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SUMMARY

RELIABILITY OF THE DENISON ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE SURVEY (DOCS) FOR USE IN A FINANCIAL INSTITUTION IN SOUTH AFRICA

By
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SUPERVISOR: MRS H.A. BARNARD
DEGREE: M.COM.
CATEGORY: INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANISATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY
FIELD OF RESEARCH: PSYCHOMETRICS

A survey of literature has revealed that there is a need for a reliability study of the Denison Organisational Culture Survey (DOCS) for use in a financial institution in South Africa. The major objective of this research was therefore to determine the internal consistency reliability of the DOCS - in other words, to determine the accuracy or consistency with which the set of survey items measures one particular scale.

The total sample of 2 735 individuals used in this research consisted of both male and female full-time employees of a financial institution in South Africa. The results of this introductory study on the reliability of the DOCS in South Africa demonstrated clear support for similar research conducted abroad and proved to be compatible with the cognitive-behaviouristic psychology movement’s original concept of organisational culture. The reliability of the DOCS, as applicable to this South African sample, reflects statistical significant internal consistency.
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