

The influence of organizational DNA on innovation performance: An empirical study in a sample of Iraqi industrial organizations

Dr.Saleh Abdul Reda Rashid
Professor of management
Dr.Ihssan Dahash Chalab
Assistant professor of management

أثر الـ DNA المنظمي في الأداء الإبداعي: دراسة ميدانية في عينه من المنظمات الصناعية العراقية

أ.د.صالح عبد الرضا رشيد
أ.م.د.أحسان دهش جلاب
جامعة القادسية كلية الإدارة والاقتصاد قسم إدارة الأعمال

مستخلص:

تختص هذه الدراسة ببيان الأفكار النظرية والتجربة العملية لنموذج (Hamilton 2005) لاسيما المتصلة منها بما يعرف بـ DNA المنظمي و الأداء الإبداعي . وإذا ما أخذنا بالحسبان حداثة هذه المفاهيم وما يترتب على ذلك من نقص في الأطر النظرية والحاجة إلى الإثبات ، فإن الدراسة الحالية أخذت ذلك على عاتقها باختيار هذا الموضوع واختباره في عينة من المنظمات الصناعية العراقية للتطبيق (الشركة العامة للصناعات المطاطية ، مصنع نسيج الديوانية ، ومصنع ألبان الديوانية) . حاولت الدراسة الإجابة عن تساؤل مفاده إلى أي مدى يمكن أن يسهم تناغم مكونات الـ DNA المنظمي (حقوق القرار، المعلومات، التحفيز، و التركيب التنظيمي) في بلوغ الأداء الإبداعي لمنظمات الأعمال معبراً عنه بـ (السرعة، الشفافية، والقابلية على المساعدة) ؟ وهل تختلف النتيجة باختلاف نوع الصناعة ؟. اعتمدت الدراسة على استمارة استبانة أعدها الباحثان اعتماداً على أفكار (Hamilton 2005) تم تحليلها باعتماد المتوسط الحسابي ، الانحراف المعياري، معامل ارتباط الرتب Spearman ، توزيع T ، واختبار Kruskal-Wallis . وتوصلت الدراسة إلى إثبات مصداقية النموذجين فضلاً عن الخروج ببعض التوصيات التي يعتقد الباحثان إنها كفيلة بزيادة الأداء الإبداعي من حيث التشجيع على ربط المنظمات بشبكة اتصال واسعة ومن ثم تفويض الأفراد في مجال الوظيفة وامتلاك الإدارة تصور واضح عن المسارات الوظيفية المستقبلية للأفراد.

Abstract:

This study introduces theoretical ideas and practical experience of Hamilton's studies related to organizational DNA and innovation performance. Taking into consideration the limitation of theoretical frameworks and need to prove them, the study attempts to develop the means by which different types of organizations can compete and attain desired objectives according to Hamilton's point of view.

Two fundamental questions arise here .First, how well or bad the four orgDNA building blocks are aligned in Iraqi industrial organizations (organizational stereotypes)?.Second, to which extent the alignment of orgDNA building blocks can influence innovation performance?. Three Iraqi industrial enterprises were chosen to investigate this problem. A questionnaire with 49 questions was designed and distributed among 27 managers to collect required data. Testing of hypotheses was performed by mean, standard deviation, correlation coefficients, t-distribution, and Kruskal-Wallis test. The results of the study indicated that organizational DNA four blocks had a positively significant relationship with innovation performance.Finally, the study concludes with many recommendations that should explore how to create the necessary conditions for organizations in emerging economics to innovate and create knowledge.

Theoretical Background

1-OrgDNA:

Based on Booze Allen Hamilton view point, organizations can be defined in terms of four organizational dimensions-organizational structure, decision rights, motivators, and information. These dimensions, when combined in myriad ways, define what call an organizational DNA..In the following paragraphs, we define the constructions with which many scholars view these dimensions:

1-1-Decision rights: Means the underlying mechanism of how decisions are truly made (Hamilton,2005:2) . In particular, this means making decisions authorities and responsibilities as black and white as possible firstly.Secondly, appoint”process owners”-the business unit or functional managers who lead the revitalization of business processes and who will be accountable for its success- and empower them (Bordia et al.,2005:6).

1-2-Information: Decisions require information that is timely and accurate .Information can play two critical roles in today's organizations that are organizational response to business pressures(Turban et al.,1999:13),and enhance key business functions(Wheelen &Hunger,2004:100).Information explain what metrics are used to measure performance ? How are activities coordinate, and how is knowledge transferred? How are expectations &

progress communicated? Who know what? Who need to know what? (Neilson et al., 2005:6).

1-3-Organizational Structure: Organizational structure is the sum total of the ways in which the organization divides its labor into distinct tasks to ensure effective communication, coordination, and integration of efforts across departments (Hodge & Anthony, 1991:290;Daft, 2001: 86). Whatever the structure, multiple organization layers and narrow span of control often result in excess bureaucracy and bottlenecked decision macking.Excutions must draw attention toward two remedies.First,rooting out and eliminating or redeploying shadow staff-people performing tasks that duplicate the performed elsewhere in organization-resources is a key to improve organizational performance.Second,managing the career path and ensuring rotations in different geographies,functions,and roles is important to the development of well-rounded senior managers of product development(Bordia et al.2005:7-8).

1-4-Motivators: Historically, no one deny the critical role motivation plays in shaping behavior and in influencing work performance and organizations. Motivators include more than money, they also include nonfinancial aspects like goals, preference,and accomplishment(Ivancevich & Matteson,2002:151).Balancing between positive(financial and nonfinancial) and negative(punishment) motivational considerations is one of the most main issues that managers must attend (Thompson and Stricland,2003:409).From the employee's point of view ,motivation is a powerful tool for furthering the organization's strategic goals.First,awards has a major impact on employee attitudes. Second, employee compensation is typically a significant organizational cost and thus requires close secruting (Noe et al,1994:545).

2-The seven organization types:

Based on Hamilton's experience working with organizations and how well or bad the four orgDNA building blocks are aligned in them, there are seven principal types of organizations- the first three are healthy and the latest four are unhealthy. Below an overview of organizational stereotypes (Hamilton,2005;Bordia et al.,2005):

2-1-The resilient organization: Resilient organizations are flexible enough to adapt quickly to external market shift, forward looking, and fun, and they attract team players. The resilient organization is the healthiest of all the profiles because it always scans the horizon for the next competitive battle or market innovation.

2-2-The just in time organization: This type of organization has demonstrated an ability to "turn on a dime" when necessary, without losing

sight of big picture. JIT organization is inconsistently prepared for change by having attitudes that infuses the office and inspires creative outbursts.

2-3-The military organization: In such organizations, everyone knows his or her role and implements it diligently. This organization often driven by a small, involved senior team because it is hierarchical and operate under a highly controlled management model that allows it to efficiently execute large volumes of similar transactions.

2-4-The outgrown organization: This organization is too large and complex to be effectively controlled by a small team, but yet it has to democratize decision –making authority. Because power is closely held at the top, this organization tends to react slowly to market developments and often it cannot get out of its own way.

2-5-The overmanaged organization: Burdened with multiple layers of management, this organization is a case study in” analysis paralysis”. Managers in this organization spend their time checking subordinates work rather than scanning environment.

2-6-The fit and starts organization: Organizations contain scores of smart, motivated and talented people, who rarely pull in the same direction at the same time.

2-7-The passive aggressive organization: This is the seething, smiley-face organization. Making change isn't problem in this organization, but implementing these change is next to impossible. Management in passive aggressive organization struggles to implement agreed-upon plans.

3-Innovation Performance:

There are many views concerning with innovation concept. Jones (1995:405) depicts it as the process by which an organization uses its resources to create new goods, process, or services. McElroy (2000:1-2) considers innovation as the process by which new knowledge is embraced into practice by organizations. Innovation is also new things or ideas (Macmillan & Tampoe, 2000:248). According to (Hitt et al., 2001: 526) innovation is the process of creating a commercial product from an invention.

In other side, innovation performance has been measured by many metrics. (Hitt et al., 2001:533) shows three areas that are time to market, product quality, and creation of customer value. (Robbins, 2003:18) determines flexibility, continually improvement in quality, and speed as an innovation performance metrics. (Wheelen & Hunger, 2004:285-287) has been illustrated three areas: new product, product quality, and faster distribution. In a recent study conducted by Hamilton innovation performance is a function to time to market, product quality, and development cost (Bordia et al., 2005:1). Finally (Bordia et al., 2005:3-5) determine three areas –depending on latest Hamilton

experience working- that are speed of decision making about new opportunities, transparency-exchange of information between functions, and accountability.

3-1-speed: Means innovate faster than others competitors. Speed in decision making enable organizations to mobilize against new opportunities in order to capture first-to –market advantages as well as to respond quickly to changes in customer environment or to the actions of competitors.

3-2- Transparency: Transparency is the properties that allow direction and action to be made visible through an organization. For effective innovation, transparency ensures that development priorities and efforts can aligned with strategic priorities.

3-3-Accountability: Accountability is the mechanism that ensures cross-functional commitments are taken seriously, and it establishes personal ownership for performance and outcomes.

Methodology:

The plan of this study is based on the ideas of Hamilton (2005) , in his articles about organizational DNA and innovation performance. The methodology has been described below:

1-Research questions:

The research has been trying to answer the following questions:-

1-1-Why some organizations cross the finish line before others have even started their engines?

1-2-How well or bad the four orgDNA building blocks are aligned in Iraqi industrial organizations (organizational stereotypes)?

1-3-To which extent the alignment of orgDNA building blocks can influence innovation performance?

2-The importance of the research:

2-1-The target research intends to contribute to the organizational theory field as well as to the knowledge about one of the most breakthrough areas- OrgDNA.

2-2-The study of OrgDNA in Iraqi industry sector would be particularly the first, since most studies on OrgDNA has been conducted in Northern European and North American context.

2-3-This research presents simple attempt to test the theoretical concepts in different settings, since that may lead to new insights and extension of this subject.

3-Data collection instrument:

A close-ended questionnaire consisting of three sections was designed to collect required data (see appendix).Section No.1 identified the four orgDNA

building blocks (questions 1-16). Section No.2 described for each of the seven organization types (questions 17-37). Section No.3 provided a description for innovation performance dimensions (questions 38-49).

4-Sample of the study:

The data collection instrument was administered to a total of three organizations in Al-Diywania city-Republic of Iraq (see Table 1):

Table (1)

Sample of studied organizations

No.	Organizations	Industry type	questionnaires distributed	questionnaires completed	percent
1	The State Enterprise for Rubber Industries	chemical	15	14	0.93
2	Al-Diywania Textile Factory	Textile	9	8	0.88
3	Al-Diywania Dairy Factory	Foods	6	5	0.83

Respondents (top management team) were asked to indicate their responses on a 5-point bi-polar scale. Twenty seven completed questionnaires were returned with a response rate of (90%).All of respondents were males with a bachelor's degree as an educational level.

5-Statistical tools used to process data:

The database was processed using some of statistical tools such as mean, standard deviation, Kruskal-Wallis test, correlation coefficient, and t-distribution to detect the significance of parameter estimates. For these statistics, significance of 0.05 or less was accepted and using a one-tailed test.

6-Variables and measurement:

The variables are summarized as following:

6-1-Independent variables: (OrgDNA building blocks) decision rights, information, organizational structure and motivators.

6-2-Explanation variable: The seven organizational stereotypes.

6-3-Dependent variables :(Innovation performance dimensions) speed, transparency, and accountability.

7-Hypotheses:

H1: In the industrial sector under study, the more aligned OrgDNA building blokes the higher innovyion perfifmance.

H1a: The degree of clearness in decision rights will positively influence innovation performance.

H1b: The degree of information availability will positively influence innovation performance.

H1c: The highest motivation level will positively influence innovation performance.

H1d: The well-designed structure will positively influence innovation performance.

H2: The relationship between OrgDNA building blocks and innovation performance will differ subject to the type of industry.

Discussion:

In order to test hypothesis No.1, means and standard deviation must be known. Table (2) shows responses about OrgDNA as it described in section No.1 of questionnaire:

Table 2
means and standard deviations for OrgDNA and innovation performance
N=(27)

no. of org .	Dimensions of organization DNA								Dimensions of innovation performance					
	Decision rights		Information		motivators		Structure		Speed		Transparen cy		Accountabili ty	
	μ	SD	μ	SD	μ	SD	μ	SD	μ	SD	μ	SD	μ	SD
1	3.4	0.5	2.5	1.3	1.8	0.9	3.1	1.1	2.5	0.6	3.3	1.2	2.6	1.4
2	2.6	0.8	1.9	0.3	4.1	1.2	3.7	0.8	1.2	0.2	2.9	1.1	3.8	0.4
3	3.3	1.1	3.8	0.9	3.5	0.6	3.3	0.4	3.9	0.9	3.8	0.4	4.1	0.8

5=strongly agree 4=agree 3= natural 2=disagree 1= strongly disagree

The state enterprise for rubber industries registers high mean score, as compared with other organizations, on decision rights, while standard deviations was low. In other side Al-Diywania textile factory emphasize motivators and structure with standard deviations (1.2)and(0.8)orderly .Information,speed,transparency,and accountability were high in Al-Diywania dairy factory as compared with other organizations.

Section No.2 of questionnaire was important to divide organizations under study according to the seven bases OrgDNA (see Table 3).

Table (3)
Organizational Stereotype

No.of org.	Means						
	resilient	JIT	Military	Outgrown	Overmanaged	Fit and Start	Passive-aggressive
1	2.88	3.62	2.22	4.27	3.21	2.15	2.77
2	3.25	4.01	3.85	2.73	4.33	2.13	1.95
3	2.7	2.95	3.91	3.36	3.44	1.29	3.23

Table (3) shows that The State Enterprise for Rubber Industries is Outgrown organization, Al-Diywania Textile Factory is Overmanaged organization. And Al-Diywania Dairy Factory is Military organization. We can say that Table (3) results are correspondent with the results of Table (2) and the two results are correspondent with the theoretical background that illustrates that outgrown organization has yet democratize decision-making authority (Bordia et al.,2005:2). And in overmanaged organization layers are impediment to the information flows and also limit transparency and speed (Bordia et al.,2005:4). Because of military organization fall into healthy organization categories (the resilient organization, the just in time organization, the military organization), it has good innovation performance (Bordia et al.,2005:2).

In general, to explore the association of study variables –as expressed by means, a bivariate correlation matrix is usually performed among OrgDNA and innovation performance dimensions (see Table 4).

Table (4)

Correlation matrix of organizational DNA and innovation performance N=(
27)

Variables	Decision rights	Information	Motivators	Structure	Speed	Transparency	Accountability
Decision rights							
Information	0.35						
Motivators	-0.24	0.33					
Structure	0.61	0.28	-0.21				
Speed	0.42	0.61	0.35	0.43			
Transparency	0.83	0.55	0.32	0.39	0.37		
Accountability	0.29	0.42	0.49	0.62	0.28	0.59	

As shown in Table (4), decision rights are positively associated with every one of innovation performance dimensions. That means logical and streamlined decision rights have a strong effect on transparency, middle effect on speed, and weak effect on accountability. This result is agreed with studies such as (Hammond et al.,1988:47-58; Schoorman & Holahan,1996:786-794). Rapid flow of information has a middle effect on speed, transparency, and accountability. This result is agreed with studies such as (McElroy,2000 ; Monge et al.,1992:250-274). Appropriate motivators have a weak effect on acting with speed and transparency within and across layers in the organizations, on the other side this effect was middle on accountability. This result is agreed with studies such as (Magnan & St-Onge,1988; Zellner,1999). Structure has a middle effect on speed and accountability, while this effect on transparency was weak. This result is agreed with studies such as (Miller,1987:7-32 ; Miller,1988:280-308).

Hypothesis No.2 says that the relationship between OrgDNA and innovation performance will be different subject to the type of industry (chemical ,textile ,and foods).So Kruskal-Wallis test will be a good tool to explore if there are significant differences among these kinds or not (see Table 5).

Table (5)
Kruskal -Wallis test results N=(27)

Variables	H value		significant level	Status
	Calculated	tabulated		
Decision rights	5.93	5.805	0.05	significance
Information	6.42	5.805	0.05	significance
Motivators	7.93	5.805	0.05	significance
Structure	5.95	5.805	0.05	significance

Degree of freedom=2

As shown in Table (5), all of calculated H values are more than tabulated values. That is industry type was a critical factor to differentiate in influence levels as measured by correlation coefficients. This result completely agrees with some studies like (Gomez-tagle,2001:375-384; Bloch,2005:4) .

Conclusions:

This research supports Hamilton experience results but within one difference, it is applied in Iraqi industry sector. In general, the following conclusions have been got:

- 1-There is a low tendency between Iraqi industry organizations (especially textile and foods)to determine authorities and responsibilities of managerial levels. This matter may be a result of classical philosophy that managers of these organizations believe.
- 2-There is a problem about activities coordination. That is information might not be transferred from the people who own it to the people who require it.
- 3-Iraqi industrial organizations had suitable objectives, incentives, and career alternatives. Reward systems in these organizations balance between financial and nonfinancial aspects.
- 4-A common structural problem has been existed in Iraqi organizations that too many management tiers with too many individuals at each levels have much few direct reports narrow spans.

5-The roots of performance differences can be traced to how the different organization types. That is healthy organizations (the resilient organization, the just in time organization , the military organization) can create and sustain successful innovation as compared with unhealthy organizations (overmanaged organization, outgrown organization , the fit and starts organization, the passive – aggressive organization).

6-The good alignment between organizational DNA building blocks lead to innovate faster, the good alignment of product and service development efforts with strategic priorities, and the short cycle time and good product launches.

Recommendations:

This study provides some suggestions for improving organizations under study in this field as the following:

1-The authorization process in Iraqi industrial organizations may be a good issue to be adjusted in a manner of white and black with empowering the individuals. This process (empowerment) must be closely related with expectations in the form of a set of performance-based outcomes.

2-Trying to assess and rank individuals in Iraqi organizations according to a normal bell curve distribution will be the ideal solution to create a real sense of differentiation that is both motivating and rewarding.

3-In innovation organization it is important that the career paths with fast progression will encourage rapid advancement to senior levels in vertical function for building cross- functional understanding and collaboration teams.

4-It is necessary, for Iraqi organizations, to have a systematic approach to organizational change .To do that senior leadership in these organizations must set and communicate the vision for their subordinates and enabling teams to act as change agents or zealots to lead the change efforts.

5-Most important trying for restructuring local organizations with decreasing organizational layers by increasing span of control. Reconsidering supervisors training levels is the main way to do that.

6-It might be close to the ideal job for Iraqi organizations that construct it's own electronic communication network, based on the laster microwave telecommunication technologies. The massive network allows enterprise wide communication over an intranet, as well enabling the organizations to communicate with customer, suppliers and other business partners in the outside world (using private networks and the internet).

References:

1-Bordia,R.,K.kronenberg,E. and Neely, D.(2005),Innovations OrgDNA.www.boozallen .com.

- 2-Bloch, Carter (2005), Innovation measurement: present and future challenges, Paper prepared for the Eurostat Conference, "Knowledge Economy – Challenges for Measurement" Luxembourg, December 8-9, 2005
- 3-Daft,R.L.(2001),Organization Theory & Design, South-Western College Publishing.
- 4-Gomez-Tagle,R.(2001),Innovation as a means to get competitive :a comparative study of central Mexico small and medium-sized enterprises. Proceeding of the 9th interdisciplinary Information Management Talks:pp.375-384.
- 5-Hitt,M. Duaneireland,R. Hoskission ,R.(2001),Strategic Management :Competitiveness & Globalization,south-westren college publishing.
- 6-Hammond ,J.,Keeny,R.and Raiffa,H.(1998),The Hidden Traps in Decision Making , Harvard Business Review,Septemper –October.pp.47-58.
- 7-Hodge,B.J. & Anthony,W.P.(1991),Organization Theory: A Strategic Approach, Allyn & Bacon,Inc.
- 8-Hamilton,B.A.(2005),Organizational DNA,www.boozallen.com
- 9-Jones,G.R.(1995),Organizational Theory: Text&Cases, Addison-Wesley Publishing co.
- 10-Ivancevich,J.M. and Matteson,M.T.(2002),Organizational Behavior and Management, McGraw-Hill co.,Inc.
- 11-Mange,p.Cozzens,M.&Contractor,N.(1992),Communication and Motivational Predictors of the Dynamics of Organizational Innovation, Organization sciences, May ,pp.250-274.
- 12-McElroy,M.W.(2000),Managing for Sustainable Innovation.www. macro innovation. .com.
- 13-Macmillan H. & Tampoe,M.(2000),Strategic Management: process-content and Implementation , Oxford University Press.
- 14-Miller,D.(1987),Strategy Making and Structure: Analysis and Implications for performance, Academy of Management Journal.Vol.30,No.1.pp.7-32.
- 15-Miller,D.(1988),Relating Porter Business Strategies to Environment and structure: Analysis and Performance Implications, Academy of Management Journal , Vol.13 , No.2.pp.280-308.
- 16-Magnan,M. and St-Onge,S.(1998),Profit-Sharing and Firm Performance: A Comparative and Longitudinal Analysis, Paper Presented at the 58th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management(SanDiago,CA,Augest).
- 17-Neilson,G.,Pasternack,B.A. and Mendes,D(2005),The Four Bases of Organizational DNA,www.boozallen.com.
- 18-Noe, R.Hollenbeck, J.Gerhart, B.and Wright,P.(1994),Human Resource Management :Gaining a Competitive Advantage, Richard D.Irwin.Inc.

- 19-Robbins,S.P(2003),Organizational Behavior, Person Education ,Inc. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- 20-Schoorman,F. and Holahan, P.(1996),Psychological Antecedents of Escalation Behavior :Effects of Choice, Responsibilities ,and Decision Consequences, Journal of Applied Psychology,December,pp.786-794.
- 21-Turban,E.Mcleam,E. & Wetherbe,J.(1999),Information Technology for Management: Making Connections for Strategic Advantage ,2nd.ed. John Wiley & Sons.Inc.
- 22-Thompson,A.A. and Strickland,A.J.(2003),Strategic Management: Concepts and Cases , McGraw -Hill / Irwin.
- 23-Wheelen, T.L. & Hunger, J.D.(2004),Strategic Management and Business Policy: Concepts , 9th Edition, Pearson Education,Inc.,Upper Saddle River.
- 24-Zellner,W.(1999),Linking Pay to Performance is Becoming a Norm in the Workplace, Wall Street Journal. April 6.p.A1.

Questionnaire

Dear Sir,

This questionnaire is a tool for scientific research titled” the influence of organizational DNA on innovation performance” .The researchers plan to test the validity of Hamilton(2005)approach in a sample of Iraqi industrial organizations .Please answer all questions by scoring your level of agreement or disagreement before it. We would like to tell you that your response will be secrecy. With thanks.

<u>Strongly agree</u>	<u>Mildly agree</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Mildly disagree</u>
<u>Strongly disagree</u>			
5	4	3	2
1			

- 1-I have all the authorities to implement my job without agreement of my boss.
- 2-Exactly we know which decisions we have rights to take.
- 3-When I have a job I have all authorities enable me to do it.
- 4-Rarely management intervenes in routine decisions.
- 5- There is high degree of coordination between departments in my organization.
- 6-Information flow freely across organizational boundaries.
- 7-We have good metrics for performance appraisal.
- 8-All data about the performance of our organization is available.
- 9-There are many attempts to increase span of control.
- 10-My organization tries to eliminate or redeploy shadow staff resources.

- 11-Management has a good and clear plan for managing career path and ensuring rotations in different geographies, functions, and roles to develop managers.
- 12-Job specialization is very important in my organization.
- 13-There is approval and appreciation to my efforts from my boss.
- 14-Wages that I receive consists with my efforts.
- 15-My organization rewards those who display mastery at their job and seeks their advance, whatever their title or position.
- 16-In my organization avoiding differentiation is a function to mastery at doing our job.
- 17-My organization encourages team working.
- 18-We all learn from past experiences.
- 19-Organizational position and processes changes subject to environmental change.
- 20-All data for implementing marketing and production strategy are available.
- 21-There is a high degree of control in my organization.
- 22-My organization is too large and complex to be effectively controlled by small team.
- 23-Decision centers have sight of the big picture.
- 24-It is true to say executives can turn on a dime when necessary.
- 25-Employees are encouraged to show their suggestions.
- 26-We feel there is a multiple layers of management that create analysis paralysis.
- 27-Decision makers spends their time to control subordinates instead of looking at necessary issues.
- 28-Managers in my organization don't mind what subordinates think or feel.
- 29-High degree of centralization has been enrooted in my organization.
- 30-Complexity and changes makes managers unable to manage my organization.
- 31-We are involved in decision-making process.
- 32-My organization tries to attract smart and talent people.
- 33-People in my organization rarely pull in the same direction at the same time.
- 34-Poor of managerial direction is the main cause to kill lambency.
- 35-All agree to make changes but nothing has been changed.
- 36-My organization is conflict free.
- 37-Suggested plans have agreement from all employees in my organization.
- 38-Decision has been taken speedily as possible.
- 39-We are the first organization to adopt new ways to production and marketing.

- 40-Internal changes have been done at good time when an external change happens.
- 41- In my organization all try to introduce new goods before reviles.
- 42-We know what aims behind managerial behaviors.
- 43-We know where the funds of our organization are expending.
- 44-Open doors is the policy that our managers believes and do.
- 45-We know the important details of external dealings with our organization.
- 46-In spite of difference between activities, we all do what we can.
- 47-We are responsible for organizational performance.
- 48-When some departments fail they always diagnose from others.
- 49-When some departments fails they rarely declare their responsibility from this failure.