Journal of Biodiversity and Environmental Sciences (JBES)
ISSN: 2220-6663 (Print) 2222-3045 (Online)
Vol. 6, No. 5, p. 483-493, 2015
http://www.innspub.net

INNSPUB
RESEARCH PAPER
OPEN ACCESS

Investigating the effect of organizational culture on the staff productivity in cultural heritage, Articrafts and Tourism Department

Pantea Alishirazi[*1], Zeinolabedin Amini Sabegh[2], Masood Ghorbanhosein[3]

[1]*Department of Public Management, College of Management, Saveh Science and ResearchBranch, Islamic Azad University, Saveh, Iran (corresponding author)*

[2]*Department of Public Management, Islamic Azad University, Saveh Branch, Saveh, Iran*

[3]*Department of Public Management, Islamic Azad University, Saveh Branch, Saveh, Iran*

Article published on May 28, 2015

Key words: Organizational culture, work, staff productivity, adoptability, consistency, involvement, mission.

Abstract

Nowadays, productivity is beyond just an economic measure and is considered as a comprehensive approach, systematic culture and attitude, and a complex of all components in some cases. It affects all economic, social, and cultural aspects of a country, organization, or people. Undoubtedly, among extant capitals, human resources have devoted a high position to themselves. From the other hand, Cultural heritage, Articrafts, and Tourism Department is a big, complex, and vital organization. Human resources are main capitals of the organization and the organization's success depends on them. Thus, productivity of human resources is the most important factor which is considered the final goal of many organizations. Besides, forming and conducting organizational culture can increase productivity of human resources. Accordingly, this study aims to examine the relationship between the productivity of human resources and organizational culture and its aspects among the staff of Cultural heritage, Articrafts, and Tourism Department. This study uses correlation approach. It uses descriptive data to test hypotheses and library and field methods for data gathering. Statistical population includes 85 staff comprising of experts in Cultural Heritage, Articrafts, and Tourism Department. Using Morgan Table, the sample size of 70 was achieved. Results showed a positive and significant correlation between organizational culture and the aspects of job mission, adoptability, consistency, involvement at work, and staff productivity. Findings showed that among the variables of organizational culture, involvement at work has the highest rank. Improving the aspects of organizational culture is a complementary method for improving staff productivity which finally yields organizatoional productivity.

***Corresponding Author:** PanteaAlishirazi ✉ palishirazi@yahoo.com

Introduction

One important issue in public organizations is low productivity of its human forces. The issue of productivity in public organizations and its improvement is a main challenge for the researchers of public management and executive management. They have always sought to find some ways for improving productivity indices in the organizations. Reports show that the index of human force productivity in Iran is lower than other countries in Eastern Asia. For example, in 2000, there was 25% decrease in human force productivity of Iran compared with 1995. So, productivity in Iran had 25% negative growth. While, this amount was 19% in India and 14% in Pakistan. Newer indices also show low productivity of human resources compared with other countries (Nezhad Haji, 1996). From the other hand, the isssue of productivity in public places is different with private organizations. Public places act under many limitations, in completely different conditions from private sections. Their goals are legally established and their activities should be flexible towards social reactions and security; this flexibility is one limitation of public organizations. Detailed rules and trends define the directions of public organizations. Also, social services and budget system limit their freedom for replacing and allocating work forcesorother organiza-tional resources. In this way, managing human resource productivity in public organizations becomes more complex than private organizations (Anyadike, 2013).

Regarding above reasons, reseachers have claimed that human resource is a vital element in public organizations (Tepora, 2013). The key question is "why a key role is considered for improving the productivity of humans? The answer is that only a human can improve the quality and quantity of his work, offer new schemes, remove his problems, and change his work place with creativity. Many scholars believe that regarding the features of public organizations, the challenge of staff productivity especially, experts are higher in these organizations compared with their private counterparts. Human resource is regarded as a strategic factor. The reason for such a thing is the changes occuring fast. In such contexes , the important positions of human resources as designers builders, and processors of operational systems or other organizational resources become clear more than before.

The most effective way of reaching competitive advantage in the present condition is making the staff of public organizations more effective via improving their productivity (Shoar, 2013). Studies on productivity and effective factors in it show that low productivity index in Iran is for the lack of culture and productivity views in the country (Hatam *et al.*, 2007). Without using a proper organizational culture, productivity decrease in the organization will occur. Because a proper culture can stimulate productivity. In fact, organizational culture suggests that how much the staff should attempt. Thus, a strong culture can stimulate productivity or limit staff productivity (Alvani *et al.*, 2004).Facing a dynamic environment, a weak culture improper to organizational mission can't match it well and follows the attempts for creating changes.Weak cultures have lower effects on the staff. This leads to the increase of absentism, the lack of commitment, job dropout, satisfaction decrease, and productivity reduction in the organization.Improper culture decreases people's innovation and risk tolerance in the organization, leading to productivity decrease (Peiman, 2004).

Nowadays, productivity has the highest position among managers and every one seeks to increase it. New managerial achievements connect high productivity to developing human resources in the organizations (Pirzada *et al.*, 2013). Also, since human resources form the basis of real wealth in the organization, there is a positive correlation between human capital and productivity (Yazdkhasti, 2008). Thus, human resources are considered themost important factors in increasing productivity of the organization (abtahi, 2000). But, since productivity is not an abstract issue and should have applied aspects, organizational management plays an important role in providing a proper ground for internalizing and

improvingit (Rezaei, 2003). But, what is organizational culture?

Every organization has an unwriten culture that identifies acceptable standards and unacceptable-behaviors. Many employees get familiar with organizational culture and understand it after some months of starting work. They know about the ways of clothing at work, rules'seriousness and behaviors causing troubles, the importance of honesty, and etc. while many organizations have some additional cultures as well (related to specific work groups) by which they add somethings to organizational standards or change it a little, dominant culture in the organization tells people what are the values and which one has higher importance. Iforganizational memebers want to have a good position in the organization, work groups should consider the standards that are imposed by the dominant organizationalculture (Hayton and Macchitella, 2013).

Organizational culture identifies the ways of doing things in the organization for the staff. Culture is the same perception from the organization whose existance is observed in all members of the organization, showing normal and fixed features that differentiate one organization from the other (Awadh and Saad, 2013). The aim of thia study is Investigating the Effect of Organizational Culture on the Staff Productivity in Cultural Heritage, Articrafts and Tourism Department.

Material and methods

Descriptive methods

This study is correlation. It uses descriptive methods for applied goals. To select the sample, Kerjesi-Morgan Table was used. By this method, the sample size of 70 was achieved from the staff. To gather data, a modified version of organizational culture's questionnaire of Denison (2000) and human resource productivity questionnaire of Heresy and Goldsmith (2004) were used. They were already used by different researchers. Some questions were changed according to the professors' ideas. The modified questionnaire had 40 elements. At start, an explanatory letter clarified the goal of data gathering for the subjects and the necessity of respondents' cooperation was stated. To gather descriptive information of respondents, some questions about the gender, age, job records, and education of them were provided that show the features of respondents. For providing responses, a five-point likert scale (1=quite disagreed, 5= quite agreed) was used. It must be mentioned that some elements (negative elements with R label) are scored conversely for their contents.

Research theories

Mirkamali refers to organizational culture as the dominant behavioral pattern among the people of an organization, created based on the values, believes, and habits of the people, supported by the majority ofthe people, affected by the factors such as supervision, control, communication, cooperation, conflict, cooperation, considering social values, and etc (Ostadhasanloo, 2011). Smir Seich defines organizational culture as a collection of key values, guiding beliefs, and understandings common in organizational memebers, showing main part of the organization (Soleimani, 1999).

Denison (2006) thinks of mention organizational culture as a tool for identifying values, beliefs, assumptions, and common methods that form memebers' attitudes and behaviors in the organization and direct them.

Organization refers to the processes of the people 's mutual relations for gaining definite goals. It has five elements:

- An organization consists of the people.
- These people are correlated and have mutual relations.
- These mutual relations can be organized.
- All people have definite goals, some of which affect personnel performance. Every one expects to get his/her goals via cooperation in the organization.
- These mutual relations facilitate gaining common goals in the organization and organizational members follow gaining common organizational goals to get their personal goals.

- Organizational members follow common organizational goals to get their own goals. With this definition, organization is nothing but mutual relations among the people and organizational structure refoects these relations including people' s roles, relations, activities, goal hierarchy, and other features. If we consider the concept of the organization, we find a specific correlation between two concepts of culture and organization.

Result and discussion

Productivity definition

Productivity refers to gaining maximum profit with optimum usage of work forces, talents, facilities, and skills for improving staff welfare. In general, productivity is the sum of efficiency and effectiveness. In fact, it is a ratio that compares some aspects of units' performance with the costs posed on them.

Effectiveness

Effectiveness refers to conducting resources towards more valuable goals. For example, focus on the results, doing job in the right time, getting short-term and long-term goals (i.e.organizational goals). Accordingly, this study aims to examine the effectiveness of human resource productivity from organizational culture and their relations with scrutiny. In this way, the issue of productivity in public organizations of Iran will be examined, identifying the effect of organizational culture on human resource productivity. Ardalan *et al.* (2008) examined the relationship between organizational culture and person-organization unity using Denison Model in public universities of the west of Iran. They showed that all four aspects of organizational culture in Denison Model is common in western universities of Iran. Also, this study showed that mission aspect has the highest correlation with the organizational measures of person-organization unity; while, involvement at work has the lowest correlation with personal measures of person-organization unity.

Monavarian and Bakhtaei (2007) used Denison Model in Industrial Management Organization. They found that this organization is at average and above average levels in all four aspects of involvement, adoptability, mission, and consistency. Industrial Management Organization has the best status in the variables of involvement and adoptability. However, in some indices such as consistency of the goals, this organization needs goals' improvement. Also, they found that flexible-fixed spectrum of Industrial Management Organization tends to be more flexible.

In the spectrum of internal-external focus, no significant difference was observed. Rasti (1997) compared organizational culture of public and private high schools and guidance schools. He concluded a significant difference of organizational culture in two groups. Thus, for having a better organizational culture in private high schools, human resources tend to be employed and stay in them more. This has a positive effect on the efficiency of human resources (Noroozi, 2004). Torabikia (1999) examined the relationship of organizational culture and job satisfaction of faculty members in Tehran University. Results showed that the indices of organizational culture in teachers have proper conditions. Also, organizational culture and job satisfaction are significantly correlated. The higher the organizational culture, the higher the satisfaction of faculty members in Tehran University. Feghi Farahmand (2009) studied the features of organizational culture with the approach of optimizing human resources of small manufacturing companies of industrial pieces in Tabriz City. Results showed no significant difference of managers' understanding and experts' understanding from the features of organizational culture. But, this result had a significant difference with workers' understanding towards the features of organizational culture. Generally, results show that among 13 features of organizational culture, the issue of personal innovation has been more considered. In their study titled "organizational culture and organizational development", Denison and Sportise (1991) found that in performing a pervasive quality management, organizational culture has a significant role.

Results

Data normality test

Table 1. Skewness and kurtosis of research variables.

Variable	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Skew-ness coeffi-cient	Std. Error of Skewness	Kur-tosis coeffi-cient
Involvement	0.566	0.511	0.287	0.078
Consistency	0.566	-0.211	0.287	-0.526
Adoptability	0.566	1.127	0.287	-0.072
Mission	0.566	0.954	0.287	-0.136
Organizational culture	0.566	0.015	0.287	0.063
Productivity	0.566	-0.173	0.287	0.377

As seen in Table 1, skewness and kurtosis coefficients for all variables are between -2 and 2. It means all variables are normal with symmetric distribution.

Table 2. Colmogrov-Smirnov test results for all variables.

Variables	Hypothesis confir-mation	Error level	sig	result
Involvement	Ho	0.05	0.399	Normal
Consistency	Ho	0.05	0.126	Normal
Adoptability	Ho	0.05	0.060	Normal
Mission	Ho	0.05	0.247	Normal
Productivity	Ho	0.05	0.523	Normal
Organizational culture	Ho	0.05	0.959	Normal

For testing data normality, the following hypotheses were stated:

H_0. Data distribution is normal.

H_1. Data distribution is not normal.

Descriptive analysis

Gender

Table 3. Frequency distribution of respondents' gender.

Gender	Percent	Frequency
Male	45.7	32
Female	52.9	37
Unknown	1.4	1
Total	100	70

Based on Table 3, most respondents are female.

Age

Table 4. Frequency distribution of respondents' age.

Age	Percent	Frequency
20-30	18.6	13
31-40	64.3	45
41-50	17.1	12
51-60	3.7	3
unknown	0	0
total	100	70

Based on Table 4, most respondents are 20-30.

Marital status

Table 5. Frequency distribution of respondents' marital status.

Marital status	Percent	Frequency
Single	27.1	19
Married	71.4	50
Unknown	1.4	1
Total	100	70

Based on Table 5, most respondents are married and 27% are single.

Employment type

Table 6. Frequency distribution of respondents' employment type.

Employment type	Percent	Frequency
Registered	29.6	12
Contractual	53.1	55
Unknown	4.3	3
Total	100	70

Based on Table 6, most respondents have contractual jobs.

Job records

Table 7. Frequency distribution of respondents' job records.

Job records	Percent	Frequency
1-5	12.9	9
6-10	32.9	23
11-15	37.1	26
16-20	14.3	10
Unknown	2.9	2
Total	100	70

Organizational status

Table 8. Frequency distribution of respondents' org-anizational status.

Organizational status	Percent	Frequency
Top manager	4.3	3
Unit manager	14.3	10
Expert	80	56
Employee	1.4	1
Total	100	70

Based on Table 8, most respondents are working as expert.

Education

For 80 respondents, the following results were achieved.

Table 9. Frequency distribution of respondents' education level.

Education level	Frequency	Percent
Associate degree	4	5.7
BA	34	48.6
MA	29	41.4
Ph.D	3	4.3
Total	70	100

Education field

Table 9. Frequency distribution of respondents' education field.

Education field	Frequency	Percent
Tourism	1	1.4
Management	13	18.6
Technical-engineering	6	8.6
Basic fields	4	5.7
IT	8	11.4
Foreign languages	5	7.1
Archeology	5	7.1
Travel	2	2.9
Other	26	46.1
Total	70	100

Based on Table 9, most respondents have studied management field with 18.6% frequency.

Organizational unit

Table 10. Frequency distribution of organizational unit.

Organizational unit	Frequency	Percent
IT	18	34.3
Communication	24	5.7
Capital assistance	4	10
Administrative section	7	2.9
Statistics office	2	1.4
Legal office	1	11.4
Handicrafts section	8	8.6
Tourism assistance	6	34.3
Total	70	100

Based on Table 10, most respondents are working in IT department with 34% frequency.

Descriptive statistics of dependent and independent variables

Descriptive statistics of organizational culture and productivity are shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Descriptive statistics of research variables.

Variable	median	var	upper limit	lower limit	std	mean	no
Involvement	2.600	0.571	4.20	1	0.755	4798.2	70
Consistency	2.813	0.532	4	1	0.729	7436.2	70
Adoptability	2.600	0.378	4.40	1	0.614	6001.2	70
Mission	2.400	0.475	4.60	1	0.688	4377.2	70
Productivity	2.423	0.308	4	1.43	0.555	4644.2	70
Organizational culture	2.526	0.280	3.84	1.32	0.538	5559.2	70

Hypotheses test with referential statistics

Examining the status of organizational culture and productivity

Since a 5-point likert scale was used, number 3 is used as the middle number. If the attitude mean of 80 staffs becomes over 3, organizational culture and productivity will have a desirable status and if it is below 3, it won't have a desirable status. Thus, statistical hypotheses are defined as follows:

P=0.4: The status of organizational culture and productivity is not desirable.

q= 0.6: The status of organizational culture and productivity is desirable.

Then, the significance of the observed mean should be examined. For this purpose, a binominal test was used whose results for organizational culture and productivity are shown in Table 12.

Table 12. Binominal tests for organizational culture and productivity.

Element	Upper limit	Lower limit	std	mean	no
Productivity	4	1.43	0.555	4644.2	70
Organizational Culture	3.84	1.32	0.538	5559.2	70

Binomial Test

		Category	N	Observed Prop.	Test Prop.	Exact Sig. (1-tailed)
Productivity	Group 1	<= 3	59	.8	.6	.000
	Group 2	> 3	11	.2		
	Total		70	1.0		
Organizational Culture	Group 1	<= 3	58	.8	.6	.000
	Group 2	> 3	12	.2		
	Total		70	1.0		

As seen in Table 12, Sig= 0.000 <0.05; thus, in the attitude of the staff, organizational culture and productivity have proper statuses.

Hypotheses test

Main hypothesis

H0. Organizational culture has no significant and positive effect on staff productivity.

H1. Organizational culture has a significant and positive effect on staff productivity.

To test hypotheses, Pearson correlation coefficient was used. The results are shown in Table 13.

Table 13. Pearson correlation coefficients for organizational culture and staff productivity.

		organizational culture
Staff productivity	Pearson correlation	0.546
	Sig	0.000
	No	70

Based on Table 13, at 0.01% significance level, there is a positive and significant correlation between organizational culture and staff productivity whose value is 55% and desirable. Then, for calculating direct and indirect effects of variables on each other, the following formula is used:

Equation 1.

Total effect=direct effect + indirect effect

Indirect effect= $\beta 2 \times \beta 3$

The following conditions are regarded for correlation fitness:

-If total effect is below 0.3, observed correlation won't be significant.

- If total effect is 0.3-0.6, observed correlation will be significant.

- If total effect is over 0.6, observed correlation will be significant.

Alternative hypotheses

H1a. Involvement at work has a significant and positive effect on staff productivity.

H0:p=0 Involvement at work has a significant and positive effect on staff productivity.

H1:p≠0 Involvement at work has no significant and positive effect on staff productivity.

Table 14. Pearson correlation coefficients for involvement and staff productivity.

		Involvement
Staff productivity	Pearson correlation	0.428
	Sig.	0.000
	no	70

Since significance level is below 0.05, thus, H0 is rejected and H1 is confirmed. Thus, involvement at work has a significant and positive effect on staff productivity. Fitness of this correlation is shown in Table 15.

Table 15. Good fitness of the correlation for involvement at work and staff productivity.

Dourbin-Watson index	std	Modified determination coefficient	Determination oefficient	Correlation coefficient
1.980	0.505	0.171	0.183	0.428

Based on Table 15, since Dourbin-Watson coefficient is 1.980 and this value is close to 2, variables are independent.

H1b. Consistency has a significant and positive effect on staff productivity.

H0:p=0 Consistency has a significant and positive effect on staff productivity.

H1:p≠0 Consistency has no significant and positive effect on staff productivity.

Table 16. Pearson correlation coefficients for consistency and staff productivity.

		consistency
staff productivity	Pearson correlation	0.285
	Sig.	0.000
	no	70

Since significance level is below 0.05, thus, H0 is rejected and H1 is confirmed. Thus, consistency has a significant and positive effect on staff productivity. Fitness of this correlation is shown in Table 17.

Table 17. Good fitness of the correlation for consistency and staff productivity.

Dourbin-Watson index	std	Modified determination coefficient	Determination coefficient	Correlation coefficient
1.959	.535	0.068	00.081	0.285

Based on Table 17, since Dourbin-Watson coefficient

is 1.969 and this value is close to 2, variables are independent.

Hb. Adoptability has a significant and positive effect on staff productivity.

H0:p=0 Adoptability has a significant and positive effect on staff productivity.

H1:p≠0 Adoptability has no significant and positive effect on staff productivity.

Table 18. Pearson correlation coefficients for adoptability and staff productivity.

	Adoptability	
Staff productivity	Pearson correlation	0.369
	Sig.	0.003
	no	70

Since significance level is below 0.05, thus, H0 is rejected and H1 is confirmed. Thus, adoptability has a significant and positive effect on staff productivity. Fitness of this correlation is shown in Table 19.

Table 19. Good fitness of the correlation for adoptability and staff productivity.

Dourbin-Watson index	std	Modified determination coefficient	Determination coefficient	Correlation coefficient
2.02	0.519	0.123	0. 136	0.369

Based on Table 19, since Dourbin-Watson coefficient is 2.0290 and this value is close to 2, variables are independent.

H1b. Mission has a significant and positive effect on staff productivity.

H0:p=0 Mission has a significant and positive effect on staff productivity.

H1:p≠0 Mission has no significant and positive effect on staff productivity.

Table 20. Pearson correlation coefficients for mission and staff productivity.

	mission	
Staff productivity	Pearson correlation	0.581
	Sig.	0.000
	no	70

Since significance level is below 0.05, thus, H0 is rejected and H1 is confirmed. Thus, mission has a significant and positive effect on staff productivity. Fitness of this correlation is shown in Table 21.

Table 21. Good fitness of the correlation for mission and staff productivity.

Dourbin-Watson index	std	Modified determination coefficient	Determination coefficient	Correlation coefficient
1.989	0.455	0. 328	0. 338	0.581

Based on Table 21, since Dourbin-Watson coefficient is 1.989 and this value is close to 2, variables are independent.

Examining regression results regarding colinearity

Colinearity is a situation that shows that an independent variable is a linear function of other independent variables in regression equation. Table 21 shows that tolerance and variance inflation factor of this model is standard and there is no few and a few value in them.

Table 21. Colinearity test in regression.

Model 1	Colinearity test results	
	VIF	Tolerance
Mission	1.157	0.604
Consistency	1.042	0.553
Adoptability	1.719	0.580
Involvement	1.256	0.672

Table 22. Colinearity test.

Model	Aspect	Eigen value	Condition Index	Variance Proportions				
				Constant	Resalat	Dargirs-hodan	Sazgari	Ente-bagh
1	1	4.855	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	2	.052	9.623	0.000	.02	.48	.00	.18
	3	.042	10.768	0.000	.63	.02	.34	0.000
	4	.029	12.945	.95	.07	.09	.23	.16
	5	.021	15.118	.04	.28	.41	.42	.66

Since, there is no specific value close to zero, internal correlation among predictions doesn't exist. From the other hand, all indices have values lower than 15 and 30, regression reliability is confirmed.

Ranking variables

For ranking variables, Friedman test was used whose results are shown in Table 23.

Table 23. Friedman Test results.

Variable	Rank	std	mean	no
Involvement	2.91	0.700	4798.2	70
Consistency	2.54	0.729	7436.2	70
Adoptability	2.31	0.614	6001.2	70
Mission	2.21	0.688	4377.2	70

No	70
Chi-Square	11.833
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.008

Based on Table 23, H0 is rejected and variables have significant difference with each other. Thus, involvement at work has the highest score and consistency, adoptability, and mission are at the next ranks.

Conclusion

Results of this study agree with the findings of Bordbar. Examining the relationship between organizational culture and staff productivity in insurance companies of Yazd, they found a positive and significant correlation between them regarding the aspects of creativity, support, cohesion, control, identity, reward system, adoptability with conflicts, communicative patterns, and productivity. Thus, improving different aspects of organizational culture is a complementary method in promoting management productivity, yielding the increase of total productivity for the organization. This result also consists who found a significant correlation between organizational cultures especially the dimensions of control and personal creativity and staff productivity with higher scores regarding transparency and recognizing role and ability. But, it disagrees with the findings of Ebrahimi. Regarding H1a results, the higher the involvement at work and its factors such as availability of organizational information for the staff, attitude towards positively in the organization, group work of the staff, progress of capabilities and skills, the higher the staff productivity. Regarding H1b results, the higher the consistency and its factors such as two sides' benefits, reaching general agreements on big problems, staff cooperation in forming general organizational attitudes, flexibility and changability at work, the higher the staff productivity. Regarding H1c results, the higher the adaptability and its factors such as staff resistence against creating changes, cooperation of various sections against changes, deep recognition of staff wants, attention to customers' interests, and information transfer, the higher the staff productivity. Result of testing H1d agrees with Tavari. Thus, the activities of every organization are affected by a set of factors whose recognition leads to the activities' promotion and goals' fulfilment. Regarding the results of ranking variables, involvement at work had the highest rank. Thus, the effective factors in this regard should be improved to increase staff productivity. Mission got the lowest rank. It shows that customers' interests are ignored; not all people have a deep understanding from their own needs, information transfer is not properly, and the staff don't show any resistence against changes. Considering these factors helps improving staff productivity.

Suggestions from the studies

For improving staff productivity, the following suggestions are offered:

1. Attempts for increasing staff salary and bonus should increase.

2. Since the features of supervisors such as expertise, personal, and moral features affect staff performance, some educations are required for improving positive behaviors, the ways of dealing with employees, the increase of professional abilities, and etc.

3. Since cooperative work has the maximum effect on organizational culture as an element of involvement at work, officials should use bottom-up decision-making systems.

4. Necessary budget and facilities should be provided by the management and other related units for doing affairs.

5. Staff performances' problems should be reminded to be improved.

6. Staff empowerment via good trainings and strong work teams should be considered for conducting affairs and developing staff capabilities in the organization.

7. Clear strategies for future, transparent strategic orientation for the staff and goals being realistic increase desirability level for human forces.

8. Customers' interests should be regarded.

9. Since organizational culture affects staff productivity, a charter of organizational culture should be provided and edited in the organization every year.

References

Abtahi H, Kazemi B. 2000. Productivity. Tehran. institute of business studies and researches.

Alharbi MA, Alyahya MS. 2013. Impact of Organizational Culture on Employee Performance. International Review of Management and Business Review **2(1).**

Alvani M, Pourezat A, Abolghasem S. 2008. Examining the relationship of organizational justice and organizational commitment (case study of engineering and Gas Company of Iran).

Anyadike N. 2013. Human resource planning and employee productivity in Nigeria's public organization Global Journal of Human Resource Management **1**(**4**), 56-68.

Ardalan M. 2008. Examining the relationship of organizational culture and individual-organizational unity in public universities in western Iran. MA thesis. Isfahan University.

Denison D. 1990. Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness. New York. John Wiley & Sons.

Denison D. 2006. Organisational culture and effectiveness: Can an American theory be applied in Russia? February 22.

Feghi N. 2009. Features of organizational culture and the approach of optimizing human resources.case study of small manufacturing companies for industrial pieces of Tabriz City.Cultural Research Quarterly **2(8),** 330.

Hatam N, Khodakhah V. 2007. Examining the relationship of organizational culture and managers 'productivity in Medical University of Shiraz.MA thesis, Management Department. Medical University of Shiraz.

James Hayton, Macchitella U. 2013. HRM, organizational culture and entrepreneurial capabilities: The role of individual and collective knowledge processes, ERC Research Paper No. 5.

Mary J, Tepora D. 2013. Predicting employees' productivity through human resource, management practices: evidence from the academe. 030 - Proceeding of the Global Conference on Business. Economics and Social Sciences.

Monavarian A, Bakhtaei A. 2007. Knowing organizational culture based on Denison model, case study of industrial management organization. 4th international management conference of Tehran.

Neghad Haji A, Irani F. 1996. Tadbir Management Publication **64,** 74-77.

Noroozi H. 1995. Examining the relationship of organizational culture in manufacturing units and staff productivity in Pars Switch Company.6th quality and productivity conference of electricity industry.

Ostadhasanloo H. 2011. The effect of education on crime in the society. first national conference of education in Iran.

Peiman H. 2005. Productivity and its examples. Tehran. zamineh publication.

Pirzada D. 2013. Impact of Human Resources Management Practices on Turnover.Productivity and Corporate Financial Performance.European Journal of Business and Management **5,(1)**.

Rasti M. 1997. Comparative study of organizational culture of public and private high schools and guidance schools. Mashhad.

Rezaei A. 2003. Management of organizations and productivity of human resources. Tadbir No. 131.

Sarmad Z, Bazargan A, Hejazi E. 2013. Methodology in behavioral sciences. Agah Publicating 25.

Sobhanipour M, Goldoost M, Delavari R, Ahadi Shoar S. 2013. Evaluating the impression-nability of human resources productivity components based on the administrative corruption, (Case Study: Tehran University, Qom Campus). J. Basic. Appl. Sci. Res **3(7),** 607-613.

Soleimani N. 2001. Examining the relationship of organizational culture and executing pervasive quality management in the schools of semnan.Educational Quarterly **21(2).**

Torabikia H. 1998. Examining the relationship of organizational culture and job satisfaction of faculty members in Tehran University. unpublished MA thesis. Beheshti University.

Yazdkhasti A. 2008. Examining the relationship of organizational culture's type and acceptance amount of pervasive quality management in public universities of Iran. PhD thesis, Educational management, training science department, Isfahan University.