

Internalization of Organizational Culture : A Theoretical Perspective

Onuoha Charity Ekwutosi, Okebaram Sunday Moses

Department of Business Administration, University of Science and Technology, Enugu State,

Nigeria

charityekwutosi@yahoo.com; sunnymorlar@yahoo.co.uk

Abstract

This study investigates internalization of organizational culture: a theoretical perspective. The study examines the following objectives; to ascertain whether organization can achieve its control through internalization of organizational culture, to determine if internalization of organizational culture influences employee commitment and to establish the differences between internalized and non-internalized of organizational culture. The study was carried out in a theoretical perspective where effort was made by the researcher to constructively achieve the objectives of the study by in-depth secondary data analysis. The study discovered that in order to achieve control through organizational culture, it is necessary to be able to influence (internalize) the processes that create, sustain and change the individual elements of organizational culture. In addition, the study revealed that by committing to the culture, individuals enhance their social "survival" and decision making abilities and they pledge allegiance to some larger purpose and "consciousness" The study recommends that organizations should forestall their stability by making sure that control mechanism is in-built to their organizational culture design and functions. Finally, they should adopt best practices of total reward strategies in order to motivate and boost the employee commitment.

Introduction

Internalized beliefs and values are often emphasized in cultural theory, yet empirical work often focuses only on the attribution of values and beliefs to organizational leaders. The framework presented here argues that organizational culture is more concerned with shared sensemaking as a whole rather than just shared internalized beliefs and values. People choose to behave based both on what they personally prefer and what they believe will lead to valued outcomes.

Admittedly, there are advantageous synergies, particularly pertaining to commitment and intrinsic motivations, to be gained from the match between cultural meanings and internalized personal beliefs and values (Sathe, 1985; Schein, 1985). These synergies led Sathe (1985) and Schein (1985) to argue

that the essence of culture is the sharing of those more taken-for-granted norms, internalized values and beliefs.

Organizational Culture Organizational culture is a concept that bridges the gap between individual- and group-level phenomena (Louis, 1985). Organizational culture is shared and maintained at the group level of analysis but operates primarily by facilitating the individual level act of sensemaking. As Van Maanen and Barley (1985) note that "while a group is necessary to invent and sustain culture, is that culture can be carried only by individuals". Organizational culture refers to the shared perceptions of organizational work practices within organizational units that may differ from other organizational units (Van den Berg and Wilderom, 2004). It is the interdependent set of shared values and ways of behaving that are common to the organization and tend to perpetuate themselves (Kotter and Heskett, 1992 cited in Ogaard Larsen, and Manburg, 2005). Schein (1992) defines it as a pattern of basic assumptions invented, discovered or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration.

Organizational culture affects the way in which people consciously and subconsciously thinks, make decisions and ultimately the way in which they perceive, feel and act (Lok and Crawford, 2004; Hansen and Wernerfelt 1989; Schein, 1990). Schein (1992) proposed three levels of organizational culture. These are basic underlying assumptions, values, artifacts and behaviour. Organizational culture can be described as bureaucratic, role task or control oriented (Lashley, 1999; Ninsiima, 2003). Organizational culture has in the last two decades drawn a lot of focus from researchers for various reasons; some of these reasons include the noticeably direct effect it has on the performance, survival and longevity of an organization. Lok and Crawford, (2004) also suggested that organizational culture can exert considerable influence in organizations particularly in areas such as performance and commitment.

Internalization Loewald (1962) uses internalization as a general term for the creation of inner experience through 'certain processes of transformation by which relationships and interactions between the individual psychic apparatus and its environment are changed into inner relationships and interactions within the psychic apparatus'.

Moore and Fine (1990) define internalization similarly as the 'process by which aspects of the outer world and interactions with it are taken into the organism and represented in its internal structure'; incorporation, introjection and identification are its three principal modes. Sensorimotor, perceptual, memory, symbol formation, imagistic and lexical processes encode aspects of objects and interactions with them creating mental structures that 'assume the functions originally supplied by others'.

According to Walrond-Skinner (1986), internalization is a 'process whereby the individual transfers a relationship with an external object into his internal world'. Internalization is taken to encompass incorporation, introjection and identification mechanisms that create permanent internal mental representations out of objects and events.

In a seminal work devoted entirely to the concept of internalization, Schafer (1968) integrated much of the work done by his predecessors and introduced important refinements: 'Internalization refers to all those processes by which the subject transforms real or imagined regulatory interactions with his environment, and real or imagined characteristics of his environment, into inner regulations and characteristics'. Schafer's definition places emphasis on the subject's activity by specifying the following: (1) it is the subject who does the work of transformation or replacement, though possibly in response to environmental pressure; (2) environmental influence or pressure may be in whole or in part imagined by the subject; and (3) not everything internalized has the objective character of being a 'regulation'.

On the other hand, Meissner's (1981) reformulation of internalization underscores the central role of external relationships: internalization, then, is any process of transformation by which external relationships, object representations, and forms of regulation become part of the inner psychic structure and thus part of the 'inner world'. By this concept of internalization, we refer to the movement of structural elements, derived from sources in reality, in the direction of integration with that part of the psychic structure which is seen as central to inner identity – the ego (Meissner 1981). Schafer's orientation is relatively introverted (in that the subject is given primacy), while Meissner has extroverted leanings (the object has primacy).

However considering all the authors' viewpoints, internalization is summed as an integrative process or a systematic integration process of learning (acquired knowledge) and assimilation of that knowledge or skill for a purposeful goal. In the midst of internalizing culture organization come across some encounter like culture wolves or devourer, resistant, adapter and assimilator. Then the following words complement the act of internalization:

Incorporation emphasizes 'zonal' or oral aspects of internalization, while introjection is used for ego aspects of the same processes. Loewald (1980) further draws the important distinction between construction of inner models or schemata of the external world (regulating our orientation to it) and the 'taking in' processes subsumed under identification, incorporation, introjection and 'instinct's turning round upon one's own person'. He uses internalization to imply both the processes involved in the creation of an internal world as well as the structural outcome of processes that make the schematic representation of externality possible.

For Loewald (1980), internalization implies a transformation of object cathexis (the investment of libidinal energy in the object) into narcissistic cathexis (investment of energy in the self), thereby generating intrapsychic coherence and integration. With the dissolution of the Oedipal complex, the ego does not repress or turn away from the complex but rather 'assimilates' it to itself. This assimilation is carried out in a manner analogous to physiological processes – that is, through transformation of relationships into elemental forms and the 'internal restructuring' of those elements.

Loewald (1980) also asserts the process of identification merges or obfuscates subject and object, erasing ordinary and apparent differences. Identification is viewed as a 'way-station' to

internalization, since internalization is marked by the 're-differentiation' of relations or identifications with the object and transformation of those object relations into an 'internal, intrapsychic, depersonified relationship'. When internalization is complete, the subject's identity with the object is renounced, resulting in 'emancipation' from the object.

Thus, the individual is enriched by the relationship to the object and is no longer burdened by identification or fantasy relations. Although definitions of internalization have retained some semantic consistency since first introduced by Freud, controversies regarding whether the subject or object should be given primacy (among other conceptual differences) have contributed to divergent theories of internalization or even new paradigms.

Moore and Fine (1990) conceive of incorporation as an undifferentiated level of internalization in which confusion of self/object distinction is associated with fantasy of oral ingestion, swallowing, or destruction of an object. Chessick (1993) sees incorporation and introjection as 'archaic prototypes of identification' and incorporation as a 'form or model of introjection' in which fantasy 'follows the model of oral ingestion and swallowing'. For Meissner (1971), incorporation is considered 'the most primitive, least differentiated form of internalization in which the object loses its distinction as object and becomes totally taken into the inner subject world'.

Schafer (1968) conceived of introjection as a type of internalization distinct from identification where the introject is an 'inner presence with which one feels in a continuous or intermittent dynamic relationship'. To Modell (1968), identification refers to the 'representation of an external object that has been taken into the ego to form a permanent element within the total personality' and is a 'complex amalgam of the memories of perception and fantasies condensed and telescoped from many developmental phases'. Moore and Fine (1990) point out that identification's generic sense refers to 'all the mental processes by which an individual becomes like another in one or several aspects', noting that psychoanalysts generally reserve the term for more advanced or mature forms of internalization.

Statement of Problem

In many organizations today culture is neglected, underutilized, abandoned and haphazardly nurtured to the workforce who in many occasion undermined the efficacy and efficiency of it in organization wellness or well being. As a result, a lot of uncontrollable behaviour or actions, mishaps occurrence emanate that destabilize the operation of them. In this scenario, culture are viewed or schemed as non-internalized, private (not shared) and the disposition affect the performance and growth of the organization. Thus, the attributes inherent in ill-felted culture increasingly diminished the flexibility, collaboration and adaptability to change and usher in rigidity and lack of standardization.

Organization that does not internalize the culture is always in disarray, confusion, pandemonium and poor performance. First, an employee are easily controlled when they understands the culture than when they are not. Also the employee are committed when they know or apprehend that the culture favour them, they are recognized, they are part and parcel of the system and are participatory to decision than when they are not. Admittedly, even in a multi-cultural dimension the organization can

easily co-ordinates their workforce when they nurture them or incorporate them than when they are not. These assumptions will anchor our perspective to the significance of organizational culture internalization.

Employee commitment in organization is lacking, this has led to unsatisfactory quality of service, most employees focus is on selling their service and the attraction and fulfillment of one time sales only, yet in today's competitive market customer choice has increased and it has become difficult for companies to assume that there exists an unlimited customer base prepared to maintain patronage.

Objectives of Study

This study intends to achieve the following objectives.

1. To ascertain whether organization can achieve its control through internalization of organizational culture.
2. To determine if internalization of organizational culture influence employee commitment.
3. To establish the differences between internalized and non-internalized of organizational culture.

Review of The Literature

Achieving Control through Internalization of Organizational Culture

Schein classifies three distinctly different levels of analysis in organizational culture; artifacts, espoused beliefs and values and basic assumptions. However, the levels indicate a deeper understanding and importance of the organizational culture. Artifacts are a superficial level of analysis, ripe with contents that need not have anything to do with culture. They are easily available for analysis, but say very little about the basic assumptions on their own. The beliefs and values are harder to get at but offer deeper insights into what governs behavior than artifacts. The basic assumptions are, usually, unconscious assumptions or values, so basic and taken for granted as to effectively narrow the range of possible actions taken in a situation pertaining to the relevant assumption. Such is the power of these unconscious governing assumptions, and this is where culture draws its ultimate power as a concept from an organizational control point of view.

According to Schein (2010) the source of the power of organizational culture comes from the basic human need for cognitive stability. The mind needs a stable frame of reference as we try to make sense of the world we live in. Organizational culture, by way of the basic assumptions, provides this cognitive framework, and in this sense, provides us with a sense of stability and security. Conversely, this is also why change on the level of basic assumptions is very difficult. Change on this level destabilizes our cognitive frameworks, which induces large quantities of basic anxiety. As such, organizational culture can appropriately be thought of as a cognitive defense mechanism.

Therefore, the management of organizational culture, as explained in Schein's terms (2010), is the management of the values and motivations. Ouchi (1979) speaks of, when explaining the characteristics required of a control mechanism able of handling the conditions of organizations in a

knowledge economy. The views on organizational culture are so many and so diverse, that it is necessary to define exactly what is meant when using the term. Martin's (2001) model of the analysis of organizational culture offers an important step forward for the less abstract and more pragmatic approach to culture. Culture is approached through different theoretical perspectives that have certain research oriented implications, which can lead to an overemphasis on things that in the application of the subject are less important. This is most obvious, and most counter-productive, in the discussion that arises when the discussion falls on what culture is, and if it is shared or not. Martin cuts through this cloud of disagreement by presenting a model that contains the three big perspectives simultaneously. In this model, culture is indeed shared, but that does not mean that cultural members are in agreement on everything. It is a concept that denotes that when sharing some basic assumptions, makes you a member of that culture. It is of no importance to your membership whether or not you disagree on other subjects. In this way, cultures exists in conceptual peace with subcultures and culture can be thought of as incompletely shared systems of meaning (basic assumptions), in which different coalitions develop over time, leading to different cultural-group compositions as the organization develops.

In order to achieve control through organizational culture, it is necessary to be able to influence (internalize) the processes that create, sustain and change the individual elements of organizational culture. To that end, Hatch (1993) has developed a cultural analysis model focusing on organizational culture as processes, and trying to bridge the theoretical gap between competing perspectives (symbolic-interpretive and functional) by presenting a model for the dynamics of organizational culture.

In this model Hatch builds on Schein's original model from 1985, by using the same three analytical elements as in Schein's model (artifacts, beliefs & values and assumptions) while adding symbols to the mix. At the same time, the model is presented in circular shape, rather than the linear presentation of Schein's model, ordered by analytical depth. Hatch does not disagree with the governing characteristics of basic assumptions, but the model is intended to highlight the dynamics between the elements as to describe how culture is changed as well as sustained. The four processes influencing on four elements of the model are: *manifestation* that refers to the proactive process by which assumptions are revealed in values, and the retroactive process by which new values introduced to the culture can over time manifest themselves in basic assumptions; *realization* that refers to the proactive process of beliefs and values influencing on the productions of artifacts, and the retroactive process of artifacts, usually from sources outside the culture, can influence the values; *symbolization* that refers to the prospective process of adding additional meaning other than the literal to an artifact and the retrospective process of enhancing the literal meaning of one artifact over others, giving some artifacts more attention than others; and finally *interpretation* that refers to the process of evoking ones broader cultural frame of reference, in the form of basic assumptions, when interpreting symbols.

The basic premise of how changes to individual elements occur is in line with Schein's thinking. Basic assumptions are the product of a learning process, in which an assumption that proves successful over time becomes gradually more ingrained (Schein, 2010).

Thus, the term control or organizational control is defined for the purpose of this study as *a* process by which an organization influences its subunits and members to behave in ways that lead to attainment of organizational objectives.

Control can be viewed as the way three elements are coordinated:

- ✚ The direction of work. What needs to be done, by whom, in what order, to what degree of precision or accuracy, and in what period of time.
- ✚ The evaluation of work. How each worker is supervised, his output evaluated, to determine which worker (or groups of workers) is performing well and which workers are performing to a substandard.
- ✚ The disciplining of work. How each worker is rewarded or punished in relations to the evaluation of the instructed direction of work (Edwards, 1979).

The different overall approaches to control as well as the historical development of the mechanisms and systems applied to achieve control and the effects of these mechanisms on control processes lead to the following categorization:

Simple Controls During the development of the modern economy the control mechanisms have gone through a significant change as business owners and managers have sought to solve the problems arising from the main problem of the capitalist/labor relationship (from a capitalist viewpoint); how to transform purchased labor power into actual labor with a minimal loss of potential labor power.

Control was personal and direct, as foremen often intervened directly in the work process, and could hold the power to hire and fire workers or discipline them in other ways. This form of organization required only a simple form of control, as the organization was never bigger than it would allow the entrepreneur and his small group of foremen to keep personal supervision of most if not all activities, and thus did not demand any elaborate award/punishment schemes, loyalty programs and so forth. Reward and punishment was direct and timely precise, hence the name direct control, although this form of control is also known as entrepreneurial control (Edwards, 1979).

Simultaneously as production facilities grew a lot bigger, the need for ever greater coordination arose with the increasing complexity of the products being produced as well as with the scale of production. The efficiency of simple controls declined with the emergence of these factors and as the increasing complexity of production and the increasing need for coordination raised the cost of production disruptions such as strikes a new way of maintaining control over the process of work was needed (Edwards, 1979).

Hierarchical Control The failures of simple controls as the size of production facilities grew saw an increase in worker resistance, in the form of massively increasing union organization as well as worker militancy. Workers slaved under poor conditions and the lack of the entrepreneur's personal touch, rewarding hard work as well as punishing lingering behavior, only worsened the situation. The hierarchical control mechanisms were in a sense a physical extension of entrepreneurial control, in so far as management attempted to recreate the conditions of entrepreneurial control by hiring foremen and supervisors (Edwards, 1979).

In an attempt to quench the worker resistance and the growing public resistance over the shady sides of the concentration of capital Big Business introduced welfare plans, company unions and co-management and worker committees for the resolution of work disputes and such. The welfare plans sought two things. First, to create a more loyal worker by portraying the image of a corporation with a genuine interest and concern for its workers well-being and secondly, to increase the workers enrolled in the welfare plan's dependency on the corporation. In both cases the objective was to reduce worker resistance and stabilize working relationships (Edwards, 1979).

Technical Control The next step in business' attempt to control worker resistance as well as minimize the problem of transforming purchased labor power into actual labor, was the technical control possibilities that followed the introduction of mass production.

But the new production facilities with more advanced, stationary, machinery that was preprogrammed to a certain pace of work meant that the workers no longer dictated the pace. A worker could either fulfill the job or be fired for not meeting the required output from the machinery. Technical control is structural control in the sense that it is built into the structure of the work flow design of the production facilities as well as the machinery, and in that sense it represents a shift in power.

The preset pace of the machinery would also represent an effective way of undermining worker organization and coordination. The machine speedup meant that it required the workers full attention. There was no time to have a chat with the workers next to you but it also meant that workers became chained to very stationary machinery. Where workers had been walking around the production facility fetching tools, delivering materials and so on, and in that process having a lot of contact with other workers, they were now barely in contact with the workers in their immediate surroundings. Under this new situation workers had much less opportunity to discuss grievances with the respective foremen, pay-rates and so forth.

Technical control was also introduced for low level white-collar staff. For this to work, companies routinized and standardized the jobs of the white-collar labor force as much as they could, resulting in a decreased difference between the lower levels of the white-collar labor force and the blue-collar workers (Edwards, 1979). Although it addressed the first element of control, the direction of work through labor deskilling and the breakup of tasks in to minute pieces, it failed to address what had been the central issue throughout the history of the large businesses: the arbitrary reward and punishment taking place at the hands of foremen wielding immense power. Although technical

control took away the foremen's right to direct the work (and the need to, for that matter), the foremen still retained the right to punish and reward as they pleased.

Bureaucratic Control Bureaucratic control is categorized as being structural control just like technical control because it is embedded in the structure of the company. But in contrast to technical control, which is embedded in the workflow and machinery designs, bureaucratic control is embedded in the social and organizational structure of the company (Edwards, 1979).

A major difference between bureaucratic control and the previous control systems is the focus on homogenizing vs. dividing the employed labor. Until bureaucratic control the emphasis was on deskilling workers and creating a situation in which it was easy to replace the worker, by simplifying each task as much as possible and having as few job categories as possible (Edwards, 1979).

Bureaucratic control emphasizes diversity. Through numerous job categories, in which a very large number of job titles exist, several pay grades within each job title, to the individual bonus, seniority bonus etc. This diversity lessons labor power to resist the business control by removing the sense of belonging to the same group. The picture of a clear dichotomy of workers and management has been eroded by the introduction of bureaucratic controls emphasis on diversity. 'We' now refers to the company, not the workers. To further the erosion, the nature of the bureaucracy has seen a dramatic increase in the number of workers with some sort of management responsibility, hovering in between roles (Edwards, 1979).

At the core of Bureaucracy is the institutionalization of power. It takes away power from foremen and vests it in company policy and rules. It is no longer your immediate supervisor telling you what to do and why, it is the company. Your immediate supervisor is merely enforcing the rules, not making them up.

Bureaucratic control systematically rewards certain behaviors that support the control system itself. While workers in the previous systems where by and large free to behave as they saw fit, within the parameters of getting the job done, the bureaucratic control system seeks to mold the behavior of the worker. There are three specific types of behavior that are systematically encouraged by bureaucratic control:

- Orientation to rules; a high degree of awareness of the rules, and a high probability to following them.
- Being dependable and predictable. Getting the job done in a reliable and dependable fashion, even when the job falls slightly outside the rules.
- Internalization of organizational goals and values. An encouragement for workers to actively identify themselves with the organization.

The required behavioral trait differs at different job levels however. The lowest job levels tend to be fairly routinized in character and therefore orientation to rules is stressed on this level. The middle level jobs tend to be less routinized in character and workers are rewarded for being dependable and

predictable. At the higher levels jobs organizations reserve rewards for those showing loyalty and commitment to the organization through an expressed internalization to the organizational goals and values (Edwards, 1979).

A deeper concern with the totalitarian characteristics of bureaucratic control was, and is, the seemingly growing dissatisfaction of workers losing their autonomy as rules came to govern everything from the direction of work, evaluation of work, reward and punishment of work and even the workers behavior at work. One way of looking at it would be to say that while workers have achieved a lot of what they were fighting for under the previous systems, it did not suffice. Once free from the arbitrary rule of foremen, blessed with greater job security and in some companies even the outlook of lifetime employment, workers have set their sights on the next point in the horizon; Workplace democracy. Once given some consideration in some matters of reasonable direct importance to the employee, the workers start asking why they are not consulted when in other matters, not necessarily pertaining directly to the workers requesting influence. Once competence is shown (or believed to have been shown) in, say rearranging the work area, and after participation has become a conscious, officially sponsored activity, participators may very well want to go on to topics of job assignment, the allocation of rewards, or even the selection of leadership. In other words, management's present monopoly of control can in itself easily become of source of contention.

The organizational control field has undergone a tremendous development in conjunction with the technological and social developments. As technological advances have increased the complexity and intricacy of production facilities, as well as advances in the business science has led to even greater knowledge, so too has the job-characteristics of today changed massively, each stage of development requiring a change in the mechanisms of control.

Internalization of Organizational Culture Influence on Employee Commitment

Beside the theoretical implications, if commitment to the values and simple compliance to the values produce the same intended behavior from the employees, in practical terms it matters little while in theoretical terms, it matters a lot. First; it is difficult to be sure of any lasting effects if there is no commitment and internalization. Second; the changes management undertake in trying to change values and assumptions are costly, expensive and the whole operation is very complex. And it will fail miserably, if the observed behavior is not due to commitment, as the new initiatives will be tailored to the scenario of commitment. If an individual's beliefs and values match those operating in the culture, we can say that the individual is committed—identifies with and is emotionally attached to the organization (Sathe, 1985). The commitment generated by culture is, however, is the result of more than just satisfying intrinsic motives. Organizational culture also engenders commitment as a result of the importance of the sensemaking system to all members of the community of experience. By committing to the culture, individuals enhance their social "survival" and sensemaking abilities and they pledge allegiance to some larger purpose and "consciousness".

A committed employee according to Meyer and Allen (1997) cited in Rashid, Sambasivan and Johari (2003) is the one who stays with the organization whatever the circumstances and shares the company goals. Thus having a committed workforce would be an added advantage to an organization. Commitment helps workers to identify with the organization's rules rewards and values. Silverthorne (2004) found that there is a relationship between organizational culture and commitment whereby bureaucratic organizational culture had the lowest level of employee commitment. Organizational culture that supports employee control and autonomy in work processes by reducing hierarchy is able to enhance intrinsically motivated and self directed behaviors among employees; employees can then focus offering good service and hence customer retention. When top management reduce on slow decision making, the hierarchical management style and routine in work processes, employees can work better and get more results in an environment where they feel informed and involved, similarly high client retention rate indicates that the client derives satisfaction from the provided services, hence would see no reasonable cause to incur switching costs to get another service provider. A satisfied client will talk good about the service provided, this word of mouth is likely not only to attract new clients but also cement the already existing business relationship, increase client patronage and thus client retention (Strauss et al, 2001)

Regardless as to what business leaders may be trying to implement in their companies any employee interacting with customers is in a position either to increase customer retention or put it at risk. Employees in such positions should therefore be supported by the organizational culture effectively and efficiently. Organizational commitment is the employee's psychological attachment to the organization. Organizational commitment refers to the employee's attachment to the employing organization – namely, the commitment to the entire organization as the employee perceived it (Morrow,1993) and the organization support for the employee (Whitener,2001). According to Buchanan (1974) organizational commitment is the emotional connection to a particular organization, which is characterized by three major parameters in the individual's attitudes towards the organization. It is the identification which means internalization of the organization's goals and value. Organizational commitment reflects the individual relationship with the organization, and that this relationship is significant in explaining the individual's behavior in the organization, and that this relationship is significant in explaining the individual's behavior in the organization.

Affective Commitment is defined as the employee's positive emotional attachment to the organization. An employee who is affectively committed strongly identifies with the goals of the organization and desires to remain a part of the organization. This employee commits to the organization because he/she "wants to".

Continuance Commitment develops out of the perceived cost (benefit against loss), and requires that the employee be aware of these benefits and losses. Therefore different workers who encounter identical situations may experience different levels of continuance commitment (Meyer and Allen,1997; Mottaz, 1989). Also it was found that continuance commitment is not the commitment

desirable for an organization, and stresses that while employees who perceived the cost of leaving the organization as heavy prefer to stay, their contribution to the organization is not as positive.

Normative Commitment leads employees to stay in the organization due to a sense of loyalty or duty, and because they feel that this is the right thing to do (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Normative commitment develops out of internal pressures that result from norms that encourage extended commitment to the organization. Individuals derive these norms from socialization processes in the family and surrounding culture, which include experiences that stress loyalty towards a particular organization. The individual undergoes a process of internalization of norms and expectations, in which he or she learns and later is aware of the expectations of the family, culture and organization that leads to internalization of loyalty to the place of work and commitment to act in a manner that fits the organization's goals and interests (Dunham,1994).

Ketchand and Strawser (2001) found that organizational commitment had been identified to have significant relationships with job satisfaction, job involvement, stress, occupational commitment, and motivation. However, the results of the studies examining the relations between these variables have been equivocal (Begley and Czajka, 1993). Mathieu and Zajac, (1990) found that individuals who have a high degree of commitment to their organizations experience greater amounts of stress than those who are less committed.

Differences between Internalized and Non-Internalized of Organizational Culture

Accordingly, two levels of analysis are to be distinguished: The first regards culture as the basic unit of analysis and is concerned with intercultural or between-group differences; the second is focused on individual clients and is interested in not only intercultural but also intracultural or within-group variation. An appreciation of the distinction between cultural differences and individual differences within a culture is crucial to multicultural composition. Yet, within-group variation has been a much neglected construct in multicultural psychology, counseling, and development (Ibrahim, 1991; Sundberg, 1981).

In this vein, Internalized culture may be defined as the cultural influences operating within the individual that shape (not determine) personality formation and various aspects of psychological functioning. Individual cognition, for instance, is influenced by internalized cultural beliefs. Internalized culture must be distinguished from cultural group membership. It should be pointed out that cultural group membership per se is not a psychological variable, but internalized culture is just as in themselves age, sex, and socioeconomic class are not psychological variables, but psychological maturity, gender, and class identification are. In effect, culture has been translated from an anthropological concept to a psychological or individual-level concept.

Differences in internalized culture arise from differences in enculturation. The concept of internalized culture explicitly addresses both between-group and within-group variations in cultural processes

(Carter, 1991), for a review of empirical research on cultural values). It enables us to better deal with findings that there may be more similarity among members of comparable socioeconomic statuses across groups than among members of different socioeconomic statuses within the same group. Very often cross-national or cross-ethnic differences decrease or even vanish when socioeconomic class is controlled. Consider too subcultural differences within the same cultural group, between men and women, old and young people, or the rich and the poor. The evidence suggests that men and women in different groups are socialized differently (Pearson, Turner, and Todd-Mancillas, 1991). It supports the contention that they have different internalized cultures and that, in a psychological sense, they belong to different subcultural groupings. Moreover, individual differences in internalized culture would be found among men and women alike. The same argument applies to the old and the young, as well as to the rich and the poor.

The idea of culture internalized is not new. Subjective culture analyzed by Triandis (1972) is also culture internalized. It refers to the characteristic ways people in each culture view the human-made part of their environment (ideas, social standards, and so forth). Among the concepts used to delineate subjective culture are worldview, cognitive map, life space, behavioral environment, and maze. A pattern of similar responses by members of a cultural group constitutes one aspect of the group's subjective culture. That is, subjective culture is a culture-level, not individual-level, construct. It is of limited utility for understanding individual worldviews and hence of limited importance to counselors. That no two individuals, even if they are from the same cultural group, share the same worldview requires assessment procedures that are more suited for counseling (Ibrahim, 1991).

In giving emphasis to individual differences, internalized culture differs from anthropological concepts of culture. Kluckhohn (1954) distinguished two frames of reference, "inwardness" and "outwardness" in relation to the concept of culture: "For complete rigor, one might need to speak of Culture A (the logical construct in the mind of the anthropologist) and Culture B (the norms internalized in individuals as manifested by patterned regularities in abstracted elements of their behavior)". The rigor of this distinction is less than complete, however. Culture is logically also a construct "in the mind of the anthropologist" not to be equated with what actually exists in the mind of the individual member of a cultural group. It is focused on inward "patterned regularities," corresponding to the outward norms of Culture.

Understandably, the focus on patterned regularities is common to cultural anthropologists, whose business is to construct conceptual models of the total culture (Culture A). These patterned regularities are assumed to be more or less shared in the collective minds of individuals belonging to a cultural group virtually all anthropologists are agreed that culture is shared. However, in what form and to what extent culture is shared remains one of the enduring issues in culture theory (Rohner, 1984). A closely related issue concerns how cultural boundaries may be defined.

Given that the counselor's business is to work with individuals, singly or in groups, it is essential to avoid equating the internalized culture existing in the mind of the client with notions of shared patterned regularities held by theorists. Informed by these notions about a cultural group, counselors are vulnerable to activate automatically expectations and judgments about clients from that group that

is, to apply knowledge about a group to make judgments about individuals (Murphy, 1977). But there is a danger of overgeneralization and even stereotyping. The form and extent of a client's sharing of the patterned regularities must be investigated empirically and not taken for granted. Indeed, such investigation is part and parcel of counseling assessment. Of special importance is the sensitivity to discrepancies, tensions, and conflicts, which may exist side by side with conformities, between the client's beliefs and values and those shared by members of his or her cultural group. Furthermore, these discrepancies, tensions, and conflicts are not to be viewed necessarily in a negative light. They may be the driving forces for adaptation, creativity, and change. A major advantage of relying on the concept of internalized culture, then, is that it helps to sensitize counselors against overgeneralization and stereotyping.

This brings us to the domain of acculturation research. Broadly speaking, however, acculturation is the process which may be bidirectional whereby members of a cultural group learn and assume the behavior patterns of another cultural group to which they have been exposed. Increasingly, modern life in diverse geographical settings is characterized by cultural inter-penetration and cross-fertilizations; hence, to varying degrees acculturation cannot be avoided. If enculturation, which involves presumably only one culture, is complex, so much more acculturation must be. New dimensions of cultural processes have to be explored. How do people adapt when they are confronted with cultural forces alien to their culture of origin? Under the condition of cultures in contact, often in conflict, both the strengths and weaknesses of a culture may be brought into sharper focus and nakedly revealed. Equipped with the concept of internalized culture, we may translate the research problem into one of investigating acculturation as a psychological phenomenon at the individual level. This requires, as a first step, the identification and measurement of acculturation variables pertaining to individuals. In studies of immigrants, for example, a crude index of cultural exposure is the ordinal generation of the individual born in the host culture. A more refined index would include measures of the quantity and well as the quality of exposure.

Olmedo (1979) advocates a psychometric perspective to the measurement of acculturation. Three main categories of items have been used in the construction of scales for measuring individual acculturation: linguistic (e.g., language proficiency, preference, and use), socio-cultural (e.g., socioeconomic status and mobility, degree of urbanization, family size and structure), and psychological (e.g., cultural value orientations, attitudes, knowledge, and behavior). The use of psychological scales, in particular, shifts the emphasis in ethnicity studies from ethnic group membership (in itself not a psychological variable) to ethnic identity and loyalty. Olmedo concludes that acculturation is measurable with reasonable reliability and validity; that it is a multidimensional process, as the linguistic, sociocultural, and psychological measures appear to be largely independent of one another; and that there may be a remarkable degree of heterogeneity in the level of individual acculturation.

Expecting to find externally or spatially located cultural boundaries is absurd once we go beyond acculturation and encounter the phenomenon of bicultural and multicultural minds. They differ from

acculturation in that no one culture is regarded as the host or dominant; assimilation, a unidirectional process, is not the object of interest. Rather, different cultural systems are internalized and coexist within the mind. Bi-enculturated or multi-enculturated persons are not merely exposed to and knowledgeable of, but have in-depth experiences and hence competence in, more than one culture. In short, the internalized culture of these persons embodies a plurality of cultural influences of diverse origins.

Bienculturation in childhood or an employee corresponds to simultaneous bilingual acquisition; acculturation corresponds to successive bilingual acquisition, in which second-language learning takes place after a first language has already been firmly established. Fully bienculturated individuals correspond to balanced bilinguals. Intercultural value conflicts correspond to linguistic interference. Finally, the thesis of cultural determinism corresponds to Whorf's (1956) hypothesis of linguistic determinism, according to which language determines the shape of thought.

Studies of individuals enculturated to more than one culture can inform us on how different cultural systems can be integrated, or fail to integrate, within single minds a fascinating question by any standard. If indeed culture shapes cognition, then how is the cognition of the bienculturated individual structured? Does bienculturation or, better still, multienculturation inoculate one against culturocentrism? How are intercultural value conflicts handled? Would a new supracultural identity emerge, or would multiple identities, perhaps with little permeability among them, be the result? Creative synthesis and compartmentalization represent, of course, only two of the many possibilities. In reviewing the literature on the psychological impact of biculturalism, LaFromboise et al. (1993) emphasize the alternation model of second-culture acquisition. According to this model, people are able to gain competence within two cultures without losing their cultural identity or having to choose one culture over the other. It is an additive model of cultural acquisition corresponding to code switching in bilingualism. In this regard, bienculturated individuals would have a distinct advantage.

Bienculturated and multienculturated individuals constitute a valuable resource for intercultural understanding. They are in a specially advantageous position to interpret intercultural events, because they are equipped with alternative cognitive maps. To this extent, they may be better inoculated against culturocentrism. They may more effectively serve as agents for combating racism and promoting intercultural understanding. LaFromboise et al. (1993) suggest that ethnic minority people who acquire bicultural competence will have better physical and psychological health than those who do not. Inherent in multiculturalism is the dialectic tension between two tendencies: diversity and unity. Diversity without unity leads to factionalism, and unity without diversity is boring uniformity.

The concept of internalized culture compels us to recognize individual differences in internalized culture, arising from differences in enculturation. Even among members of the same cultural group, no two individuals would be expected to have an identical internalized culture. The uniqueness of the individual is reaffirmed. Closely related to internalized culture are two psychological concepts that hold a promise to liberate us from the rigidity of looking at people solely in terms of their cultural membership. The first, cultural identification, acknowledges that individuals may differ widely in the extent to which they identify with the cultural heritage of their group or those of other groups. The

second, cultural orientation, reaffirms a measure of autonomy in individual preference for various cultural patterns. It is a concept of special significance to the identity of bienculturated and multienculturated individuals. A great opportunity is present for them to articulate a supracultural value system, such that value judgments and moral reasoning are no longer anchored to a single culture (LaFromboise, 1993). Cultural identification and cultural orientation are thus instrumental to the development of self-identities and worldviews (Meyer et al., 1991). The more integrated the individual's identity is, the more likely healthy coping patterns will be present (Murphy, 1977).

Conclusion

Organizational culture, by way of the basic assumptions, provides this cognitive framework, and in this sense, provides us with a sense of stability and security. In order to achieve control through organizational culture, it is necessary to be able to influence (internalize) the processes that create, sustain and change the individual elements of organizational culture. The four processes influencing elements includes, manifestation, realization, symbolization and interpretation.

By committing to the culture, individuals enhance their social "survival" and decision making abilities and they pledge allegiance to some larger purpose and "consciousness". The individual undergoes a process of internalization of norms and expectations, in which he or she learns and later is aware of the expectations of the family, culture and organization that leads to internalization of loyalty to the place of work and commitment to act in a manner that fits the organization's goals and interests.

The concept of internalized culture explicitly addresses both between-group and within-group variations in cultural processes. A major advantage of relying on the concept of internalized culture, then, is that it helps to sensitize counselors against overgeneralization and stereotyping. Acculturation as a multidimensional process, both in linguistic, sociocultural, and psychological measures shows that there is remarkable degree of heterogeneity in the level of individual acculturation. In short, the internalized culture of these (Bi-enculturated or multi-enculturated) persons embodies a plurality of cultural influences of diverse origins. Bi-enculturated and multi-enculturated individuals constitute a valuable resource for intercultural understanding. They are in a special advantageous position to interpret intercultural events, because they are equipped with alternative cognitive maps.

Recommendations

1. The organization should forestall their stability by making sure that control mechanism is in-built to their organizational culture design and functions.
2. They should adopt best practices of total reward strategies in order to motivate and boost the employee commitment.
3. They should ensure that internalization framework is all encompassing (fixing both the inter and intra culture) elements in order to achieve a positive synergy in survival and competitive advantage

References

1. Allen, N.J. and Meyer, J.P. (1996), "Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: Examination of Construct Validity", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 49 No. 3, pp. 252-76.
2. Begley, T. M. and Czajka, J. M. (1993), "Panel Analysis of the Moderating Effects of Commitment on Job Satisfaction, Intent to Quit and Health following Organizational Change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.78, pp.552-556.
3. Buchanan, B. (1974), "Building Organizational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers in Work Organizations", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 19, pp. 533-46.
4. Carter, R. T. (1991), "Cultural Values: A Review of Empirical Research and Implications for Counseling". *Journal of Counseling and Development*, Vol.70, pp.164-173.
5. Chessick (1993) Cited in Kenneth C. Wallis and James L. Poulton (2001) *Internalization: The Origins and Construction of Internal Reality*, Buckingham: Open University Press
6. Dunham, R.B., Grube, J.A. and Castaneda, M.B. (1994), "Organizational Commitment: The Utility of an Integrative Definition". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 79, pp. 370-80.
7. Edwards, Richard (1979), *Contested Terrain*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
8. Hansen, G. and Wernerfelt, B. (1989), "Determinants of Firm Performance: The Relative Impact of Economic and Organization Factors", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol.10 No.3 pp. 399 – 411.
9. Hatch, M. J. (1993), *Dynamics of Organizational Culture*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
10. Ibrahim, F. A. (1991), "Contribution of Cultural Worldview to Generic Counseling and Development". *Journal of Counseling and Development*, Vol.70. pp.13-19.
11. Kanter, R.M. (1968), "Commitment and Social Organization: A Study of Commitment Mechanisms in Utopian Communities". *American Sociological Review*, Vol.33 No.4 pp. 499-517.
12. Ketchand, A., and Strawser, J. R. (2001), "Multiple Dimensions of Organizational Commitment: Implications for Future Accounting Research". *Behavioral Research in Accounting*. Retrieved June 7,2013 from <http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary>
13. Kluckhohn, C. (1954), Culture and Behavior. in G. Lindzey (Ed.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*, Vol. 2. Special Fields and Applications (pp. 921-976). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
14. Kotler, P. (2000), *Principles of Marketing*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd
15. Kotter J. P. and Hasket J.L (1992), *Corporate Culture and Performance*. New York: The Free Press
16. LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L. K., and Gerton, J. (1993), "Psychological Impact of Biculturalism: Evidence and Theory". *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol.114, pp.395-412.

17. Lashley, C. (1999), "Employee Empowerment in Services: A Framework for Analysis". *Personal Review*, Vol. 28, pp.1-19.
18. Loewald (1962) Cited in Kenneth C. Wallis and James L. Poulton (2001), *Internalization: The Origins and Construction of Internal Reality*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
19. Lok, P. and Crawford, J. (2004), "The Effect of Organizational Culture and Leadership Style on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: A Cross National Comparison". *Journal of Management Development*, Vol.23 No.4 pp. 321-338.
20. Louis, M. R. (1985), *Introduction: Perspectives on Organizational Culture*. in P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), *Organizational Culture* (pp. 27-30). Beverly Hills: Sage.
21. Martin, J. (2001), *Organizational Culture: Mapping the Terrain*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
22. Martin, J. and Frost, P. (2000), *The Organizational Culture War Games; A Struggle for Intellectual Dominance*. London: Sage.
23. Mathieu, J. E. and Zajac, D. M. (1990), "A Review and Meta-analysis of the Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences of Organizational Commitment". *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol.108,pp. 171-194.
24. Meissner, W. W. (1981), *Internalization in Psychoanalysis*, New York: International Universities Press.
25. Meyer J. P., and Allen, N. J., (1991), "A Three Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 1, pp.61-89.
26. Meyer J. P., Allen, N. J., (1997), *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research and Application*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.
27. Modell (1968), Cited in Kenneth C. Wallis and James L. Poulton (2001) *Internalization: The Origins and Construction of Internal Reality*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
28. Moore and Fine (1990), Cited in Kenneth C. Wallis and James L. Poulton (2001) *Internalization: The Origins and Construction of Internal Reality*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
29. Morrow, P.C. (1993), *The Theory and Measurement of Work Commitment*, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
30. Mottaz, C. J. (1989), "An Analysis between Attitudinal and Behavioral Commitment", *Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 143-58.
31. Murphy, H. B. M. (1977), "Migration, Culture and Mental Health". *Psychological Medicine*, Vol.7, pp. 677-684.
32. Myers, L. J., Speight, S. L., Highlen, P. S., Cox, C. I., Reynolds, A. L., Adams, E. M., & Hanley, P. (1991), "Identity Development and Worldview: Toward an Optimal Conceptualization". *Journal of Counseling and Development*, Vol. 70, pp. 54-63.

33. Ninsiima, K.J. (2003), *Competencies, Empowerment, Perceived Justice, task performance and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in Uganda Revenue Authority*. Unpublished Masters Dissertation, Makerere University Kampala, Uganda.
34. Olmedo, E. L. (1979), "Acculturation: A Psychometric Perspective". *American Psychologist*, Vol.34, pp.1061-1070.
35. Ouchi, W. G. (1981,) *Organizational Paradigms: A Commentary on Japanese Management and Theory Z organizations*,
36. Pearson, J. C., Turner, L. H., and Todd-Mancillas, W. (1991), *Gender and Communication*. Dubuque, IA: Brown
37. Rohner, R. P. (1984), "Toward a Conception of Culture for Cross-cultural Psychology". *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol.15, pp.111-138.
38. Sathe, V. (1985), *Culture and Related Corporate Realities*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
39. Schafer, R. (1968), *Aspects of Internalization*, New York: International Universities Press.
40. Schein, E. (1990), "Organizational Culture", *American Journal of Psychologist*, Vol.4 No.2 pp.109-19.
41. Schein, E. (1992), *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bus
42. Schein, E. H. (1985), *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
43. Schein, E. H. (2010), *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
44. Silverthorne, C. (2004), "The Impact of Organizational Culture and Person-Organization fit on Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction in Taiwan". *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, Vol.25 No.7 pp. 592-599.
45. Strauss B, Chojnacki K, Decker A and Hoftman F (2001), "Retention Effects of Customer Club". *International Journal of Service Industry Management*. Vol.12 No 1
46. Strauss, A.L. and Corbin, J. (1990), *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*, London: Sage.
47. Sundberg, N. D. (1981), *Cross-cultural Counseling and Psychotherapy: A Research Overview*. In A. J Marsella & P. B. Pedersen (Eds.), *Cross-cultural Counseling and Psychotherapy* (pp. 28-62). New York: Pergamon.
48. Triandis, H. C. (1972), *The Analysis of Subjective Culture*. New York: Wiley.
49. Van den Berg P. T. and Wilderom, C. (2004), "Defining, Measuring and Company Organizational Cultures". *Applied Psychology: International Association for Applied Psychology*, Vol.S3 No.4 pp. 570-582.
50. Van Maanen, J., and Barley, S. R. (1985), *Cultural Organization: Fragments of a Theory*. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), *Organizational Culture* (pp. 31-54). Beverly Hills: Sage.

51. Walrond-Skinner (1996) Cited in Kenneth C. Wallis and James L. Poulton (2001) *Internalization: The Origins and Construction of Internal Reality*, Buckingham: Open University Press,
52. Whitener, E. (2001), "Do High Commitment Human Resource Practices affect Employee Commitment? A Cross-level Analysis using Hierarchical Linear Modeling", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 27 No. 5, pp. 515-35.
53. Whorf, B. L. (1956), *Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf* (J. B. Carroll, Ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.