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Abstract

The present study was conducted to identify the relationship between the facets of organizational culture and in-role job performance among the private sector bank employees of Islamabad and Rawalpindi. The sample was taken from different private banks of Rawalpindi and Islamabad, thus including 133 male and 67 female employees. The age of respondents ranged from 20 to 60 years. In order to measure organizational culture Organizational Culture Index (OCI) was employed. It was developed by Wallach in 1983. In-Role Job Performance was measured by using the scale developed by William and Anderson (1991). Our show that bureaucratic organizational culture has a significant positive impact an in-role job performance of the employees and innovative culture is also positively related while supportive culture has a non significant impact on in-role job performance.
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Introduction

Organizational culture influence employee performance in different ways. Such as employees who feel themselves as an important part of corporate culture, work harder for the attainment of organizational goals. An organization contains different cultures that can influence employee performance. For example, if the norm of the culture is “talk when necessary”, the employees will follow it; however, in certain areas of organization it is difficult to follow such as, the sales team, as it needs to be outspoken and socially active, the organization may experience rivalries among these areas. Therefore, it is important for an organization to allow its areas to develop their own norms according to the nature of work, it will affect performance of the employees deployed elsewhere in the company.

Organizational culture plays an important role in achieving the planned goals of an organization. Behavior and attitudes of the employees can be modified by changing the organizational values, customs and rules in order to improve the performance (Rosenthal & Masarech, 2003).

The key instrument for organizations to gain competitive advantage and enhance performance is the culture of an organization. To survive in the dynamic environment, organizations have to depend on the innovations to attain or sometimes maintain their performance. The vast literatures including the empirical studies have showed that a well established culture in an organization will strengthen their performance. This argument was supported by the study which concludes that a well established culture would lead to higher levels of performance as compared to a weak culture (Gordon & DiTomaso, 1992). Indeed, Kotter and Heskett (1992) in their study also conclude similar results about culture.
Innovation in the culture is based on the shared views and values, in these members of an organization perceive themselves as a part of it and also there is a mutual benefit and improvement of the organization and individual as well. Nemeth (1997) in his study concludes that innovative work culture strengthens certain work related behaviors such as rules about attitudes and appropriate behaviors cohesion, loyalty. As this culture encourages the autonomy to work in teams and managers supports the novelty in projects by recognition or reward, it also builds strong relationship of trust, sincerity, and consideration with all the departments of the firm (Shirivastava & Souder, 1987). This culture is not taken as rigid instead it facilitates introducing new things at workplace while decreasing the resistance in organization to change. To encourage innovation in the context of culture, leadership and management styles plays an important role (Ven, 1986). Contrary to this, cultures that do not foster innovation is individualistic in nature. In these organizations employees work on their individual goals, thus the contemplation of a unit would be lost. Working in a non innovative culture one cannot evaluate the consequence of their individual actions on the rest of the organization. As a non innovative organization does not foster the initiative to try new action so, employees have to wait for the authority to tell them what to do, they stresses and values constancy (even opposing the changes) and take pride for their successes happened in the past.

According to Kandula (2006), a strong culture is the key to high-quality performance. Furthermore, he explained culture as a unique feature of an organization and it varies across organizations and in the same organization as well, for example a single strategy would not work for all. Magee (2002) concludes that it is essential to consider the importance of organizational culture, because certain practices such as performance management could be counterproductive, as the two concepts are interdependent, changing one will influence the other. It is evident that a strong or positive culture is capable of making an average individual work brilliant whereas an outstanding employee
can underperform due to the de motivating factors of a weak culture, which leads to no achievement. Therefore the culture of an organization plays a direct and active role in performance management.

Recent research on organizational culture and performance was done by Ogbonna and Harris (2000) they analyzed the relationship between the two while considering the leadership style. Performance was measured in different aspects and Facets of culture were measured. They concluded that all the dimensions of cultures are associated with performance. Specifically the innovative and competitive cultures directly affect performance whereas performance has no direct relation with bureaucratic and community cultures.

The study was replicated in 2002, in which cultural orientation was analyzed by authors, performance while considering the role of strategic human resource management. Similar measurements were used that yields the consistent results with the previous study.

Competitive advantage that can be gained from the organizational culture to the perceived role of performance (Scholz, 1987). Krefting and Frost (1985) suggested that the culture of an organization can be helpful in creating competitive advantage by defining the boundaries of competitive advantage. These boundaries can facilitates interaction among individuals and it can limit information processing to certain levels. Correspondingly, it is argued that a management can predict the employee reactions by shared values, which will help them to minimize the undesirable consequences (Ogbonna, 1993). Researchers also argued the criteria of organizational competencies that can be both superior and imperfectly imitable by competitors’ leads to the sustainable competitive advantage (Reed & DeFillippi, 1990). Johnson, 1992 argued that the quality of uniqueness makes an organization more powerful by generating competitive advantage. Rather focusing on the tangible aspect of organizations,
Gordon and DiTomaso (1992) and Denison (1990), studied the relation of organizational culture and performance. They concluded that the success of organizations depends on the adaptable nature of work i.e. the dynamic environmental conditions. Furthermore, the unique qualities of the culture cannot be imitated, so the culture must not only be strong but contains the element of uniqueness.

In 1990, Odom, Boxx and Dunn studies different facets of organizational culture in relation to other work related variables. They found that there is no significant relation between the bureaucratic nature of work environment employee’s commitment and satisfaction. It was also found that the innovative culture enhances the attitudes and behaviors of employees towards their organization. Furthermore, supportive culture leads to the higher levels of commitment and satisfaction in employee’s performance.

There is a rich and diverse literature on the organizational culture as well as on its facets. It is due to the importance of the relation between culture and performance. There are some theorist or researchers who question the relation of these two variables, but a vast and sufficient evidence suggests that culture of an organization is associated with the in-role job performance (Ogbonna & Harris, 2000).

Pakistan being a developing country faces many challenges and little work has been done on the types of culture influencing the employee performance. Therefore there is a need to understand different organizational cultures that are bureaucratic, supportive and innovative and their influence on the in-role job performance of the private sector bank employees, in order to enhance the effectiveness and successful working of organization. This study examines the culture of different organizations in Pakistan and how their existing culture is affecting the in-role job performance of the private sector.
bank employees which will in turn enhance the organization’s effectiveness. Study provides the comparison of different cultures that exists in the Pakistani organizations. It would provide a better insight for the implication that which culture leads to the effectiveness of the organization by improving the in-role job performance of bank employees.

Therefore, the objectives of the study was to study the relationship between bureaucratic was to supportive culture, innovative culture and in-role job performance. To attain the above mentioned objectives, the following hypothesis phrased was

1. H1: there is a negative relationship between bureaucratic culture and in-role job performance.

2. H2: there is a positive relationship between innovative culture and in-role job performance.

3. H3: there is a positive relationship between supportive culture and in-role job performance.

Method

Sample

A sample of 200 employees of private sector banks participated in the research. Private sector bank from Islamabad and Rawalpindi were visited. The visited banks included Allied bank, Askari bank, bank Alfalah, Habib bank, United bank, Fasyal bank, Meezan bank, Dubai Islamic, bank Al Islami, KASB, Standard chartered bank, NIB, HSBC, Soneri bank. The sample comprised of 67 females and 133 male respondents. Demographic variables in the study were age, gender, education, experience and income. The participants of the study were full-time, working adults. Age ranged from 20 years to the maximum age limit of 60. The base line of experience was considered as for the employees having completed their probation period. Additional information included the name of
bank and the department in which the employees were working presently. Following table summarizes the demographic information of the sample population.

**Instruments**

To collect information for the present study the following instruments were used.

**Wallach (1983) Organizational Culture Index (OCI).** Wallach (1983) Organizational Culture Index survey was used in the study to measure dimensions of organizational culture. The three dimensions of culture are described in Wallach’s (1983) organizational culture index (OCI), these are bureaucratic organizational culture, innovative organizational culture and supportive organizational culture. It is a 24 item instrument, each of the three dimensions of organizational culture are assigned with eight items. The rating is accomplished on a four-point scale ranging from does not describe my organization (0) to describe my organization most of the time (3). The alpha coefficient reliability of organizational culture index was 0.82 Yahyagil, M. Y . (2004). The alpha coefficient reliability for the subscales was found to be 0.86 for bureaucratic scale, 0.70 for innovative scale and 0.97 for supportive scale (Chen 2004).

**In-Role Job Performance Scale.** Williams and Anderson’s (1991) 7-item measure of in-role performance was used in the study. It was a 7 item questionnaire, sample items include “Adequately completes assigned duties”, and “Meets formal performance requirements of the job”. Responses of each statement were obtained on a seven-point scale where a value of one corresponded to “Strongly Disagree” and a value of 7 corresponded to “Strongly Agree”. The scores obtained on each of the five items were averaged to produce a summary score reflecting in-role performance. The coefficient al-pha
reliability estimate for this scale 0.85 indicates high internal Consistency (Burney, Henle & Widener, 2006).

Procedure

Employees of the Private sector banks from Islamabad and Rawalpindi were contacted on behalf of National Institute of Psychology. Employees were briefed about the rationale and objectives of the study and questionnaires were provided. Oral as well as written instructions were given to the participants regarding their demographics and work history before filling the study questionnaire. They were assured that the information provided by them shall be used for research purpose only. Study data was collected by the consent of bank management and also with the consent of employee willingness to participate in the study.

Results

The data was subjected to statistical analysis to meet the study objectives. The objective were to study the link between the cultural dimensions of organization with the in-role job performance and also the relation of demographic (age, gender, education) variables with the study variables. The Alpha Reliability Coefficient of was computed (Table 2). The Bivariate correlation Analysis was performed to examine the relationship between the bureaucratic, innovative, supportive and in-role job performance. Linear Regression Analysis was performed to predict the relation between organizational culture and innovative culture with the in-role job performance.

Table 1 shows the demographic description of sample. The highest frequency of various demographic variables was as follows, 83-12 years in age, 88-12 in work experience, 81.5-7.5 in educational levels and 50.5-2.0 in income.
Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages of Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MBA</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS/MPhil</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 35 yrs</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 35 yrs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 10 yrs</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 10 yrs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15000-35000</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35000-55000</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55000-75000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75000-95000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 100,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Alpha Reliability Coefficient of all the Study Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>Alpha coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic culture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative culture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive culture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-role job performance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of scales of the all study variables. The reliability coefficients have been determined by computing Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the organizational culture and its subscales i.e. bureaucratic culture, innovative culture, supportive culture, and the in-role job performance scale. For the organizational culture the reliability ranged from .69 to .87. The alpha reliability coefficient determined for bureaucratic culture, innovative culture and supportive culture is .75, .74 and .69 respectively. The Cronbach Alpha obtained for this study were found relative to the references studies. For the in-role job performance scale reliability coefficient is .65. The alpha coefficient of item no. 5 of the in-role job performance scale was relatively low in common culture. When the item was deleted, the Cronbach á would increase. The alpha reliability coefficient indicated that all the scales are internally consistent and reliable measures of the study.

Table 3

Inter scale correlation among all the study variables (N=200)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic culture</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative culture</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive culture</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-role job performance</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that the Inter scale correlation coefficient determined for in-role job performance with the organizational culture and its dimensions i.e. bureaucratic culture, innovative culture and supportive culture scale. According to the Inter scale correlation here is a significant relation between organizational culture and in-role job performance at p < .05. Correlation with the dimensions like bureaucratic culture, innovative culture with the in-role job
performance is significant at p > .05 and p > .01 while there is no significant relation between supportive cultural dimension and in-role job performance.

Table 4

Linear Regression analysis for predicting the relationship between innovative culture and in-role job performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>95 % CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative culture</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>6.43*</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R=1.77, R²=.031, p< .05
Adjusted R²=.027

The above table shows innovative culture is predicting the in-role job performance of the employees. It shows that innovative culture has a significant impact on the in-role job performance of the employees. The predictor variable innovative culture (β= 1.77) has a very significant positive effect on the outcome variable in-role job performance with a significance level p < .05.

Table 5

Linear Regression analysis for predicting the relationship between Bureaucratic culture and in-role job performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>95 % CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic culture</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>15.5*</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5 shows bureaucratic culture is predicting the in-role job performance of the employees. It shows that bureaucratic culture has a significant impact on the in-role job performance of the employees. The predictor variable bureaucratic culture ($\beta = .27$) with the F value of 15.5 which means that it 15% effect on the outcome variable in-role job performance with a significance level $p < .05$.

**Table 6**

*Comparison of Gender difference among Bureaucratic culture, Innovative culture, Supportive culture and In-role job performance of the private sector bank employees (N=200)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Men ($n=133$)</th>
<th>Women ($n=67$)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Cohen's d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>24.3 (4.12)</td>
<td>24.6 (3.85)</td>
<td>.34 .73</td>
<td>-.99 1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>19.7 (3.47)</td>
<td>19.9 (3.54)</td>
<td>.31 .75</td>
<td>-.87 1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>22.7 (4.80)</td>
<td>23.4 (4.01)</td>
<td>.91 .35</td>
<td>-.72 1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJP</td>
<td>43.0 (4.00)</td>
<td>44.1 (4.14)</td>
<td>1.77 .08</td>
<td>-.12 2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** BC= Bureaucratic organizational Culture, IC= Innovative Organizational Culture, SC= Supportive Organizational Culture, IJP= In-role Job Performance.

Table 6 shows non-significant differences between male and female bank employees on bureaucratic culture, innovative culture, supportive culture and in-role job performance. It suggests non-significant mean differences among male and female private bank employees.

**Discussion**

In the present study, it was assumed that bureaucratic culture is negatively related to the in-role job performance, while innovative and supportive culture is positively related to the in-role job performance. Bivariate Correlation analysis of the study showed that bureaucratic and innovative culture is positively related to the in-role job performance. And there is no significant correlation between
supportive and in-role job performance among the private sector bank employees.

The relationship between bureaucratic cultures with the in-role job performance of the employees (hypothesis I) was not supported by the data. Study proposed the negative relationship between the two variables but the data had showed the significant positive relationship between bureaucratic culture and in-role job performance, thus rejecting the H1 i.e. there is a negative relationship between bureaucratic organizational culture and in-role job performance. These findings are consistent with the Weber’s Theory of Bureaucracy. According to him, bureaucracy is an ideal organization; in fact the pure form of organization. Weber sought to define bureaucracy as one that would be perfectly rational and would provide maximum efficiency of operation (Weber, 1990).

According to Weber (1990), bureaucratic organizations have a rational authority, as its leaders recognize and obey in the subscription of logical reasons, values and efficiency. The functioning of these organizations is based on the legitimate laws in their rules and regulations. The legitimacy of these laws, rules and regulations were derived by the consistent, disciplined, rationalized and methodical calculation of optimal means to given ends. Weber (1990) posited that the bureaucratic act orient an organization towards problem solving and also guide the decision making procedure to the objective of efficiency, predictability and calculability. Therefore, more rational decisions were made due to the impersonality to the emotional aspect and rationality that can’t be possible with the regard to person i.e. more immune to the personal irrational and emotional aspect (Jain, 2004).

According to Weber (1990), the aspiration or reason of bureaucracies was to enhance effectiveness. He posited that bureaucracies were strictly proficient instruments of administration for the reason that their institutionalized set of laws and policy which
enables employees to learn performing their duties optimally (Jain, 2004).

There is a need to understand how managerial hierarchy relates to the complication of work and how we can utilize it to accomplish an effective employment of aptitude and energy. According to 1992, Jaques, bureaucracy is the best structure for getting work done in large organizations. In short, what we need is not some new forms of organization, but rather managerial hierarchy that understands its own nature and purpose (Jaques, 1992). In addition, one of the most fundamental advantages of managerial hierarchy is that it provides a way of achieving coordination among those sub-units that must work together. The managerial hierarchy is not only a mechanism for directing the activities of individual sub-units but also a means for achieving the coordination required within the function (Lorsch, 1992).

From an economic point of view, it can be argued that bureaucracy which provides the mechanism with which to facilitate the standardization of work structure and processes exist because market fail. Based on microeconomic theory, hierarchies will then become more efficient and replace markets by allocating resources through rules and authority relationships. Under high uncertainty, hierarchies arise because they reduce costs by establishing rules and coordination positions that are not found in markets (Robbins, 1990). There is no doubt that this distinction between markets and hierarchies could provide an explanation for the existence of bureaucracies. This approach to the organizational structure has been very popular as it showed efficiency in performing certain tasks and also it has the ability to reinforce and sustain particular patterns of power and control. The increasing rate in the fluctuation of society and the changes occur due to any reason can pose many problems for bureaucratic organizational designs.
In 1991, Hofstede's 5D model of organizational culture explored the Pakistani culture. From his findings, a good overview about the deep drivers of organizational culture of Pakistan and their relevance to other cultures in the world. Results showed the dominant score on the power distance culture which indicates that Pakistan's society is hierarchical. This shows that hierarchical structure is accepted by the society. Hierarchy is reflected by the centralized structure, inherent inequalities, set of reporting lines, and the concept of an ideal boss is a benevolent autocrat.

The study of Hofstede, (1991) also shows the low score of Pakistan on the individualistic culture, indicating that Pakistan is a collectivist society. As in a collectivist culture close long term commitment to the group members is apparent, this group can be family, friends or any other relation that individual consider as the in-group. In these societies offence can lead to disgrace and the relationship of employer and employee are perceived in morals terms, the perception of in-group can be seen different procedures like hiring, promotions, and decision making.

By taking the Hofstede (1991) perspective result of the H1 can be justified that Pakistan has a collectivist culture, which prefers hierarchical structures in organization, strong leaders and a high regard for authority that can enhance their in-role job performance. In collectivist society loyalty is a paramount that over-rides most other rules and regulations of the society. These societies foster strong associations among the members, by which each member takes responsibility for their fellow members of their group. People in collectivist culture like to work under specific rules that can improve their performance. So the study data supports the view that in-role job performance that is particularly the tasks assigned for the job is positively related to the bureaucratic organizational culture as it provides certain rules and hierarchies in order to do a job.
According to H2, the innovative organizational culture is positively related to the in-role job performance. It was supported by the data as the Results indicated significant relation between the two variables. The correlation analysis showed the value of .16 at p < .05. Linear Regression analysis was applied to assess the contribution of innovative organizational culture as a predictor of in-role job performance. It showed significant prediction with \( \beta = 1.77 \) the F change is 6.43 respectively at p < .05. Therefore H2 is accepted. These results are consistent with the findings of previous researches on innovation culture by Kumar et al. 2013, Nemeth (1997), Shirivastava and Souder, (1987), and Ven, 1986, who considers that innovative culture, strengthens the in-role job performance.

According to H3, supportive culture was posited to have a significant relation with in-role job performance. Analysis showed no significant relation between supportive culture and in-role job performance. These findings are contrary to the reviewed literature regarding the association between supportive culture and in-role job performance. For instance, Harrison (1993) suggests that supportive culture is related to the in-role job performance and that the employees of such organizations have a sense of belonging, they feel that they can contribute to the success of the organization and that their decisions are important and appreciated (Harrison 1993). But this was not observed in this study.

However, these findings are consistent with the research by Leskaj, Lipi and Ramaj (2013) on the features of organizational culture and their impact on performance. In which Dension model of OC was used and results indicates no significant relation between involvement culture type and performance. It is already discussed in the introduction that involvement culture of Denison model and supportive culture of Wallach model have similar values.

Results of the study show no difference on the basis of gender, age, education and experience. This suggests that these
demographic variables apparently did not affect the relationship of private sector bank employees with their organizations. Similar findings have been observed in the previous research on bank employees that have no significant difference Maria, (2005), Bukhari, (2008) and Sattar, (2013).

Conclusion

The research analyzes the relationship between the facets of organizational culture and in-role job performance, using a sample of 200 from the private sector bank employees of Islamabad and Rawalpindi. In order to measure the facets of organizational culture, Wallach 1984 conceptualizations were used that explains three dimensions of culture i.e. bureaucratic, innovative and supportive culture in organizational Culture Index was used.

It has been concluded from the result findings that bureaucratic culture is positively related to the in-role job performance in the representative culture as it was identified in the Weber theory of bureaucracy. Innovative culture is positively related to the in-role performance as, reviewed in the literature. Whereas in the supportive culture showed no significant relation with the in-role performance among the employees.

Limitations & Suggestions

The study results cannot be generalized due to small sample size, because sample was taken from the region of Islamabad and Rawalpindi.

Other issues that contribute to the weakness of the study are the self-report method of data collection. Consequently the results may be affected due to the response bias.
The present study was based on the cross-sectional design and Organizational culture changes over time and this impact on in-role performance. So it is suggested that the future researcher do longitudinal design to study the changing patterns of culture over time.

It is recommended that the present study be replicated in future with larger and more representative sample. To deal with the response bias it is recommended to use qualitative or multiple source of data collection

**Implications**

The present study investigates the relationship between organizational culture and in-role job performance. The findings supported the previous literature regarding organizational culture, innovative culture with the in-role job performance. This finding further extends the scope of research.

The findings of the study are applicable in the control systems of management that allows the organization to attain higher performance. Thus, it is verified from the study findings that the control system of management is an essential feature for the organizations, as they can provide crucial information in decision-making processes.

The results of the innovative work culture in the study can be useful for the entrepreneurs, that the awareness about the benefits in implementing the innovative strategies can be useful for the management operations such as control systems. By gaining the knowledge of innovative attitude that can be implied to adopt fresh ideas and values that are not threats but strengths, to increase competitiveness and assure the future of the firm.
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