

## VALUE PROFILES OF UKRAINIAN UNIVERSITIES ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Most modern multinational companies face significant challenges in the HR management process, primarily related to the cultural characteristics of their employees as representatives of different levels and types of culture. Each culture has its own common problems and tasks that occur in practically every cultural representative. Culture is always collective in nature, but the communities it may be associated with differ from one another. If you imagine how the characteristics of individuals vary in the form of a curve of normal distribution, then differences between cultures can be represented as a displacement of a given curve when we move from one culture to another [1]. Every employee of the company as an individual belongs to different groups of people at the same time, carrying certain elements of culture inherent in these groups [2]. Thus, the scientist [2] is suggested a carrier of different levels of culture: national, determined by belonging to a particular nation or country where the man was born and formed as a person; gender according to the gender of personality; regional that attests to a relevant ethnic or religious or linguistic group, since most nations are culturally different groups; generational, determined by age and belonging to the relevant generation; professional, related by educational opportunities and features of professional activity of the individual; organizational, created on the basis of national culture (s) in the environment of a particular company. Organizational culture is a pattern of basic assumptions that have emerged in the process of group-solving problems of socialization, growth, external adaptation and internal integration that determine routine functioning and adaptability shared by the employees. Herewith, any group of people with a stable composition and a long history of a group experience formation create its own culture [4]. For this reason, the value profiles of organizational culture of multinational company staff have been constructed in the study. The results of the canonical analysis of the terminal and instrumental values of a company's personnel as representatives of one national culture and, at the same time, different generational and one organizational cultures have not been empirically studied before. In the context of cross-cultural management, the phenomenon of culture must be viewed primarily at the micro level, exploring culture as a system of attitudes, values, experiences and behaviors inherent in the individual who is a representative and bearer of that culture [5]. The main conceptual direction of cross-cultural research is the value approach. It ascertains that any culture has a complex and multilevel structure, based on values. Hence, to study the culture, it is necessary to determine

the structure of the system of these values. However, values do not exist separately. They always create a coherent system. Each group of people defines their own value structure, characteristic of most of this group [1].

"Values are fundamental beliefs that either determine what is right and wrong, or set common priorities, and influence choices about the available means and outcomes of the action" [6].

Contemporary personality-based value studies are based mainly on a methodological approach to value assessment [5], which is one of the main approaches to the study of values based on conditional "measurement" of values [3]; [6]; [7]. Belonging to a particular culture determines distribution of values into terminal and instrumental settings as well as certain behavioral attitudes, that is, values are a criterion for evaluating individuals' or groups' behaviors and others in society [5].

Terminal values are the basic goals of the individual, reflecting a long life perspective, defining the basic life position. They are achieved by means of instrumental values, defined at a particular stage of the person's understanding of the life situation and himself. That is why instrumental values determine the model of personality behavior, while terminal values determine the purpose of that behavior [5]. A profile analysis as a profile building is a continuation of a comparative analysis that takes a specific perspective: finding out the willingness or interest of different categories of people to change, that is, when it is necessary to differentiate a group of people at the personal or group levels in order to find out who is more focused on and ready for proposed changes [8]. The following sequence of constructing a value profile of culture at different cultural levels is proposed using a methodological approach to value assessment. The first stage is a survey of representatives of the appropriate level of culture (national, generational and organizational). For this purpose, representatives of the appropriate level of culture are offered questionnaires that include lists of two categories of values (terminal and instrumental) and general information about the respondents (age, gender, place of birth and place where the person grew up to 14 years, i.e. place of socialization). These questionnaires are a modified and adapted version of the list of values [5]. At the second stage, the respondents rank the proposed lists of two categories of values (terminal and instrumental) according to their importance in the lives of the respondents. Taken together, the first and second steps of the sequence follow a modified methodological approach to the valuation [5]. As a result of these two steps we obtained a list of terminal and instrumental values of representatives of the respective cultural level. An

the third stage, to determine the level of coherence of the respondents' viewpoints, a correlation between the predicted lists of terminal and instrumental values of the representatives of the respective cultural level is resolved. If the relationship between the spaced lists of terminal and instrumental values is uncertain, this indicates the need to find other representatives of the appropriate level of culture for the survey. This relationship is determined based on a canonical analysis that establishes a link between the two groups of attribute values [9]. The fourth step of the methodological approach is to build a value profile of the culture. For this purpose, value lists (terminal and instrumental) of importance for the whole group of respondents are formed based on the results of values ranking by each respondent, averaging them by each respondent. The sequences of values thus obtained are the basis for the creation of a value profile of culture at different cultural levels. The fifth stage is the analysis of the system and structure of cultural values at the corresponding level, which allows to define the features of the value orientations system of the given cultural level in more detail. The main components of this analysis are [8]: the analysis of terminal and instrumental values and their significance in the respective culture. Two leading Kharkiv universities (S. Kuznets KhNUE and KhNURE) with a significant level of international activity were selected for the analysis of organizational culture. The staff of these universities operate in a cross-cultural environment and participate in the process of cross-cultural interaction in the course of the University's activity with various contractors (foreign students and scientists). In 2017-2018 the survey to build a value profile of organizational culture was conducted at these two universities in Kharkiv. 77 respondents aged 30 to 70 years were polled in S. Kuznets KhNUE, of which 72.37% were women and 27.63% were men. 55 respondents aged 30 to 70, were interviewed in KhNURE, of which 57.41% were women and 42.59% were men. As a result of canonical analysis the linear combinations of the two sets of values with the highest correlation have been identified (table 1). It has been proved that the organizational culture of the analyzed organizations is effective because it is shared by all surveyed respondents, as evidenced by the relationship between the categories of values. Leading ranks of terminal values in the organizational culture of these universities were defined for two specific values – "health" and "materially assured and comfortable life" and two abstract values such as "love" and "inner harmony", which is a manifestation of the total national culture influence. Each organizational culture has its own values. Two specific values, such as "happy family life" and "active life" are also important for organizational culture of S. Kuznets KhNUE, while one specific value ("interesting work") and one abstract value ("vital wisdom") is important for the organizational culture of KhNURE. All this will form the basis for the development of practical guidance on personnel management of these organizations.

Table 1

The most significant terminal values in organizational culture at analyzed universities

Rank	Terminal value	Canonical value
S. Kuznets KhNUE		
1	health	-67,178
2	happy family life	-60,646
3	love	-60,273
4	inner harmony	-48,934
5	a financially secure and comfortable life	-50,926
6	active life	-62,7607
KhNURE		
1	health	111,793
2	inner harmony	-80,605
3	love	-85,761
4	interesting job	-49,433
5	a financially secure and comfortable life	-88,963
6	life wisdom	-85,041

There are also limitations to this study. Only two organizations were analyzed when constructing the value profile of organizational culture. That is why further research will be done by analyzing representatives of other national, generational and organizational cultures, as well as detailed analysis of the importance of the canonical weight of each of the values and their impact on the value profile of the culture.

### Bibliography

- [1] G. Hofstede, G.J. Hofstede, and M. Minkov, *Cultures and Organizations: Software for the Mind*. New York, USA: McGraw-Hill, 2010.
- [2] G. Hofstede, *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*. California, USA: Sage thousand oaks, 2001.
- [3] N. Lebedeva, and A. Tatarko, *Cultural Values and Models of Economic Behaviour*. Moscow, Russia: National Research University, Higher School of Economics, 2007.
- [4] E. H. Schein, *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, USA: Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2004.
- [5] M. Rokeach, *Understanding human values: Individual and societal*. New York, USA: Free Press, 1979.
- [6] N. Todorova, *Cross-cultural management*. 2009. [Online]. Available: [http://ea.donntu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/2021/1/CCM\\_Todorova.pdf](http://ea.donntu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/2021/1/CCM_Todorova.pdf). Accessed on: January 20, 2020.
- [7] D. L. Debats, and B.F. Bartelds. (1991). *The structure of human values: a principal components analysis of the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS)*. [Online]. Available: <https://numerous.files.wordpress.com/2012/04/02-analysis-of-the-rokeach-value-survey.pdf>. Accessed on: January 19, 2020.
- [8] A. I. Prigozhin, *Organization development methods*. Moscow, Russia: ICFER, 2003.
- [9] V. S. Ponomarenko, and L. M. Malyarets, *Multidimensional analysis of socio-economic systems*. Kharkiv, Ukraine: Vyd. KHNU, 2009.