

THE CORRELATION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, COMPETITIVE STRATEGY AND COMPANY PERFORMANCE: A REVIEW

by Turnitin 6

Submission date: 03-Nov-2023 12:27PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 2207693745

File name: B1._3_article_15.pdf (250.53K)

Word count: 6690

Character count: 39750



DOI 10.18551/rjoas.2021-07.15

THE CORRELATION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, COMPETITIVE STRATEGY AND COMPANY PERFORMANCE: A REVIEW

Wanto Hary Sastrya
Faculty of Agriculture, University of Wijaya Kusuma Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia
E-mail: sas_hary@uwks.co.id

ABSTRACT

Small and medium-sized enterprises have an important role in contributing to Gross National Product and employment. Therefore their existence needs serious attention, especially in terms of organizational culture, organizational learning and information technology, their influence on competitive strategy because these factors also affect its performance. This review shows that corporate culture has a positive and significant effect on organizational learning and has no significant positive impact on competitive strategy but substantially affects the competitive system. Information technology has a positive and significant impact on the competitive process and company performance. The competitive strategy has a positive and significant effect on company performance.

KEY WORDS

Gross National Product, organizational culture, organizational learning, information technology.

Changes in situations that occur almost all the time, both internal and external conditions make all companies always pay close attention to them. All assumptions in business planning that have been successful in the past should constantly be reviewed. The changes that occur are triggered by various factors such as global competition, corporate culture, technological changes, economic conditions, and learning within an organization that will affect the organization's survival in the future. Companies generally have long-term goals based on economic motives to generate added value and economic benefits for stakeholders, including company owners, employees, business partners, and society in general. To realize the added value and economic benefits, the company is expected to have a planned, focused, and sustainable vision, mission, strategy, work program.

Attention to small and medium entrepreneurs in the industry, trade, and services has continued to grow in the last decade in the form of research in Indonesia. This situation arises because small and medium entrepreneurs become a marginal group in the socio-economic constellation, even though the role of small and medium enterprises is quite significant, especially in terms of labor absorption. The facts show that it turns out that small entrepreneurs are more able to survive during the economic crisis. It gives more confidence that local economic development on a people-based basis must be carried out to encourage a more resilient and stable financial structure. Small and Medium Enterprises have an essential role in contributing to a country's economy because Small and Medium Enterprises have the ability as an economic engine that can improve people's quality of life and make a substantial contribution to the Gross National Product (GNP) in a country. In America, Small and Medium Enterprises can contribute to GNP by 45%. In Australia, they donate 33% (Sunata, 2007). In Indonesia, the number of Small and Medium Enterprises in 2007 reached 49.8 million or 99.8% of the total existing businesses. An entire workforce absorbed 79 million people and contributed to the GNP of Rp 1,778.91 trillion or 55.92% (Ministry of Cooperatives and Small and Medium Enterprises, 2007).

Based on the Decree of the Minister of Cooperatives and Small and Medium Enterprises of the Republic of Indonesia Number: 120/KEP/M.KUKM/IX.2003 11 September 2003 and Number: 135/KEP.MKUKM/IX.2003 dated 28 September 2003. By product Small and Medium Enterprises Leading Small and Medium Enterprises are Small and Medium



Enterprises that have products that local communities can rely on to develop the regional economy. Its turn will encourage the improvement of the regional economy (Ministry of Cooperatives and Small and Medium Enterprises, 2003). The organization is a unit that seeks to coordinate various interests and to achieve multiple goals and objectives. The increasingly complex work environment causes organizations to change quickly to adapt to the interests of society. Three things characterize organizational change, namely: efficiency, sophistication, and complexity. Since ancient times, through established organizations, humans have strived to continuously improve their productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness in reducing operating/production costs. Human resources have a direct relationship with the mastery of business management aspects, especially the socio-cultural community of East Java is a plural society, so this kind of condition must receive special attention in managing the organization not to hamper the company. About 63.4% of Small and Medium Enterprises in East Java in financial management are not carried out separately from family finances from the management aspect. At the same time, those who have done financial management separately from family finances are around 36.6%. On the other hand, the involvement of Small and Medium Enterprises in training activities is about 50 percent, whether carried out by Disperindag, Diskop, and Small And Medium Enterprises or the private sector. This training activity is one of the decisive factors in developing Small and Medium Enterprises in East Java.

This review needs to be done to understand the relationship between **organizational culture, organizational learning** comprehensively, and **information technology on competitive strategy and company performance**, then based on previous empirical research and related to the conditions of Small and Medium Enterprises in East Java. It becomes the researcher's consideration to choose the influence of **organizational culture, organizational learning, and information technology on competitive strategy and company performance**.

Organizational culture. The use of organizational culture variables in this study is by the theory proposed by Robbins (1990), while the indicators used in this study are by the research of Batitci et al., (2004), Batitci et al., (2006), and Lee and Yu (2004). Respondents' perceptions of the variables can be seen from the results of the frequency distribution analysis. For the organizational culture variable, the lowest degree of respondent perception on the humanity indicator with an average score of 3.77, thus this indicator is perceived well by respondents. Table 5.8 shows that 30.5% of the humanity indicators are moderately responded to by respondents. It indicates that SME owners pay less attention to relationships between employees. This condition is a weakness of SME owners because if the relationship between employees is not good, it will affect the company's running.

The task indicator has an average score of 3.92, which is better than humanity. Thus this indicator is responded to well by respondents. Respondents who answered were reaching 19.1%. This condition should receive more serious attention by SME owners, especially on tasks that have become the responsibility of employees. Besides, employees need to be equipped with other task skills to replace other employees' positions if required. The results of the descriptive analysis in this study indicate that support is the best-perceived indicator by respondents. Thus, company owners have an essential role in shaping organizational culture by providing support to employees. The part of the company owner, in this case, can create conditions for good relations between superiors and subordinates, motivate to improve employee skills, and encourage employees to develop competence.

Based on the previous study, the average score for the support indicator is 4.09, the highest compared to the average score for other work culture indicators. Still, in this indicator, the respondents who responded were 8.5 %. It indicates that the support indicator has a vital role for SME owners in building organizational culture. This indicator is perceived very well by respondents. Seeing this condition, empirical support has a reasonably high role in SMEs in East Java, but this indicator still has weaknesses because some respondents still respond moderately. Based on the analysis, the part of company owners is vital in providing support to company employees to develop and improve company performance.

The average value of the support indicator appears to be greater than the average value of the organizational culture variable. It illustrates that support dominates the other two hands,



namely task and humanistic, which make up the corporate culture variable. Therefore company owners should pay attention to support, which includes: maintaining superior and subordinate relationships, motivating employees, and the importance of developing employee competencies.

Organizational Learning. For the organizational learning, SME owners pay less attention to employee unique advantages. This condition is a weakness of SME owners because the individual advantages of each employee can be used as an example for other employees so that if employees have unique advantages, they will have a good influence on company performance. This condition should receive more serious attention by SME owners, especially on the mindset of employees, by SME owners need to equip employees with knowledge that supports their company, with a better employee mindset will improve company performance. There is a weakness of SMEs, because they ignore employees' personality, even though personality is very supportive of the company's activities. Also, because sharing a vision is necessary for an organization. Therefore SME owners must pay attention to this indicator. The indicator that is best perceived by respondents in this research is team learning, thus empirically team learning has an important role in encouraging SMEs in East Java to become learning companies. SMEs who want to progress must make their companies a learning company, therefore this indicator must receive special attention from SME owners.

The theoretical review has been put forward by Senge (1990) there are five indicators of organizational learning, namely: (1) personal mastery (personal advantage), (2) mental models, (3) shared vision, (4) team learning, and (5) system thinking., then Senge (1990) says people who want to compete in the business environment must make their organizations "Learning Organizations" by continuously adapting to the environment. The ability of each company to anticipate and adapt to any changes will determine its survival. Ability must be trained with a continuous learning process. As a learning organization, it always provides opportunities for its employees to always be able to improve themselves to achieve success, through individual learning they can do everything that was never possible before, to create individual learners, is to provide the widest opportunity for employees to increase their knowledge. Neefe (2001) states that one of the important indicators in organizational learning is teams learning, this opinion is also reinforced by Dixon (1994), Pawlowsky (1992), stating that team learning is an essential factor in organizational learning. Fang and Wang (2006) have carried out an empirical review, also using Senge's (1990) model indicators in measuring organizational learning about corporate strategy, Fang and Wang (2006) in their research, team learning is used as a variable that affects system concludes that team learning has a significant effect on company strategy.

Information Technology. Information technology is very likely to have an impact on the company's strategy and performance. Items that are part of the meaning include: information technology increases efficiency, information technology accelerates service, information technology helps decision making The use of information technology is in accordance with the theoretical review proposed by (Porter, 1993). that information technology is useful for creating competitive advantage. Two general approaches that can be used as guidelines in viewing the benefits of information technology are: an analysis of the company's operating value chain and a competitive analysis

Rockart and Morton (1984) have introduced the use of value-added chains to describe the potential opportunities arising from information technology. They identified three types of opportunities that could create competitive advantage: (1) increasing the value of each function, (2) connecting with customers and suppliers for low-cost activities, and (3) creating new business through services or products. Furthermore, Ives and Learmonth (1984) say that it should be noted that this value chain analysis, in terms of operational efficiency and functional effectiveness, is closely related to internal strategy. Kearns and Lederer. (2001), explained that the important indicators in information technology are the suitability of information technology with business plans and the suitability of technology with competitive strategies.

Competitive Strategy. In competitive strategy, there are still weaknesses because 61.7% of SMEs respond moderately. Thus, most company owners have not paid attention to market



segments, even though market segments are closely related to company profits (Porter, 1993). Indicators that are perceived to be better than focus are low costs. The score for this indicator, respondents' perceptions are classified as good, namely 3.67. Although it is well perceived that this indicator still has weaknesses, respondents still give a moderate perception of 31.2%. Thus, many SME owners do not think about efficiency in running their business even though this is important to increase company profits.

The indicator perceived as the most dominant by respondents in the competitive strategy variable is differentiation, with a score close to 4, 3.99. Although this variable is perceived well by the respondents, it is shown that the average score is in the range of $3 < NS \leq 4$ (Account, 2006). However, from all respondents, there are still 10.6% of SMEs that have not differentiated. Still, it can be said that overall, in general, SMEs in East Java do product differentiation to compete with other companies. Based on the results of this analysis, other indicators still have significance in competitive strategy because one hand and another have a relationship. For example, the company differentiates to focus on a particular market so that the resulting product can enter the planned market segment.

This theoretical review has been put forward by Porter (1980), asserting that companies must be competitive to become industry leaders and succeed on a national and international scale must have a competitive advantage. Then Porter (1980) argues that companies must choose between one basic strategy to achieve excellence and profit. The strategy chosen must be supported by decision-makers who create complementary internal processes that align with management philosophy.

According to Porter (1985), the competitive strategy includes cost leadership, product differentiation, and focus has been recognized as a typology of strategies for organizations. Porter's typology has been widely known in the United States since the late 1980s. However, the extent to which these strategies are applied in non-United States markets and how they are implemented in non-US cultures is of concern to scholars and academics.

Based on Porter's theory, Allen et al., (2006) conducted a study to examine Porter's primary business strategy used by Japanese companies and compared it with the usefulness of Porter's approach applied in the United States. The results show that differentiation is an essential indicator of competitive strategy in America and Japan, although differentiation is below the cost leadership indicator.

Another researcher who uses Porter's theory is Barth (2003). Research conducted by Barth looks at the relationship between competitive strategy and administrative mechanisms (managerial skills and organizational structure) of small companies and whether this match is related to company performance. Barth, in his research, agrees with Porter's (1980) opinion that there are three critical dimensions in competitive strategy, namely cost leadership, differentiation, and focus, which are good indicators for a company's competitive strategy.

Performance. The theoretical review of performance appraisal proposed by Hansen and Mowen (1997) shows two types of measurement. Financial and non-financial, other figures which convey the same thing are McAdam and Bailie (2002) distinguish between two types of measurement, namely economic and non-financial measurements. The financial measure is required as legislation and has been done for a long time, so all businesses use some form of financial measurement system. The development of non-financial measurements is still relatively new, in line with the increasing interest in using non-financial measures as a strategic tool. At the same time, the critical indicators, according to them, are sales and profitability.

An empirical review was conducted by Gardner et al., (2000), who used the number of sales indicators in measuring company performance in their research. Wahyudi (2008) uses the same indicator as Gardner et al. (2000) by adding another indicator: profitability.

CONCLUSION

Organizational culture has no significant positive effect on the company's competitive strategy, meaning that organizational culture is not the main requirement for the creation of a good competitive strategy, this finding does not support the results of research conducted by



Fang and Wang (2006), however, organizational culture has an indirect and significant effect to corporate strategy through organizational learning. Organizational culture has a positive and significant effect on company performance, the better the organizational culture, the higher the company's performance, thus organizational culture has an important meaning in improving company performance, this is in accordance with the theory put forward by Robbins (1990) the stronger the organizational culture, the better the organization's performance. This finding also supports previous research conducted by Lee and Yu (2004) Lopez et al., (2004) Ogbonna and Harris (2000) Batitci et al., (2004). Batitci et al., (2006), Syied and Rowland (2004) In addition to direct influence, organizational culture also has an indirect and significant effect on company performance through organizational learning and competitive company strategy.

FUNDING

This review did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

DECLARATION OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Adam, Everett and Swamidass, Paul M (1989). Assessing Operations Manajemen From A Strategic Perspective. Journal of Management, dalam Fang Shih-Chieh and Jue-Fan. (2006). International Journal of Management Vol 3 No.3 Part.1.
2. Allen Richard S, Merlyn M Helms, Margaret B. Takeda, Charles S White, Cynthia White (2006). A Comparison Of Competitive Strategies in Japan and United State. S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal; 71, 1; ABI/INFORM Global.
3. Allen R S. and Helms M (2006): Linking Strategic Practices and Organizational Performance to Porter's Generic Strategies. Business Process Management Journal 12 No. 4, 2006 pp. 433-454.
4. Amabile, T.M. (1997), Motivating creativity in organisations: on doing what you love and loving what you do, California Management Review, Vol. 40 No.1, pp. 39-58.
5. Amabile, T.M. (1998), How to kill creativity, Harvard Business Review, September/October, pp. 76-87.
6. Anderson O and Kipriano (1994). Resource-based theory and International Growth Strategies an Explanatory Study. International Business Review Vol 7. pp. 163-184
7. APO, Agriculture Report, (2000), Promotion Of Rural-Based Small Industries in Asia and The Pacific, Asian Productivity Organization, Tokyo.
8. Arad, S., Hanson, M.A. and Schneider, R.1. (1997), A framework for the study of relationships between organizational characteristics and organizational innovation, The Journal of Creative Behavior, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 42-58.
9. Atkinson, P.E. (1990), Creating cultural change, Management Services (UK), Vol. 34 No. 11, pp. 6-10.
10. Baker and Sinkula (1997) A framework for market-based organizational learning: Linking values, knowledge and Behavior Academy of Marketing Science. Journal; Fall 1997; 25, 4; ABI/INFORM Global pg. 305.
11. Baker and Sinkula (1999) The Synergistic Effect of Market Orientation and Learning orientation on Organizational Performance. Academy of Marketing Science. Journal; Fall 1999; 27, 4; ABI/INFORM Global pg. 411.
12. Bakos, JY., and Tracy (1985). Toward a More Precise Consept of Information Technology. Proceeding of The Sixth Interbational Conference on Information Systems. L Gallegos (ed) Indianapolis. pp. 17-24.



13. Bank Indonesia. (2003). Laporan semester I lembaga keuangan perbankan and bukan bank. Bank Indonesia. Jakarta.
14. Bank Indonesia Surabaya (2007). Kajian Pengembangan Ekonomi Provinsi Jawa Timur. Tiriwulan II/2007) Surabaya. Bank Indonesia Surabaya.
15. Barney, Jay B. (1997). *Gaining and Sustaining Competitive Advantage*. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
16. Barth Henrik (2003). Fit among Competitive Strategi, Administrative Machanisms and Performance: A Comparative Study of Small Firms in Mature And New Industries. *Journal Of Small Business Management* Apr 2003;41,2; ABI/INFORM Research
17. Basu, Arnab K; Nancy H. Chau. 1999. Adverse selection, asymmetric information, and foreign investment policies. *International Review of Economics and Finance*. Number 8 – 1999 239-252.
18. Bawono, Sri Hananto. Analisis Perbandingan Tingkat Kinerja Karyawan Berdasarkan Kesesuaian Budaya Organisasi and Nilai /Preferensi Individu. Tesis Pascasarjana Universitas Wijaya Putra Surabaya.
19. Bates, K.A., SD (1995). The Crucial Interrelationship between Manufacturing and Organizational Culture, *Management Science*, 41(10) 1565-1580.
20. Batitci US. Mendibil K. Nudurupati S. Garengo P. and Turner T (2004). The Interplay Between Performance Measurement, Organizational Culture and Management Styles. *Measuring Business Excellence*. Vol.8 pp. 24-41.
21. Batitci US. Mendibil K. Nudurupati S. Garengo P. and Turner T (2006). Dynamic of Performance Measurement and Organizational Culture. *International Journal of Operation and Production Management*. Vol.26. No 12. pp. 1325-1350.
22. Benyamin, RI., Rockart JF., Marton MS., and Wayman J. (1984). Information Technology: A Strategic Opportunity. *Sloan Management Review*. Vol 25. No. 3. pp. 3-14.
23. Bournoe, M., Mills J., Wilcox, M., Nelly, A. and Platta, K. (2000). Designing, Implementing and Updating Performance Measurement Systems. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol.20. No.6, pp.51.9.
24. BPS (2007) Statistik Industri Kecil: Small-Scale Manufacturing Industry. Jakarta: Biro Pusat Statistik.
25. Brown, L.D. (1983). *Managing Conflict at Organizational Interfaces*. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.
26. Chatman, Jennifer A. and Karen A John. (1994). Assessing the Relationship between Industry Characteristics and Organizational Cultures: How Different Can you Be. *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol.37 (Juni).
27. Chatterjee, A. 1995. *Managing for the Future*. London: Mc Millan. Press. Ltd.
28. Christensen, C.R., Andrews, K.R., Bower, J.L., Hamermesh, R.G. and Porter, M.E. (1982), *Business Policy: Text and Cases*, 5th and 6th eds, Irwin, Homewood, IL J.M.P.
29. Cook, P (1998). The Creativity Advantage – Is Your Organisation the Leader of the Pack, *Industrial and Commercial Training*, Vol.30 No.5, pp179-184.
30. Choo, Wei Chun and Bontis, Nick. (2002). *The Strategic Management of Intellectual Capital and Organizational Knowledge*. Oxford University Press, New York.
31. Cyert, March, and Starbuck (1961), Trade Off? What Trade Off? *Competence and Competitiveness in Manufacturing Strategy*. *California Management Review*, Summer 107-112.
32. David, R. Fred. (2002). *Concept of Strategic Management 8th edition*. Macmillan Publishing Company. New York.
33. Dangayach, GS., and Deshmukh SG. (2004). An Explanatory Study of Manufacturing Strategy Practices of Machinery Manufacturing Companies in India. *Omega: The International Journal of Management Science*. Vol.34. No.3. pp. 254-273.
34. David, R. Fred. (2002). *Concept of Strategic Management 8th edition*. Macmillan Publishing Company. New York.
35. De Mayer, A. And K. Ferdows (1989). *Removing Barrier in Manufacturing on the 1990 European Manufacturing Future Survey*. *European Management Journal* 9 (1), 22-29.



36. Dess, G.G., Lumpkin, G.T. (1997). Entrepreneurial strategy making and firm performance: Tests of contingency and configurational models. *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol.18, No.9, pp.677-695.
37. Dewett T. (2004). Creativity and strategic management Individual and group considerations concerning decision alternatives in the top management teams. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* Vol. 19 No. 2, 2004 pp. 156-169q Emerald Group Publishing Limited 0268-3946.
38. DiBella, A.J. and Nevis, E.C. (1998), *How Organizations Learn: An Integrated Strategy for Building Learning Capability*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
39. Dimara Efthalia, Dimitris Skuras and Kostas Tsekouras (2004) Strategic Orientation and Financial Performance of Firms Implementing ISO 9000 *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management* Vol. 21 No. 1, 2004 pp. 72-89 q Emerald Group Publishing Limited 0265-671 DOI 10.1108/02656710410511704.
40. Dixon NM. (2000). *Common Knowledge How Companies Thrive by Sharing What They Know*. Harvard Business School Press. Boston. MA.
41. Drejer Anders (2004). Back to Basics and Beyond: Strategic Management – an Area Where Practice and Theory Are Poorly Related. *Management Decision*. Vol 42. No.34. pp. 508 -520. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
42. Elfring, Tom & Henk W. Volberda (2001). "Multiple Futures of Strategy Synthesis: Shifting Boundaries, Dynamic Capabilities and Strategy Configurations." Dalam Volberda, Henk W. & Tom Elfring (eds.), *Rethinking Strategy*. London: SAGE Publications, hlm. 245-285.
43. Entrialgo, M. (2002). The Impact of Alignment of Strategy and Managerial Characteristics an Spanish SME S. *J.S. Business Management*. 40(3): 260 – 270.
44. Fang Shih-Chieh and Wang Jue-Fan. (2006). Effects of Organizational Culture and Learning on Manufacturing Strategy Selection: An Empirical Study *National Kaohsiung International Journal of Management* Vol 3 No.3 Part.1 Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
45. Farrell and Oczkowski Are Market Orientation and Learning Orientation Necessary For Superior Organizational Performance? School of Management, Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga, NSW, PO BOX 588, NSW, 2678, AUSTRALIA.
46. Ferdinand, Agusty. (2000). *Structural Equation Modelling dalam Penelitian Manajemen*. Cetakan Pertama BP. UNDIP Semarang.
47. Franklin, P (1996). *Dialogues in Strategi*. *Journal of Strategic Change*. Vol 5. No.3. pp.441.21.
48. Gardner David M. Frank Johnson., Moonkyu Lee and (2000) Ian Wilkinson, A Contingency Approach to Marketing High Technology Products. *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 34 No. 9/10, pp. 1053-1077.
49. Garvin, D.A. (2000). *Learning in Action: A Guide to Putting the Learning Organization to work*. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.
50. Gephart, H. & Marsick, W. 2001. *Dimension of the Learning Organization*. [www.kmadvantage.com/docs/presentations/Measuring Learning for Innovation and Linking It to Performance.pdf](http://www.kmadvantage.com/docs/presentations/Measuring_Learning_for_Innovation_and_Linking_It_to_Performance.pdf).
51. Gerstein and Risman (1992). Creating Competitive Advantage With Computer Technology. *Joyrnal of Business Strategy* Vol.3 No.1. pp. 53-60.
52. Glor, ED. (1997), *Encouraging Publik Sector Innovation*, *Optimum* Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 41-48.
53. Graham C M and and Fredrick Muyia Nafukho FM. (2007). Culture, organizational learning and selected employee background variables in small-size business enterprises. *Journal of European Industrial Training* Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 127-144.
54. Grant, Robert M. (1995). *Contemporary Strategy Analysis: Concepts, Techniques, Applications*. Second Edition. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Pub.
55. Graves D. (1986). *Corporate Culture Diagnosis and Change: Auditing and Changing the Culture Organization*. London: Frances Printer (Publishers) Limited.



56. Gunawan, (2000). Integrasi Strategi Bisnis and Teknologi, Jurnal Ekonomi and Bisnis. Universitas Surabaya. Vol 2. No.2.
57. Haeruman, Herman JS., Eriyatno, Kemitraan dalam Pengembangan Ekonomi Lokal, (2001), Penerbit Yayasan Mitra Pembangunan Desa-Kota and Business Inovation Centre Indonesia. Jakarta.
58. Hamel, G. and Prahalad, C. K. 1995 Competitive in the Future. Harvard Business School Press.
59. Hansson B (2006) Company-based determinants of training and the impact of training on company performance Results from an international HRM survey. Personnel Review Vol. 36 No. 2, 2007 pp. 311-331 q Emerald Group Publishing Limited 0048-3486 DOI 10.1108/00483480710726163.
60. Hardley and Mavondo. 2000. The relationship between Learning Orientation, Market Orientation and Organisational Performance. Visionary Marketing for 21st century, Facing the challenge.
61. Hofstede (1991). A Panel Studi of Manufacturing in Sweden. International Journal of Operations and Production Management 11(3), 135-144.
62. Hubeis, Musa, (1997), Menuju Industri Kecil Profesional di Era Globalisasi Melalui Pemberdayaan Manajemen Industri. (Orasi Ilmiah) Guru besar Tetap Ilmu Manajemen Industri IPB, Bogor.
63. Huber (1991). Organizational Learning: The Contributing Processes and The Literatures. Organization Science Vol 2. No. 1. pp. 88-115.
64. Ibrahim JT (2005). Strategi Pengembangan UKM di Jawa Timur. Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Provinsi Jawa Timur.
65. Ife, James William (1995) Community Development, Creating Community Alternatives (Vision, Analysis and Practice), Longman, Australia.
66. Indarwati, (2005). Wolker's Technology Acceptance A Behavioral Aspect in Information Technology Implementation. Jurnal Ekonomi Universitas Merdeka Malang.
67. Irawan, Andi. 2007. Kewirausahaan UKM Pemikiran and Pengalaman. Graha Ilmu. Yogyakarta.
68. Ismail N (2002) Technology Adoption Strategies Amongst Small and Medium-sized Enterprises in Malaysia. Tesis di Universitas Malaysia.
69. Ives B and Learmondh GP. (1984). The Information System as a Competitive Weapon. Communication of The ACM. Vol. 27. No.12. pp.1193-1201.
70. Jaw Bih-Shiaw, Taiwan K., Ling Ya-hui, Chang W-C.,Feng-S., Lien-H and Taiwan (2006). The Impact of Culture on Chinese Employees' Work Values. Personnel Review 36. No.1. pp.128-144. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
71. Johnson, J.L., Pui-Wan Lee, R., Saini, A. and Grohmann, B. (2003), "Market focused strategic flexibility: conceptual advances and an integrative model", Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Vol. 31, Winter, pp. 74-89.
72. Jusi (2001). Aligment of Strategic Priorities and Performance: and Integration of Operation and Strategic Management Perspective. Journal of Operation Management Vol.21. No. 3. pp. 353-359.
73. Kao and Lee (1996). An Integration model for Manpower Forecasting. Journal of Manpower Forecasting. Vol.15. No.7. pp, 543-552.
74. Kaplan, R. And Norton, D. (1996). Translating Strategy into Action – The Balance Scorecard, Harvard Business School Press. NY.
75. Karim A.Kahar. (2007). Pengaruh Karakteristik Individu and Pengetahuan Serta Teknologi Terhadap Budaya Organisasi and Implikasinya terhadap Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah. Desertasi Doktor. Universitas 17 Agustus 1945. Surabaya.
76. Kazan H, Gokhan Ozer and Ayse Tansel Cetin (2006). Insights From Research The Effect of Manufacturing Strategies on Financial Performance. Measuring Business Excellence VOL. 10 NO. 1, pp. 14-26, This Business Management and Economics in a Changing World.
77. Kearns GS and Lederer AL. (2001). Strategic IT Alignment: A Model For Competitive Advantage. Twenty-Second International Conference on Information Systems.



78. Kelley L Lee, Deborah A. Blackman, Jeffrey Peter Hurst (2007). An exploration of the relationship between learning organizations and the retention of knowledge workers. *The Learning Organization* Vol. 14 No. 3, 2007 pp. 204-221 Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
79. Kim, D.H. 1993. The Link Between Individual and Organizational Learning. *Sloan Management Review*, 35: 37-50.
80. Kotter JP and Heskett JI. (1992). *Corporate Culture and Performance*. New York: The Free Press A Division Simon & Schuster Inc.
81. Kreitner R., and Kinicki A. (1992). *Organizational Behavior*. Boston: Richard D. Irwin Inc.
82. Krueger, A. B. and M. Lindahl. (2000). Education for Growth: Why and For Whom?. NBER Working Paper 7591. Cambridge: NBER.
83. Laudon, KC. And JP. Laudon. 2004. *Management Information System: Managing the Digital Firm*. The 8th Ed. Prenticehall International Inc.
84. Lee and Tsai (2005) The Effects of Business operationmode on Market Orientation, Learning Orientation and Innovativeness *Industrial Management & Data Systems* Vol. 105 No. 3, 2005 pp. 325-348.
85. Leigh, A. (2003), "Thinking ahead: strategic foresight and government", *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 62 No. 2, pp. 3-10.
86. Leong and Wrad (1994). The Six Ps of Manufacturing Strategy. *Internasional Journal of Production Management*. Vol.10 No.3 pp, 32-45.
87. Locke, E.A. and Kirkpatrick, SA. (1995), *Creative Action in Organisation: Ivory Tower Visions and Real World Voices*, Sage Publication Newbury Park CA.
88. Luthan Fred (2005). *Organizational Behavior* 10th Edition. The Mc Graw-Hill Companies Inc.
89. Marshal, M., Wray, L. Epstein, P and Grifel S. (1999). 21st Century Community Focus: Better Results by Linking Citizens, Government and Performance. *Public Management*, Vol 81. NO.10. pp. 12 -19.
90. Martins, N. (1997), "Handstand Gold-mine: organisational culture survey", Johannesburg report, unpublished).
91. Maruchek (1990). An Explanatory Study of the Manufacturing Strategy Process in Practice. *Journal of operations Management*, Vol.10(1), 101-123
92. Morgan, G. (1991). *Images of Organization*, Sage. Beverly Hill CA.
93. Murotsumoto D. (1996). *Culture and Psychology*. Washington: Brook/Cole Publishing Inc.
94. Mathis. Robert L and Jackson, John H. (2000). *Human Resource Management*, 9th Edition, South-Western Publishing Ohio.
95. Mavondo and Farrell (2003). Cultural Orientation: Its Relationship with Market orientation, innovation and organisational performance. *Management Decision* Vol 4 No. 3. pp.241-249.
96. Mavondo, Chimhanzi and Stewart (2005) Learning Orientation and Market Orientation Relationship with Innovation, Human Resource Practices and Performance. *European Journal of Marketing*. Vol. 39 No. 11/12, 2005 pp. 1235-1263.
97. McAdam, R. and Bailie, B. (2002), "Business performance measures and alignment impact on strategy", *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, Vol. 22 No. 9, pp. 972-96.
98. McGuinness and Morgan.2005. The Effect of Market and learning Orientation on Dstrategy Dynamic. Emerald group publishing limited, *European journal of marketing*. Vol 39 No 11/12 pp 1306-1336.
99. McLeod R (2001) *Sistem Informasi Manajemen jilid I and II (Terjemahan)*. Prenhallindo. Jakarta.
100. Miles M.P., J. Govind and M.B. The Relationship Between Enviromental Dynamism and Small Firm Structure, Strategi and Performace. *J.M. Teory and Practice*. Vol.8 (2): 63 – 74.
101. Minor E.D., RL Hensley and D.R. Wood. Jr. (1994). A review Emperical Manufacturing Strategy Studies. dalam Fang Shih-Chieh and Wang Jue-Fan. (2006). *Internationa Journal of Management* Vol 3 No.3 Part.1.



102. Mintzberg, H. and Musselman V.A. (1994). The fall and rise of strategic planning. *Harvard Business Review*, January-February, 107-134.
103. Moeljono, D. (2005). *Cultured: Budaya Organisasi dalam Tantangan*. PT.Alex Media Komputindo. Kelompok Gramedia. Jakarta.
104. Mondy, Wayne and Noe M Robert. (1990). *Human Resources Management fourth Edition*, South Western Publishing. Ohio.
105. Nystrom, H. (1979), *Creativity and Innovation*, John Wiley and Sons, Chichester.
106. Nanni, A., Dixon, J., and Voltmann T. (1992). Management Accounting Support The Manufacturing Realities. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*. Vol. 4. No.3. pp. 28-48.
107. Naschold, Frieder and Glenn Daley (1999). The Strategic Management Challenge: Modernizing Local Government. Part Two dalam *International Public Management Journal*, 2(1): 52-67.
108. Neefe, D.O. 2001. Comparing Levels of Organizational Learning Maturity of Colleges and Universities Participating in Traditional and Non-Traditional (Academic Quality Improvement Project) Accreditation Processes. *American Psychological Association (APA) Publication Manual 4th Edition*.
109. Nelson, L. and Burns, F.L. (1984), "High performance programming: a framework for transforming organizations", *Transforming Work*, Mises River Press, VA, pp. 225-42
110. Nelly, A., Gregory, M., and Platta, K. (1995). The Performance Measurement System Design: a Literature Review and Research Agenda. *International Journal of Operation and Production Manajement*, Vol.19. No.2, pp.205 -228.
111. Nelly, A. (1999). The Performance Measurement Revolution: why now and what next ? *Internatonal Journal of Operations and Production Manajement*, Vol.19. No.2, pp.205 -228.
112. Nimran, Umar. (2005). *Prilaku Organisasi*. Cetakan Ketiga. CV. Citra Media. Surabaya.
113. Nonaka, Ikujiro (1994) A Dynamic Theory of Organizational Knowledge Creation. *Organization Science*, 5 (1), 14-38.
114. Nonaka, I. and Takeuchi, H. (1995), "The Knowledge-creating Company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation", Oxford University Press, New York.
115. Noori, Hamid. (1990). *Managing The Dynamics of New Technology (Issues in Manufacturing Management)*. Prentice Hall Inc. Englewood Cliffs, New, Jersey
116. Nystrom, H. (1979), *Creativity and Innovation*, John Wiley and Sons, Chichester.
117. Ogbonna Emmanuel and Lloyd C. Harris(2000) Leadership style, organizational culture and performance: empirical evidence from UK companies *Int. J. of Human Resource Management* Vol. 11 No. 4 pp.766–788.
118. O'Reilly, CA. and Chatman (1991). People and Organisational Culture a Profile Comparison Approach to Assessing Person-Organization Fit. *Academy of Management Journal* Vol.34. No.3. pp.487-516.
119. O'Reilly, CA. and Chatman (1996). Culture as Sosial Control: Operations, Culture and Comitment, in STW. BM and Cumming LL (Eds). *Research in Organisational Behavior* Vol. 10 JAI.pp 175-200.
120. Pedler M. (1989). *The Learning Company*. McGraw Hill. London.
121. Pitts, Robert.A.(1996). *Strategic Management: Building and Sustaining Competitive Advantage*. West Publishing Company.
122. Porter Michel E (1980). *Competitive Strategy*. A Division of Macmillan Publishing Co.,Inc.
123. Porter Michel E (1985). *Competitive Advantage Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance*, Free Press. New York. NY.
124. Porter Michel E (1987). From Competitive Advantage to Corporate Strategy. *Harvard Business Review*. May/June. pp. 43-59.
125. Porter Michel E (1993). *Competitive Advantage*. Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc.



126. Ratminto, Winarsih S. Atik. 2006. Manajemen Pelayanan (Pengembangan Model Konseptual, Penerapan Citizen's Charter and Standar Pelayanan Minimal, Cetakan Kedua. Pustaka Pelajar Yogyakarta.
127. Reitsperger and Daniel (1990). Dynamic Manufacturing: A Comparisons of Attitude in the USA and Japan. *Management International Review* 30(3), 203-216.
128. Robbins Stephen P (1990). *Organization Theory: Structure, Design and Application*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
129. Robbins Stephen P (2001). *Organizational Behavior*. Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey.
130. Robinson R. (1997). Planned Patterns of Strategic Behaviour and Their Relationship to Business Unit Performance, *Strategic Management Journal* Vol 9. pp 43-60.
131. Rockart, JF., and Morton MS. (1984). Implications of Changes in Information Technology for Corporate Strategy. *Interfaces* Vol. 14. No.1. pp. 84-85.
132. Schein E.H.(1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. 2nd Ed. San Francisco. Jossey Bass.
133. Schein, E.H. (1996), "Culture: the missing concept in organization studies", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 229-40.
134. Schroeder, Anderson and Cleveland (1986). *The Content of Manufacturing: An Empirical Study*. *Journal of Operations Management* 6 (4), 405-415.
135. Senge (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of The Learning Organization*. Doubleday and Company, New York, NY.
136. Senge (1990) *The Leader's New Work: Building Learning Organizations*. *Sloan Management Review* Vol 32(1), 1-15.
137. Sherman H, Daniel J. Rowley and Barry R. Armandi 2006. *Developing a Strategic Profile: the Pre-planning Phase of Strategic Management Business Strategy Series* Vol. 2 NO. 3 2007, pp. 162-171, Q Emerald Group Publishing Limited, ISSN 1751-5637.
138. Smircich, L. and Stubbart, C. (1985), "Strategic management in an enacted world", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 724-36.
139. Singarimbun 1995, *Metode Penelitian Survei*, LP3S, Jakarta.
140. Sinkula (1994). Market Information Processing and Organizational Learning. *Journal of Marketing* Vol.58. No.2. pp.35-46.
141. Skinner, W. (1996), "Manufacturing: missing link in corporate strategy", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 47 No. 3, pp. 136-45.
142. Starbuck, WH. (1961). Two Experiments on Bias and Conflict in Organizational Estimation. *Management Science*. Vol. 7. No.3. pp. 254- 265.
143. Suriasumantri, JS (1985). *Filsafat Ilmu. Sebuah Pengantar Populer*. Sinar Harapan.
144. Sugiyono. 2002. *Metode Penelitian Bisnis*. Penerbit Alfabeta, Bandung.
145. Suseno, Hg. 2003. *Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Rakyat Melalui UKM and Entrepreneurship di Kalangan Pengusaha Kecil*. *Jurnal Widya Manajemen and Akuntansi* Vol. 3 No. 1 April 2003, 63-69. Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya.
146. Sunata IW. (2007). *Pengaruh Sumberdaya Perusahaan Terhadap Kapabilitas, Keunggulan Kompetitif, Strategi Kompetitif and Kinerja Perusahaan*. Desertasi S3. Universitas Brawijaya Malang.
147. Swamidass PM (1996). *Manufacturing Strategies, Environmental Uncertainty and Performance: A Path Analytic Model*. *Management Science* Vol.33.No.4 pp. 509-524
148. Sweeney M.T. (1991). *Benchmarking for Strategies Manufacturing Management*. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management* 14(9), 4-15.
149. Swink and Way (1995). *Manufacturing Strategy: Propositions, Current Research, Renewed Direction*. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 15 (6), 4-26.
150. Syied-Ikhsan and Fytton Rowland (2004) *Knowledge Management in Public Organization: a Study on The Relationship Between Organizational Elements And The Performance of Knowledge Transfer*. *Journal Of Knowledge Management*. Vol 8. No.8.
151. Rois A. (2003). *Prlilaku Organisasi*. Bayumedia. Malang.



152. Tesluk, P.E., Faar, J.L. and Klein, S.R. (1997), "Influences of organizational culture and climate on individual creativity", *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 21-41.
153. Thompson, L. (2003), "Improving the creativity of organizational work groups", *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 96-109.
154. Triguna (2003). *Budaya Organisasi*. PT. Gilden Terayon Press. Jakarta.
155. Thushman and Anderson (1995). *Technological Discontinuities and Organizational Environments*. *Administratation Science Quarterly* 31. pp. 459-465.
156. Tushman, M.L. and O'Reilly, C.A. Itl (1997), *Winning through Innovation: A Practical Guide to Leading Organizational Change and Renewal*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
157. Udwardia, F.E. (1990), "Creativity and innovation in organizations: two models and managerial implications", *Technological Forecasting and Social Change: An Internationaf Journal*, Vol. 38 No. t, pp. 65-80.
158. Wahyudi, D. (2008). *Pengaruh Orientasi Pasar terhadap Orientasi Pembelajaran, Budaya Organisasi, kepemimpinan, Inovasi, strategi kompetitif and Kinerja (Survei terhadap Stasiun Radio FM swasta di Jawa Timur)*. Desertasi S3. Universitas Wajaya Malang.
159. Valerie Decoene and Werner Bruggeman (2006) *Strategic alignment and middle level managers' motivation in a balanced scorecard setting* *International Journal of Operations & Production Management* Vol. 26 No. 4, 2006 pp. 429-448 Emerald Group Publishing Limited 0144-3577 DOI 10.1108/01443570610650576.
160. Venkatraman (1994). *IT-Enabled Bussiness Transformation From Automation to Business Scope Redefinition*. *Sloan Management Review* Winter pp. 73-87.
161. Vitayala, Aida., (2000). *Tantangan and Prospek Teknologi Informasi and Komunikasi dalam Otonomi Daerah*. *Proseeding Seminar Pemberdayaan Manusia Menuju Masyarakat Madani*. Bogor, 25-26 September 2000.
162. White, R.E. (1986), "Generic business strategies, organizational context and performance: an empirical investigation", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 7, pp. 217-31.
163. Wilkins, A.L. (1983), "The culture audit: a tool for understanding organizations", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 2, pp. 24-38.
164. Wortzel, H. V. and Wortzel, L. H. 1998. *Strategic Managemet in the Global Economy*, Ed-3th. John Wiley & Sons Inc.
165. Wren Daniel A. (1994). *The Evolution of Management Thought*. The University of Oklahoma. John Wiley and Sons. Inc.
166. Wright, P. and McMahan, G. (1992), "Theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 18, pp. 295-320.
167. Yulianto E (2003). *Information Technology and Organization Transformation*. Lancaster University. UK.
168. Zehir Cemal; A Zafer Acar and Haluk Tanriverdi (2006): *Identifying Organizational Capabilities As Predictors of Growth and Business Performance*. *The Business Review*, Cambridge; Summer; 5, 2; ABI/INFORM Global.

THE CORRELATION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, COMPETITIVE STRATEGY AND COMPANY PERFORMANCE: A REVIEW

ORIGINALITY REPORT

23%

SIMILARITY INDEX

22%

INTERNET SOURCES

16%

PUBLICATIONS

14%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| 1 | doaj.org Internet Source | 3% |
| 2 | Journal of Managerial Psychology, Volume 19, Issue 2 (2006-09-19) Publication | 2% |
| 3 | www.slideshare.net Internet Source | 2% |
| 4 | rudyct.com Internet Source | 1% |
| 5 | www.docstoc.com Internet Source | 1% |
| 6 | Rodney McAdam, Brian Bailie. "Business performance measures and alignment impact on strategy", International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 2002 Publication | 1% |
| 7 | Submitted to University of Leicester | |

Student Paper

1 %

8

curve.carleton.ca

Internet Source

1 %

9

go.gale.com

Internet Source

1 %

10

Submitted to Universitas Wijaya Kusuma
Surabaya

Student Paper

1 %

11

idoc.pub

Internet Source

1 %

12

etds.ncl.edu.tw

Internet Source

1 %

13

Submitted to Universitas Brawijaya

Student Paper

1 %

14

repository.stiesia.ac.id

Internet Source

1 %

15

repository.widyamataram.ac.id

Internet Source

1 %

16

docshare.tips

Internet Source

1 %

17

www.lmfeui.com

Internet Source

1 %

18

citeseerx.ist.psu.edu

Internet Source

1 %

19

tudr.thapar.edu:8080

Internet Source

1 %

20

journal.stkipsingkawang.ac.id

Internet Source

1 %

21

K.A. Chatha, I. Butt. "Themes of study in manufacturing strategy literature", International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 2015

Publication

1 %

22

Submitted to The University of Manchester

Student Paper

1 %

23

nccur.lib.nccu.edu.tw

Internet Source

1 %

24

webcache.googleusercontent.com

Internet Source

1 %

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches < 1%

Exclude bibliography Off