

WHY DO DYSFUNCTIONAL NORMS CONTINUE TO EXIST IN THE WORKPLACE?

Seema Singh*, Rashmi Kumar**

Abstract *The objective of the present work is to understand the factors influencing internalization of dysfunctional norms amongst the employees of an organization. The factors considered in the present study which could possibly influence the internalization of dysfunctional norms were- cultural values, organizational structure, socialization strategies, and leader integrity. The study was conducted in two manufacturing organization in the industrial zone of district Allahabad in Uttar Pradesh. Total sample of employees was 307. Internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms was predicted by leader integrity, job codification, institutionalized socialization strategies, collaboration, and centralization. It was concluded that the predictor variables had stronger relationship with internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms in terms of pervasiveness as compared to the second dimension i.e. intensity. Among all the predictor variables perceived leader integrity and serial vs. disjunctive socialization tactics were found to be the most important facilitators of internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms. Also socialization strategies of the organization were found to mediate the impact of leader integrity, structural factors, and cultural/ values on the internalization of the dysfunctional norms.*

Keywords: *Dysfunctional, Norms, Internalization, Socialization*

INTRODUCTION

An individual's first encounter with an organization is with its culture, which consists of values, beliefs systems, and ideologies. According to Chatman and Cha (2003), culture is a system of shared values defining appropriate attitudes, behaviours and norms. Appropriateness of attitudes and behaviours can be evaluated against norms, which are legitimate, and socially shared standards. Norms influence how members of organizations perceive and interact with one another, approach decisions, and solve problems. Norms are distinct from rules, which are formal, codified directives. The concept of norms also implies social control- that is, norms act as means of ensuring conformity and applying sanctions to deviant behaviour.

Behaviours in organizations are directly guided by the prevailing norms. The kinds of norms that an organization develops and maintains are crucial for effective organizational functioning. The famous Hawthorne studies by Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939) unequivocally demonstrate that group norms shaped employee's behaviour more powerfully than either monetary rewards or physical work environments. Thus, norms prevalent in a particular subgroup or in wider organization may facilitate organizational growth or hinder it.

The nature of the organizational norms can be functional as well as dysfunctional in nature. Functional norms are

defined as those behaviours prevailing in an organization, which support and enhance organizational performance and development and are flexible enough to change when required. Dysfunctional norms refer to the behaviours prevailing in an organization, which come into the way of organizational development, growth and productivity thus threatening its very survival. They create obstructions in the adaptation of the organization to its external environment and in the coordination of internal systems and processes. Internalization of such dysfunctional organizational norms may lead to outcomes such as reduced efficiency, less effectiveness, low turnover. Why and how these dysfunctional norms are learnt; what kind of socialization practices facilitates learning and internalization of these dysfunctional behaviours is the concern of this paper.

Internalization of such organizational norms depends upon a number of organizational as well as individual level factors. Prevailing organizational culture as well as organizational structural properties such as centralization, formalization, and technology, and also leadership quality such as integrity are some of the organizational variables that are likely to influence internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms through the process of socialization.

Norms within formal organizations for example, express "those overarching 'shalts' and shalt nots' which govern the actions, imply the sanctions, and in time permeate the souls of organization members" (Kahn et. al., 1964; 150-

* Assistant Professor, AIBHAS, AmityUniversity, Noida, India. Email: seema.singh08@yahoo.com

** Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Allahabad, Allahabad, India. Email: rashmi.Kumar54@gmail.com

151). According to Campoux (2000) functional norms relate to consequences of behaviour that are good for the organization and help in its adjustment and adaptation. Such results contribute to the organization's progress towards its goals. On the contrary dysfunctional norms hinder the very growth of the organizations.

Learning of dysfunctional norms would be influenced by a number of factors-both at the organizational level and individual level. Based on the conclusions drawn by Jones (1983) and Falcione and Wilson (1988), it is expected that factors at these two levels interact to influence the acceptance of norms in an organization.

The organizations transmit to members the expectations associated with their roles through the process of organizational socialization. Therefore socialization processes has a mediating role in the process of learning and internalization of organizational norms as through these processes the individual know about the organization's 'ways' and 'nuances'. Ideally all members internalize these expectations so that they will voluntarily and willingly perform the role behaviours expected of them. Much of the socialization arises spontaneously within informal social groupings of various kinds (Trice and Beyer, 1993). Gino, Ayal, and Ariely (2009), find that individuals' unethical behaviour does not depend only upon the assessment of cost-benefit analysis, but it depends on the social norms understood from the dishonesty of others and also on the saliency of dishonesty.

As organizational socialization plays an important role in the extent of internalization of norms and practices (both functional and dysfunctional) it is crucial to understand the strategies that are employed for the socialization process.

Van Maanen (1978) suggests that socialization process is characterized by certain strategies or tactics. The tactics may be used alone or in tandem, and by design or by accident (Van Maanen and Schein, 1979). Van Maanen and Schein (1979) argue that the strategies are commonly used and they do influence the employee's ongoing organizational experience. Van Maanen (1978) describe socialization strategies as sequential or non-sequential, fixed or variable socialization, collective or individual, formal or informal, investiture or divestiture, and serial or disjunctive. Serial socialization is characterized by the use of mentors or role models. Disjunctive socialization is a process whereby an employee does not have a guide which to model organizational behaviour, which makes it more difficult for her to reduce uncertainty in a systematic manner because there is greater reliance on information sources which may be inaccurate or inappropriate.

Acquisition of dysfunctional norms: Given below are some of the factors that influence acceptance of dysfunctional norms.

1. Socialization Strategies: Jones, (1986) termed individual, informal, variable, random, investiture, and disjunctive socialization practices, as 'individualized socialization tactics' - He was of the view that through them the individual organizational members generally experience a unique set of learning experiences, which make them learn on their own the 'ways' and nuances of the organization. Thus there is greater possibility of accepting the unintended and undesirable consequences of the socialization processes which are termed dysfunctional organizational norms. On the other hand the institutionalized socialization tactics (i.e. collective, sequential formal, fixed, divestiture and serial) probably lead to a common set of learning experiences among the organizational members. The institutionalized socialization processes are relatively structured and guided by the organization and hence the possibilities of undesirable consequences like the learning of dysfunctional norms do not take place.

2. Organizational Culture: Corporate culture is based on the needs of individuals to reduce uncertainty and to have some reference to guide their actions. This uncertainty-reducing need is resolved by the evaluation of behaviour standards (do's and don'ts) (Furnham, 1997). Cultures can be functional but can also be 'equally dysfunctional' (Trice 1985, p. 248). They have many downside risks and costs, even in companies that are admired for both their performance and cultures. Also, organizational cultures that were functional for one period of time can become dysfunctional as the environment or other circumstances change (Starbuck, Greve, and Hedberg 1978; Miller 1990).

The most important aspect of organizational culture are the values it propagates. There is a reciprocal relationship between values and behaviours (Watson, Teague, and Papamarcas, 2004). In contrast to the person-organization cultural fit approach of value congruence, they hint at a cyclic deep link between values and behaviour. Once dysfunctional norms and practices are accepted and followed, organizational members may cognitively restructure their value systems in order to justify their present behaviour, thereby further strengthening the internalization of dysfunctional norms.

Pareek and Rao, 1992 have discussed eight important values relevant to institution building or culture profile of an organization. These are openness, confrontation, trust, authenticity, proaction, autonomy, collaboration, and experimentation. These are considered to be the eight steps to create a functional ethos in the organization.

3. Organizational Structure: Another factor, which appears to be related to internalization of dysfunctional norms, is organizational structure. It is generally expected that as an organization becomes more structured and complex it moves towards greater rigidity and inflexibility, thereby greater chances of having dysfunctional norms as those norms

would not change with changing times. Aiken and Hage define centralization as extent to which power is distributed among social positions (Hage and Aiken, 1967: Pg; 77). In each of their articles, they state that centralization has two sub constructs: the concentration of decisions referring to resource distribution or policy formulation and concentration of decisions referring to performance of tasks. They define formalization as ‘the use of rules in an organization’ which was considered to have two sub constructs: ‘job-codification’, the degree to which job descriptions are specified, and ‘rule observation, that is ‘the degree to which job occupants are supervised in conforming to the standards established in job-codification’ (Hage and Aiken, 1967:79). Later, Aiken and Hage (1968) add another sub construct, job specificity, which they define as the ‘degree to which procedures defining jobs are spelled out.’

In defining organizational technology, Hage and Aiken (1969) concentrate on perceived routineness, a construct that Perrow describe as referring both to the kind of ‘search procedures’ used, depending on the degree to which the task is understood, and the variability of the task (Perrow, 1967).

Much research has indicated the way in which emergent patterns of interaction are not prescribed by structural framework. The early critique of Weberian bureaucracy by Merton (1940), Selznick (1949), Crozier (1964), lucidly demonstrate the possibility of organizational members displacing goals, subverting roles, and amplifying rules. The works of Bittner (1965), Douglas (1971), and Zimmerman (1971) suggest that the ‘rational’ panoply of roles, rules, and procedures which make up organizational design is not pre given in the organization but is the skilled, practical, and retrospective accomplishment of members. The presence and the learning of dysfunctional norms could be supported by both the prescribed frameworks and the way those frameworks are realized in practice.

4. Leadership Integrity: Leadership also has a role in the socialization and internalization of norms; both functional and dysfunctional. Leadership theorists and researchers have found that integrity is a central trait of effective business leaders (Bass, 1990; Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991; Yukl and Van Fleet, 1992). In the literature on organizational behaviour and human resource management, scholars have paid considerable attention to the topic of integrity (Becker, 1998). In work on employee selection, researchers have examined integrity as a predictor of job performance and counterproductive behaviours (Ones, Viswesvaran, and Schmidt, 1993). At the same time, the interpersonal and group relationship theorists also have identified integrity as a central determinant of trust in organizations (Mayer, Davis and Schoorman, 1995). This integrity factor is also a factor that influences employees to accept dysfunctional norms.

The present work has made an attempt to study factors facilitating internalization of dysfunctional organizational

norms in one public sector and one private sector manufacturing organization. An attempt has been made to gain an insight into the behaviours prevalent in the organizations defined as organizational norms, which are dysfunctional. An attempt has also been made to understand how various factors such as cultural values, organizational structure, leaders’ values, and socialization strategies, influence the acceptance and internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms. Further the paper also attempts to understand whether the type of socialization strategy used in an organization mediates the influence of cultural values, leader’s values, and organizational structure on the internalization of dysfunctional norms.

METHOD

The objective of the study was to assess the factors influencing the internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms. The study used a correlational design to find out the factors that influence the acceptance of dysfunctional norms.

Tools of Data Collection: The following measures were used:

(a) Internalization of Dysfunctional Organizational Norms: To measure the criterion variable i.e. internalization of dysfunctional norms a scale was developed by the current researchers. Internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms was defined in terms of Pervasiveness and Intensity of acceptance of dysfunctional organizational norms. The scale consisted of forty items (i.e. 40 dysfunctional norms).

Internalization of dysfunctional norms was assessed in terms of two indices (or two sub measures). One was the ‘pervasiveness of the acceptance of dysfunctional norms’ (Pervasiveness). It was operationally defined in terms of the number of people perceived to be following dysfunctional norms. This measure was taken to assess how widely a particular dysfunctional norm was followed in the organization. For this a five point scale ranging from ‘majority of members’ to ‘very few members’ was used. A low score on this scale indicated high Pervasiveness and a high score indicates low Pervasiveness.

The Cronbach alpha co-efficient for pervasiveness was found to be 0.94.

The second sub-measure was the ‘intensity of acceptance of dysfunctional norms’ (Intensity). It was operationally defined in terms of how frequently the organizational members were perceived to be following the dysfunctional norms and behaviours. This measure was taken to assess how strongly a particular dysfunctional norm was guiding the behaviour of the employees of the organization. For this a five point scale ranging from ‘never’ to ‘many times’ was used. A low score on this scale indicates low intensity, and a high score indicates high intensity. Jointly these two sub

measures were expected to assess the degree of acceptance of a dysfunctional norm in an organization.

The alpha co-efficient for intensity sub-scale was found to be 0.95.

(b) Organizational culture: Organizational culture was measured with the help of a scale developed by Pareek and Rao (1992) known as OCTAPACE profile. This scale had 40 items that gave the profile of organization's ethos in terms of eight values. These values were openness, confrontation, trust, authenticity, proaction, autonomy, collaboration, and experimentation. The alpha co-efficient was found to be 0.83.

(c) Organizational Structure: Organizational structure was defined in terms of centralization of power and authority, formalization of rules and regulations, and variability in tasks i.e. task routineness. Organizational structure was measured by scales developed by Aiken and Hage (1967). Structure was measured with the help of three sub scales related to three broad dimensions-centralization, formalization, and task routineness. The alpha co-efficient was found to be 0.54 for these scales.

(d) Socialization tactics: Assessment of socialization tactics was done by using the scales developed by Jones (1986). The scales assessed six socialization tactics (each consisting of 5 items) i.e., collective and individual, formal and informal, sequential and random, fixed and variable, serial and disjunctive, and investiture, and divestiture. The alpha co-efficient for these scales, measuring the six sets of socializations tactics, was found to be 0.72. A 7 point rating scale ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree' was used.

(e) Leader Integrity: Leader integrity referred to here of the subordinates' perception of his/ her supervisor's behaviour as ethical or unethical. It was measured by using 'Perceived Leader Integrity Scale' (PLIS) developed by Craig and Gustafson (1998). The PLIS measured subordinates' perceptions of their leaders' integrity in organizational settings (Northouse, 2003). The alpha co-efficient for this scale was found to be 0.95.

Sample: A total of 307 employees were taken as sample from two manufacturing organizations, one from public sector and the second from private sector from the industrial zone of district Allahabad in Uttar Pradesh. The minimum number of years of service at the time of the study was two years. It was assumed that as the participants of the study had undergone the process of socialization in their respective organization they would be in a position to reflect upon the prevailing socialization practices. Non probability purposive sampling technique was used. The researchers ensured representation of different hierarchical levels.

RESULTS

The objective of this study was to assess the factors influencing internalization of dysfunctional norms in organizations. In order to do so, regression analyses was carried out, taking organizational culture, organizational structure, socialization strategies, and leader integrity as independent variables of internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms. Pervasiveness was the dependent variable, and the analyses shows that the cultural values in all explained 14.5 % of the variance ($R^2 = 14.5$) (Table I); and among the eight values, 'collaboration' was found to be significantly predicting pervasiveness.

Structural dimensions explained almost 18% variance ($R^2 = 17.9$) (Table 1); and among the various dimensions of structure, hierarchy of authority, rule observation, and job codification were found to be significantly predicting pervasiveness.

Socialization strategies were found to explain 15.0% variance in pervasiveness (Table 1). Among the six strategies, serial vs. disjunctive socialization strategy was found to be significantly predicting pervasiveness. Leader integrity explained 20.6% variance in pervasiveness and thus was found to be a significant predictor of pervasiveness.

Table 1: The predictors of Pervasiveness of internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms.

| Predictor Variables | R Square | beta | t |
|--|----------|------|----------|
| Culture | .14 | | |
| Collaboration | | -.30 | -4.21*** |
| Structure | .17 | | |
| Hierarchy of Authority | | .18 | 2.52** |
| Rule observation | | .12 | 2.21** |
| Job Codification | | .23 | 4.17*** |
| Socialization tactics | .15 | | |
| Serial vs. Disjunctive Socialization Tactics | | .30 | 4.93*** |
| Leader Integrity | .20 | -.45 | -8.89*** |

Note: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

The next analysis was carried out with intensity as the dependent variable. Cultural values explained 5.4% of variance; and among the eight values, confrontation, openness and authenticity were found to be significant predictors of Intensity.

Structural dimensions were found to explain 5.3% of variance; and among the various dimensions of structure, 'job codification' was found to be a significant predictor of intensity.

Socialization strategies was found to explain 8.5% of variance; and among the six strategies, serial vs. disjunctive socialization strategies were found to be a significant predictor of Intensity. Leader integrity was found to explain 7.1% of variance; and it was also found to be a significant predictor of Intensity (Table 2).

Table 2: The predictors of Intensity of internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms

| Predictor Variables | R Square | beta | t |
|--|----------|------|----------|
| Culture | .05 | | |
| Confrontation | | .21 | 2.33** |
| Openness | | -.16 | -1.95* |
| Authenticity | | -.14 | -2.34** |
| Structure | .05 | | |
| Job Codification | | -.19 | -3.24*** |
| Socialization tactics | .08 | | |
| Serial vs. Disjunctive Socialization Tactics | | -.24 | -3.83*** |
| Leader Integrity | .07 | .27 | 4.84*** |

Note: * p< 0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001

In the next phase of analyses the dimensions of all the determinants which were found to be significantly predicting internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms were taken up in separate regression analyses, and subjected to regression equation, to predict the internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms along its two dimensions i.e. pervasiveness of acceptance of dysfunctional organizational norms (Pervasiveness), and intensity of acceptance of dysfunctional organizational norms (Intensity).

Table 3 shows the stepwise regression for the outcome variable Pervasiveness. The dimensions of the predictor variables, which were found to be significantly predicting the criterion variable, were included in the regression equation viz., collaboration, hierarchy of authority, job codification, rule observation, leader integrity, and serial vs. disjunctive

socialization strategies. Five variables have been found to be significantly predicting Pervasiveness. Rule observation was excluded i.e. it was not found to be significantly predicting pervasiveness. 36 percent of variation in criterion variable i.e. Pervasiveness was predicted or accounted for by these five predictors. Out of these five predictors, perceived leader integrity (PLI) accounted for maximum variation in Pervasiveness (20%).

Table 4 shows the stepwise regression for the outcome variable Intensity. The dimensions of the predictor variables, which were found to be significantly predicting the criterion variable intensity, were included in the regression equation. Sixteen percent of variation in Intensity was predicted by the four variables, which were found to be significant predictors. Authenticity and openness were excluded. Out of the four predictors, serial vs. disjunctive socialization tactics accounted for maximum variation in Intensity i.e. eight percent. The negative relationship of ‘serial vs. disjunctive socialization tactics’ with ‘Intensity’ indicates that when serial tactics were used less in the organizations (i.e. the role of seniors and mentors as socialization agents was less) the intensity or the frequency with which the individuals followed dysfunctional norms increased.

An effort was made to understand the role of socialization strategies as a mediator between predictor variables (i.e. leader integrity, collaboration, job codification, hierarchy of authority, and confrontation) and outcome variable pervasiveness and intensity. Mediation analysis was performed using the assumptions (Baron and Kenny, 1986) that independent variables had its effect on dependent and mediating variables and further mediating variables affects the dependent variables when the dependent variables are included in the equation. If socialization strategy have a mediating effect, a significant relationship between the predictors and dependent variables (pervasiveness and intensity) should disappear or be reduced when socialization strategy is added to the model. This was found to be true (Table 5).

Table 3: The predictors of Pervasiveness of internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms

| Predictor Variables | R Square | Adjusted R Square | R Square Change | F Change | beta | t |
|--|----------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|------|----------|
| Leader Integrity | .21 | .20 | .21 | 79.02*** | -.45 | -8.89*** |
| Collaboration | .28 | .27 | .07 | 29.94*** | -.27 | -5.47*** |
| Job Codification | .32 | .31 | .04 | 19.80*** | .21 | 4.45*** |
| Hierarchy of Authority | .34 | .33 | .02 | 9.79** | .15 | 3.13** |
| Serial vs. Disjunctive Socialization Tactics | .36 | .35 | .02 | 9.68** | .16 | 3.11** |

Note: * p< 0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001

Table 4: The predictors of Intensity of internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms

| Predictor Variables | R Square | Adjusted R Square | R Square Change | F Change | beta | t |
|--|----------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|------|----------|
| Serial vs. Disjunctive Socialization Tactics | .08 | .07 | .08 | 25.69*** | -.28 | -5.07*** |
| Leader Integrity | .11 | .11 | .03 | 11.77** | .20 | 3.43** |
| Job Codification | .14 | .13 | .03 | 9.23** | -.16 | -3.04** |
| Confrontation | .16 | .15 | .03 | 9.82** | .17 | 3.13** |

Note: * p< 0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001

Table 5: Mediation analysis

| Predictor Variables | Mediator Variable (Socialization Tactics) | Pervasiveness | Mediator Variable (Socialization Tactics) | Intensity |
|------------------------|---|--------------------|---|--------------------|
| Leader Integrity | -0.21** | -0.45** -0.41** | 0.21** | 0.27** 0.23** |
| Collaboration | -0.36** | -0.36** -0.30** | | |
| Job Codification | 0.11* | 0.29** 0.26** | 0.11** | -0.27** -0.19** |
| Hierarchy of Authority | 0.14* | 0.32** 0.29** | | |
| Confrontation | | | -0.34** | 0.14** 0.08 |

Among the six socialization strategies specifically the mediating role of serial vs. disjunctive socialization strategy was also assessed as it was found to be a significant predictor of both pervasiveness and intensity (Table 3 and 4). In accordance with the assumptions stated above if serial vs. disjunctive socialization strategy have a mediating effect, a significant relationship between the predictors and dependent variables (pervasiveness and intensity) should disappear or be reduced when serial vs. disjunctive socialization strategy is added to the model. This was found to be true for leader integrity, collaboration, and confrontation but not for job codification, and hierarchy of authority. This analysis is shown in Table 6.

DISCUSSION

Research has indicated that when employees enter an organization, they begin to conform to the organization’s values. During the process of socialization, employees observe cues regarding what is acceptable behaviour, and they adapt accordingly. Employees who plan to remain with the company usually conform and demonstrate acceptance of how things are done (Louis, 1980); Van Maanen and Schein, 1979). On the other hand it has also been found that navigating in organizational life requires often members to employ tactics beyond simply performing an honest

day’s work (Hewlin, 2003). In an article in the *Los Angeles Times*, Oldham (1998:20) advises organizational employees to “get ready to rumble” and emphasizes the importance of developing tactics for survival and success within the political warfare of work organizations.

Regression analyses were carried out in order to find the significant predictors of internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms. Pervasiveness had five significant predictors, which together explained 36 percent variation along this dimension, in the internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms. Perceived leadership integrity was revealed as the strongest predictor of pervasiveness, followed by strong growth as is evidenced by the existence of values like collaboration, formalization in terms of job codification, centralization in terms of hierarchy of authority, and serial vs. disjunctive socialization tactics.

As stated, one of the findings was that low levels of perceived leader integrity enhanced the internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms. Leaders play an important role as role models and as socializing agents. Integrity of the leaders is important for their viability as role models and for their effectiveness. It may be concluded that in order for the dysfunctional norms to be less followed in the organization, the leaders have to reflect high integrity in their work and behaviour. Thus organizations low on

Table 6: Mediation analysis

| Predictor Variables | Mediator Variable (Serial vs. Disjunctive Socialization Tactics) | Pervasiveness | Mediator Variable (Serial vs. Disjunctive Socialization Tactics) | Intensity |
|------------------------|--|--------------------|--|--------------------|
| Leader Integrity | -0.33** | -0.45** -0.37** | -0.33** | 0.27** 0.20** |
| Collaboration | -0.40** | -0.36** -0.26** | | |
| Job Codification | 0.10 | 0.29** 0.25** | 0.10 | -0.21** -0.18** |
| Hierarchy of Authority | 0.07 | 0.32** 0.30** | | |
| Confrontation | | | -0.37** | 0.14** 0.05 |

this aspect i.e. leadership integrity will have to work on it and improve it, as the role of perceived leadership integrity was revealed as the strongest factor influencing how widely the dysfunctional norms are accepted in the organization. Chen, Chen, and Xin, 2004 concluded on the basis of their research – the utility of expanding procedural neutrality in terms of unbiased procedures and policies to neutrality – as both reflected managerial integrity and trustworthiness, which were found to be a significant factor influencing internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms.

The existence of the value of collaboration came out to be the second most important factor influencing how widely the dysfunctional norms are accepted in the organization. Collaboration means how far the organizations members are able to work together as a team. Weakness on this value in organizations may get reflected in issues like intergroup conflicts, and problems in interdepartmental coordination. Collaboration and trust go hand in hand – Bradach and Eccles, (1989) stated, trust has a powerful, “self fulfilling quality: the existence of trust gives one reason to trust (for both social and transactional cost reasons), just as distrust begets distrust”. Prior research suggests that trust facilitates social and resource exchange, increases communication, and enhances cooperation between individuals (Tsai and Ghoshal, 1998).

Job codification was the third predictor of pervasiveness. Job codification had a positive correlation with pervasiveness i.e. the more defined were the job descriptions, greater was the pervasiveness, probably because it lead to a reduction in flexibility in task performance. Macaulay’s (1963) classic study depicts how rational controls diminished decision making flexibility. Extensive formalization indicates a lack of trust and blunts the value of social ties, “turning a cooperative venture into an antagonistic horse trade” (Macaulay, 1963).

It was found that the more centralized was the authority structure, higher was the pervasiveness of internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms. In order to counter these dysfunctional behaviours findings from research have suggested that attending interdepartmental events may enable disparate areas of the organization to share myths, stories, and metaphors (Gruenfeld and Fan, 1999). Shared narratives are a key element of cognitive social capital (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998), and hence, such exchanges should ultimately facilitate the development of shared language and understanding among employees. Further it was found that with greater use of institutionalized socialization practices in the organization, the pervasiveness of the acceptance of dysfunctional norms decreased. The strength of this relationship was strongest for serial socialization tactics i.e., influence of the ‘mentors’ or ‘role models’ as the socializing agents was important for the acceptance or rejection of dysfunctional practices.

Intensity was significantly predicted by four variables which together explained about 16 percent of variation along this dimension of internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms. The strongest predictor was serial vs. disjunctive socialization tactics (institutionalized tactics), perceived leadership integrity, job codification, and value of confrontation. Serial vs. disjunctive socialization tactics was also a highly significant predictor of Intensity. Serial vs. disjunctive socialization tactics had a negative correlation with Intensity, i.e. an individual appear to more frequently engage in dysfunctional practices, if he was subjected to individualized (in particular disjunctive) socialization tactics in the organization. Greater use of serial (institutional) socialization strategies led to lower levels of internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms (both in terms of pervasiveness and intensity). The more positive experiences the receivers of the socialization processes have- in terms of encouragement, help, support and guidance by the

experienced organizational employees- lower was the possibility of the receivers or the targets of the socialization processes, engaging in dysfunctional practices. This effect was enhanced when the perceived integrity of the socializing agents (i.e. leaders/ seniors) was high.

Intensity or the frequency of people engaging in dysfunctional norms was also high when individualized tactics were used in the organization. This dimension of internalization of norms was also influenced relatively more by the social and interpersonal aspects of the socialization process than by the content aspects.

It was further found that socialization tactics mediated the effect of cultural values, organizational structure and leader integrity on internalization of dysfunctional norms. The relationships of collaboration, job codification, hierarchy of authority, and leader integrity with internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms were found to be mediated by the nature of the socialization strategies used in the organization i.e. higher was the collaboration valued in the organization and more was the leader integrity, and lower was the job codification and hierarchy of authority- this led to greater use of institutional socialization strategies, thereby leading to lower levels of internalization of dysfunctional organizational norms. Also if leader was perceived as having integrity and institutionalized tactics were used in the organization then lower was the internalization of dysfunctional norms.

Certain implications can be drawn from these conclusions. The ratio and strength of functional to dysfunctional norms in an organization could be so maintained that the proportion of dysfunctional norms is lower and weaker in strength. For this the integrity levels should be high, especially of the leaders and senior level people. Collaboration among the members of the organization should be increased and interpersonal and task related problems and issues should be confronted and worked upon precisely and effectively. Another step needed is to reduce hierarchy-wise centralization of power and also reduce the degree or level of job descriptions. This implies that the organization should be designed in a manner such that the negative impact of informal structure is minimized-which could be a facilitator of acceptance of dysfunctional norms in organizations. Institutionalized socialization tactics should be used more, especially the formal use of mentors and role models as socializing agents is crucial. In order to reduce the hold of dysfunctional norms in organizations, the social capital of the organizations has to be increased along three dimensions – structural, relational, and cognitive dimensions (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998). Thus the study identifies the typical factors related to internalization of dysfunctional norms.

REFERENCES

- Aiken, M., & Hage J. (1968). Organizational interdependence and intra - organizational structure. *American Sociological Review*, 33, 912 - 930.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.) New York: Free Press.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182
- Becker, T. E. (1998). Integrity in organizations: Beyond honesty and conscientiousness. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(1), 154 - 161.
- Bittner, E. (1965). The concept of organization. *Social Research*, 32, 239 - 255.
- Bradach, J. L., & Eccles, R. G. (1989). Markets versus hierarchies: from ideal types to plural forms. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15, 97-118
- Campoux, J. E. (2000). *Organizational Behaviour : Essential Tenets for a New Millinium*, Boston : South - Western College Publishing.
- Chatman, J. A., & Cha, S. E. (2003). Leading by leveraging culture. *California Management Review*, 45(4), 20 - 34.
- Chen, C. C., Chen, Y. R., & Xin, K. (2004). Guanxi practices and trust in management: A procedural justice perspective. *Organization Science*, 15(2), 200-209.
- Crozier, M. (1964). *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press.
- Douglas, Jack D., Ed. (1971) *Understanding Everyday life*. London. Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Falcione, R. L., Wilson, C. E. (1988). Socialization processes in organizations. In Gerald M. Goldhaber, & George A. Barnett (eds.) *Handbook of Organizational Communication*. Ablex Publishing.
- Gino, F., Ayal, S., & Ariely, D. (2009). Contagion and differentiation in unethical behavior. The effect of one bad apple on the barrel. *Psychological Science*, 20(3), 393-398.
- Gruenfeld, D. H., & Fan, E. T. (1999). What newcomers see and what old timers say: Discontinuities in knowledge exchange. In L.L. Thompson, J.M. Levine, & D.M. Messick (Eds.). *Shared Cognition in Organizations*. 245-265. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hage, J., & Aiken, M. (1967). Relationship of centralization to other structural properties. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 12, 72 - 92.
- Hage, J., & Aiken, M. (1969). Routine technology, social structure, and organizational goals. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 14, 366 - 376.

- Hewlin, P. F. (2003). And the award for the best actor goes to...Facades of conformity in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 28, 633-642.
- Jones, G. R. (1983). Psychological orientation and the process of organizational socialization: An interactionist perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 464-474.
- Jones, G. R. (1986). Socialization tactics, self efficacy and newcomers adjustment to the organization *Academy of Management Journal*, 29(2), 262 - 179.
- Kahn, R. L, Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rasonthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational Stress*. New York : Wiley.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A. & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do trails matter? *Academy of Management Executive*, 5, 48 - 60.
- Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sensemaking: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 226-251.
- Macaulay, S. (1963). Non - Contractual relations in business: A preliminary study. *American Sociological Review*, 28, 55 - 67.
- Mayer, R. C. Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. K. 1995. An interactive model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 409 -734.
- Merton, R. K. (1940). Bureaucratic structure and personality. *Social Forces*, 17, 560 - 568.
- Miller, B. (1990). *The Icarus Paradox*. New York: Harper Business.
- Nahaphiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 242-266.
- Northouse, P. G. (2003). *Leadership : Theory and practice* (3rd Ed.) New Delhi : Sage.
- Oldham, J. (1998). In the office politics game, look out, listen in and join up. Newbies: Get ready to rumble. Los Angeles Times.
- Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran, C., & Schmidt, F. L. (1993). Comprehensive meta - analysis of integrity test validities: Findings and implications for personnel selection and theories of Job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 18, 679 - 703.
- Pareek, U., & Rao, T. V. (1992). *Designing and managing human resource systems* (2nd Ed.). New Delhi : Oxford & IBM.
- Perrow, C. (1967). A framework for the comparative analysis of organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 32, 194 - 208
- Roethlisberger, F. J., Dickson, W. J., & Wright, H. A. (1939). *Management and the Worker: An Account of a Research Program Conducted by the Western Electric Company*, Hawthorne Works, Chicago (Cambridge: MA, Harvard University Press).
- Selznick, P. (1949). *TVA and the grassroots*. Berkeley, C. A.: University of California Press.
- Starbuck, W. H., Greve, A., & Hedberg, B. L. T. (1978). Responding to crisis. *Journal of Business Administration*, 9, 121 - 37.
- Trice, H. M. (1985). Rites and ceremonials in organizational cultures. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 4, 221 - 70.
- Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1993). *The cultures of work organizations* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Tsai, W., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital and value creation: The role of intrafirm networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 765-802.
- Van Maanen, J. (1978). People processing: Strategies of organizational socialization. *Organizational Dynamics*, 7, 18-36.
- Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Towards a theory or organizational socialization. In B. M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in organizational behaviour*, 1, 209 - 264. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Watson, G.W., Teague, B.T., & Papamarcos, S.D. (2004). Understanding values in Organization. A value dynamics perspective. *Journal of Human values*, 10(1), 23 - 39.
- Yukl, G. A., & Van Flect, D. D. 1992. Theory and research on leadership in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd. Ed.) 3, 147 - 197. Palo Alto, CA : Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Zimmerman, Don (1971). The Practicalities of rule use. In Jack Douglas (ed.). *Understanding Everyday Life*, 221-238. London : Routledge and Kegan Paul.