized groups by which they can move forward reaching his personal goals. Such groups are systematically clarifying organizations consisting of common social principles and ground rules. An organization consists of environment, strategy, versatile interaction of work, technology and individuals (Nadler, 1997). The mounting development of organizations have titled our era the age of organizations (Gharamaleki, 2014). There is a set of rules in each organization, which is defined by a context named as culture. The culture of each organization builds up the identity and existence of it. According American Heritage culture is the whole of communally transferred behavior, configurations, arts, beliefs, organizations and all other products of human effort and understood characteristic of a community of people. Organizations differ in their existing culture from one to another because beliefs and values of different groups are specialized within their own certain organizational culture. In other words, organizational culture is the key source of abilities in a system. One of the organizations that plays a significant role in the goals orientation and higher education development of each society is the university, which its leading culture possess a assured distinctiveness and like an ethnic group they follow their own values, beliefs and cultural, language, regional model (Becher, 2001). The key feature of the university culture is its function in identity making. Regarding this point, Taylor argues that university identity is divided into three levels such as identity figured from place of work, field identity, and universal identity (Taylor, 1999). According to Gharamaleki (2014), research has a collective identity, which constructs the organizational culture.

There is a variety of factors, which influence the research ethics among faculties of different subjects. This study pays a meticulous attention to the research ethics misbehavior, which is a growing phenomenon in Iran. Frequently, Iran's Ministry of Sciences, Research and Technology have announced several types of research misconduct such as research misbehavior, ignoring the rights of subject, ignoring commitment and responsibility toward beneficiaries, data forgery, plagiarism, scientific hiring, ignoring the rights of intellectual ownership and accomplished research responsibility, republication, publication overlapping, trading research works, identity forgery (Yousefi, 2016).

The process of research ethics in Iran meets a serious crisis, for instance the most recent example of this misconduct, which happened as a result of fraud in writing process, judgment, and publication, ended in rejection of 58 Iranian papers from Springer (Yousefi, 2016). The mentioned example is one of the many samples happening in not also Iranian academic life, but in many other scientific societies around the world. Since research ethics is deeply affected by the university culture; therefore, based on findings, the researchers want to find the attribution of organizational culture to research ethics.

1.1. Concept of culture

So far, sociologists and great thinkers have presented many different definitions of culture. Some researchers claimed that culture is an abstract phenomenon, which is a conceptual image of behavior; therefore, if we consider culture as behavior then it may include in psychological categories, while they believe it is an image of behavior not itself (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952). UNESCO held a conference in 1982 in Mexico city by which a comprehensive definition of culture was presented as on the broadest

perception, culture is a totality including unique material, virtual, intellectual and emotional characteristics, which are the indicators of a group or society; it is not only the art and products of a society but the life style, basic rights of individuals, values system, traditions, and the beliefs of it; therefore, culture is a concept that differentiate a society from another.

1.1.1 Organization, Organizational Culture and University

As we mentioned before, nowadays people prefer to reach their goals via joining well planned groups, which are called organizations. The identity of each organization is made of set of beliefs and values among the members that is known as organizational culture. Organizational culture plays a substantial role in management system of different groups because of its impacts on the concerns of commitment, faithfulness, intent, and the general fulfilment level of the organization (Chow & Harison, 2004). Organizational culture first was applied by Andrew Pettigrew in administrative science periodical in management academic literature in 1979 in the article “On Studying Organizational Culture “and has been studied by many attracted scholars until now. Each organization nevertheless being small or big has its own method of supervision system that affects all of the features of the current tactics. In fact the groundwork of this culture has been established from the essential beliefs, values and principles as well as the set of management performs undergo because they are important for the members (Denison & Neale, 1990). So far researchers have not reached unanimity on how to outline organizational culture (Cook & Rousseau, 1988; Hofstede, 1998; Schein, 2010). However many scholars are expected to show their agreement on that the organizational culture, which is considered as an important aspect in employee place of work behaviors (Cameron & Quinn, 2006; Denison et al., 1990; Schein, 1990). Several models have been used to classify organizational culture. The authors state some of these models in order to reach the most comprehensive one which has the closest attribution to the research ethics that is the main focus of this study.

Hofstede believed in the role of impact of cultural differences on intellectual methods and social behaviors, and even in mental arrangement. He highlights the connection between culture and ethics. He pointed out long versus short term placement, which states that the concern of society for virtue and setting up the truth (Toscano, 2015). Deal and Kennedy are another academics that created a model of organizational culture based on four different types of organizations, such as work tough, play-tough culture, which has quick response / prize and low risk result (Deal & Kennedy, 2000). According to Schein, culture is the most problematic organizational feature to change. His organizational model is defined at three levels of (a) items, which consists of the services, workplaces, the way that its members wear and all the visible communications with organizational strangers (b) adopted values that is a complex of local and private values (c) original fundamental principles are character’s imprints about the trustworthiness and effectiveness of an organization. Many of these implicit rules occur without the practical awareness of the members (Schein, 2010). Charles Handy, connected organizational structure to organizational culture. His model contains four cultures of authority, role, task, and person. Authority culture, which is focused on the authority among a small crowd and its control is scorching from its center like a net. Role culture that is a model in which control is completed by procedures, which are extremely appreciated (authority originates from the person’s positions not from an expert), strict roles and professional definition. Task culture is the way groups are planned to solve definite problems. Power is resulting from the group with the expertise to

run along with an operation (Matrix structure). Person culture is shaped when all characters are confident of themselves to be superior in the organization. It may get problematic for such organizations to function well; however, in some methods it can go fine because each mate brings a distinctive skill to the firm (Hofstede, 1998). Stephen McGuire generated a model of organizational culture, which predicts earnings from new sources. The features of this model are: personages and authorization concentrated, value basis through innovation, consideration to the fundamentals, performance the correct things, self-determination to progress and to be ineffective, obligation and personal responsibility, and stressing the future (Maguire, 2003). In 1990, Daniel Denison created a model, which was composed of four dimensions of adaptability, consistency, involvement, and mission. Based on Denison’s organizational culture model, there are two features of organizational culture; namely, visible and invisible. Visible indicates individual manners and group standards. These aspects are easy to perceive. Invisible alludes that some aspects are hard to observe because they represent the invisible values and core beliefs. The cultural system cannot be easily observed but the people who worked in the organization can recognize it well. Actually, recognizing the different dimensions of organizations are highly helpful to understand influential factors of research ethics among academic members (Denison et al., 1990). To the best of the researchers’ knowledge, Denison's model of organizational culture, is a precious model to be examined as to understand the attributions of the dimensions of his model to academic’s research ethics, which is a concern noticed by authors in this study.

Basically, the focus of the paper is mainly of involvement and consistency traits that the concepts of these two are reflected on different models. In order to visualize the studied models table.1 could help readers to comprehend the paper.

Table 01. Different models of organizational culture

Model	Dimensions	Sub-dimensions
Hofstede (1998)	Authority distance	
	Ambiguity prevention	
	Individuality vs. collectivism	
	Masculinity vs. femininity	
	Time placement	
Deal & Kennedy (2000)	-Work-tough, play-tough culture	-Urgency in doing obligations, group work, stress on job fascination, low risk activities, quick reaction to situation
	-Hard –guy masculine culture	-High risk activities, quick reaction to situation, stress on supporting the member’s abilities
	-Procedure culture	-Well-organized official procedure, low risk activities, gentle
	-Bet-the-business culture	reaction to situation, stress on task’s information
	- values	-stress on methodological abilities, high risk activities, gentle reaction
	Basic underlying assumptions	
Handy (1991)	-Power culture	
	-Role culture	-Extreme loyalty to authorities in organizations, actions based on rules
	-Task culture	-Emphasis on Bureaucratic structure, clear definition of
	-Person culture	tasks
Maguire (2003)	-People and empowerment focused	-Emphasis on functional standards, Hard efforts to reach goals

	-Values creation through innovation and change	-Protecting professionals and specialists
	-Attention to the basics	
	-Hands-on management	
	-Doing the right thing	
	-Freedom to grow and to fail	
	-Commitment and personal responsibility	
	-Emphasis on the future	
Denison (1990)	Mission	
	Adaptability	
	Involvement	
	Consistency	
O'Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell (1991)	-Organizational Cultural Profile (OCP)	
Rosauer (2014)	The worker, The work, The customer	
Johnson (1988)	-The paradigm	Strategic Direction and Intent, Goals and Vision
	-Control system	Creating change, customer Focus and Organizational Learning
	-Organizational structure	Empowerment, Team Orientation and Capability Development
	-Power structures	Core Values, Agreement, Coordination/Integration
	-Symbols	Innovation, Supportiveness, Stability, Respect for people, Outcome orientation, Attention to detail, Team orientation, and Aggressiveness.
	-Rituals and routines	
	-Stories and myths	
Stanley & Lawrence' (1978)	-Self-in-organization schemata	
	-Person-in-organization schemata	
	-Organization schemata	
	-Object/concept-in-organization schemata	
	-Event-in-organization schemata	
Cook & Rousseau (1988)	-Constructive cultures	
	-Passive/defensive cultures	
	-Aggressive/defensive cultures	Achievement, self-actualizing, humanistic-encouraging, affiliative
Grant (2013)	-Giver culture	Approval, conventional, dependent, avoidance
	-Taker culture	Oppositional, Power, competitive, perfectionistic
	-Matcher culture	
Cameron & Quinn (2006)	-Clan culture	
	-Adhocracy culture	
	-Market culture	Internal focus and flexible
	-Hierarchy culture	External focus and flexible

2. Problem Statement

As the researchers studied different models of organizational cultures, they have found Denison's model of organizational culture as one the most comprehensive ones in order to detect the attribution of its traits to the academic's research ethics which is the highlighted portion of this study. As a matter of fact the main issue of this paper to be analyzed is the involvement and consistency as the traits of this model.

3. Research Questions

Several questions raised to get answers in this paper that can be summarized in one main question: what is the priority setting among the traits and subcategories of Denison's model in attribution to research ethics?

4. Purpose of the Study

This study is to highlight the existing constraints for developing research ethics among faculty members of an Iranian state university. It is suggested to be taken into consideration that research ethics in an organization like a university, is deeply influenced by its academic culture because a university needs the specific culture and also the research ethics.

5. Research Methods

The researchers utilized quantitative approach with Friedman non – parametric measurement, applying a researcher-made questionnaire, which was based on 60-Item Denison's questionnaire. These items are along with four main traits and subcategories of these traits. Adaptability, consistency, involvement, and mission are the main traits. Adaptability includes creating change, customer focus, and organizational learning. Consistency covers coordination and Integrity, agreement, and core Values. Involvement contains empowerment, team orientation, and capability. Also, mission comprises of strategic direction, goals and objectives. The purposeful sampling was used and also 55 faculty members in human sciences were selected as the respondents. The sample were selected from Kharazmi University, Iran.

6. Findings

In this part, the researchers analyze the priority of Denison's four dimensions of organizational culture, which is presented in table.1, the traits are prioritized regarding their attribution to research ethics.

Table 02. Ranking the traits of organizational culture based on the attribution to research ethics

No	Traits	Mean	Ranking
1	Involvement	2.80	1
2	Consistency	2.45	2
3	Adaptability	2.30	3
4	Mission	2.45	2
	Chi 2	DF	Significance Level
	1.825	2	0.001

Table 2 shows that regarding the ranking of organizational culture based on attribution to research ethics, chi2 is 1.825 and the significant level of $\alpha=0.05$, there is the significant difference. Moreover the highest level of the ranking is allocated to Involvement and the lowest is given to Adaptability.

Table 03. Ranking the traits of involvement & consistency based on the attribution to research ethics

No	Traits	Mean	Ranking
1	Involvement	1.57	1
2	Consistency	1.43	2
	Chi 2	DF	Significance Level
	0.429	1	0.001

Table 3 shows that regarding the ranking of organizational culture based on attribution to research ethics, chi2 is 0.429 and the significant level of $\alpha=0.05$, there is the significant difference. Moreover the highest level of the ranking is allocated to involvement and the lowest is given to consistency.

Table 04. Ranking the indices of involvement based on the attribution to research ethics

No	Traits	Mean	Ranking
1	Empowerment	4.05	2
2	Team Orientation	3.41	3
3	Capability	3.25	4
4	Coordination and Integrity	3.09	5
5	Agreement	2.80	6
6	Core Values	4.41	1
	Chi 2	DF	Significance Level
	12.832	5	0.000

Table 4 shows that regarding the ranking of organizational culture based on attribution to research ethics, chi2 is 12.832 and the significant level of $\alpha=0.05$, there is the significant difference. Moreover the highest level of the ranking is allocated to core values and the lowest is given to agreement.

Table 05. Ranking the indices of consistency based on the attribution to research ethics

No	Traits	Mean	Ranking
1	Creating Change	2.20	1
2	Student Centered	1.66	3
3	Organizational Learning	2.10	2
	Chi 2	DF	Significance Level
	5.146	2	2

Table 5 shows that regarding the ranking of organizational culture based on attribution to research ethics, χ^2 is 5.146 and the significant level of $\alpha=0.05$, there is the significant difference. Moreover the highest level of the ranking is allocated to creating change and the lowest is given to student-centered.

7. Conclusion

To summarize what the researchers have obtained from this study, since there have been various organizational culture models so far, the authors tried to find the common points of the models attributed to research ethics among academic members. As we mentioned before regarding the focus of the studies on different organizational models, to the best of researchers' knowledge, Denison's organizational culture model seemed an appropriate match to the organization of university. As we mentioned before because of the comprehensive features of Denison's model comparing with the other organizational culture, two traits of this model have been highlighted which are involvement and consistency. According to Kreitner, R. & Kinicki (2012), Kayworth & Leidner (2002) and Denison et al., (1990), it is discussable that active involvement among the staff leads the organization to a better efficiency and dynamism of the system. Consequently, the participatory leadership facilitates the process of problem solving, taking advantage of the members' involvement. Consistency is another noticeable trait according to Deal & Kennedy (2000), which is based on a belief that the success of an organization is linked to its integrity and cooperation.

In conclusion, core values, empowerment, and teamwork are the main factors that can influence research ethics. These factors show that core values that are the subcategory of consistency are highly attributed to research ethics following by empowerment and teamwork that are the subcategories of the involvement. It is deduced that if in the university the managers focus on these three the result will be reflected on the improvement of research ethics among academic members.

It is suggested by the researchers that other models of organizational culture examine by other research as to understand the attribution of different traits to research ethics. Moreover, the different studies could be measured to observe different manifestations of misconducts in research as well.

References

- Becher, T. (2001). *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Culture of Disciplines*. SRHE & Open University Press.
- Cameron, K. S. & Quinn, R. E. (2006). *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture: Based on the Competing Values Framework*. Jossey-Bass.

- Chow, C.W. & Harison, G.& et al. (2004). Organizational Culture: Association with Commitment, Job Satisfaction, Propensity to Remain, and Information Sharing in Taiwan. *International Journal of Business Studies*, 11.(1) , 25-44.
- Cook, R. A. & Rousseau, D. (1988). Behavioral Norms and Expectations A *Quantitative Approach To the Assessment of Organizational Culture*. Sage, 13(3), 245-271
- Deal,T. & Kennedy, A. (2000). Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life. Basic Books.
- Denison, D. R. & Neale, W. S. (1990). Denison Organizational Culture Survey Facilitator Guide. Denison Consulting, LCC.
- Gharamaleki, A. (2014). Organizational Strategies to Research Ethics. In R. Fallah (Ed.), Disputes in Research Ethics. Institutue for Humanities and Cultural Studies.
- Grant, A. (2013). In the Company of Givers and Takers. Harvard Business Review. April issue.
- Handy, C. (1991). Gods of Management: The Changing Work of Organization. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hofstede, G. (1998). Identifying Organizational Subcultures: An Empirical Approach. *Journal of Management Studies*, 35(1), 1–12.
- Johnson, G. (1988). Rethinking Incrementalism. *Strategic Management Journal*. 9(1), 75-91.
- Kayworth, T. R. & Leidner, D. E. (2002). Leadership Effectiveness in Global Virtual Teams. *Management Information System*. 18(3), 7-40.
- Kreitner, R. & Kinicki, A. (2012). Organizational behavior. Edition 10. Mc Graw - Hill Higher Education.
- Kroeber, A. L.& Kluckhohn, D. (1952). Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions. Papers of the Peobody Museum of Archaeology & Ethnology, Harvard University, 47(1), Cambridge, Mass., The Museum.
- Maguire, E. (2003). Organizational Structure in American Police Agencies: Context, Complexity, and Control. Sunny Press
- Nadler, D. (1997). Competing by Design: The Power of Organizational Architecture. Oxford University Press.
- O'Reilley, C., Chatman.J. & Caldwell, D. (1991). People and Organizational Culture: A Profile Comparison Approach to Assessing Person-Organization Fit *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3), 487-516.
- Rosauer, B. (2014). Reputational Risk Management Using the Three Bell Curves. Insurance Thought Leadership.
- Schein, E. (1990). Organizational Culture. *American Psychologist*, 45(2), 109–119.
- Schein, E. (2010). Organizational culture and leadership. Jossey bass.
- Stanley, M. & Lawrence, P. (1978). Problems of Matrix Organizations. Harvard Business Review. May issue.
- Taylor, P. G. (1999). Making Sense of Academic Life: Academics, Universities and Change. Society for Research into Higher Education. Open University Press.
- Toscano, N. A. (2015). Understanding the Impact of Leadership and Organizational Culture on Nonprofit Employees' Commitment and Turnover Intention. Dissertation.
- Yousefi, Z. (2016). THE Study of 58 Iranian Papers Plagirism. Mehrnews Agency. Retrieved from <http://www.mehrnews.com/news/3822240/>