

**THE ORDER DIAGNOSTICS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE:
THE VALIDATION OF THE SCALE OF DIAGNOSTIC
OF THE DEGREE OF EXPRESSIVENESS OF SUBORDERS
OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE**

Anna Yu. Smirnova

Saratov State University,
83, Astrakhanskaya Street, Saratov, Russia
Anna-smirnova-sgu@mail.ru

Liudmila N. Aksenovskaya

Saratov State University,
83, Astrakhanskaya Street, Saratov, Russia
liudmila_aksenovskaya@mail.ru

Abstract

The purpose of the article is to clarify the psychometric properties of the scale of diagnostic of the degree of expressiveness of suborders of organizational culture. The cross-sectoral design data (N=85) collected in industrial enterprises. The average years of employees includes into research is 48.9. Correlation analyses, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses revealed the existence of the family, army and church suborders and the validity of the scale of diagnostic of the degree of expressiveness of suborders of organizational culture (The Cronbach alpha 0,784, 0,822, 0,800). The management interaction determining the formation of a family suborders is characterized by such features of management style of managers as trust of subordinates, delegation of responsibilities, creation of a team, good knowledge of managers of their subordinates, encouragement for well-executed work and people orientation, openness and friendliness of managers in relation to staff, the desire to interact with people, the ability to establish contact and understand personal needs of employees. For the army suborder (it is dominant in our sample), the managerial activity is focus on controlling function, following the schedule, striving for detailed fulfillment of the task, knowledge of the organization's policy, detailed planning of the work process. The church suborder is characterized by the trust of subordinates to managers, good

relationships based on trust. The trust relationships inherent in the church suborder allows to get better results from the work of the staff, to join the group to solve complex tasks, to avoid conflicts, and to regulate it effectively if it is arise.

Key words: organizational culture, order diagnostics, validity, managerial skills.

The development of scales of social-psychological diagnostics of organizational culture is an important theoretical and practical challenge to organization psychology. Causes of high interest to the measuring organizational culture techniques, on the one hand, is in the complexity and conceptual ambiguity of the phenomenon of organizational culture, and on the other hand, in the interdependence between the long term effectiveness of the organization and the characteristics of its organizational culture [1, 2, 3]. This explains the persistent interest of researchers and practitioners to the measuring the features of organizational culture techniques, as these technique let to make a prediction about the impact of the culture on the success of the organization and its competitive abilities in changing economic environment [4, 5, 6].

Widely used socio-psychological scales of diagnostics of organizational culture are characterized by two main features: 1. the multidisciplinary. The socio-psychological techniques (G. Hofstede [7, 8]; E. Schein [9]; R. Ruttiger [10]) used simultaneously with managerial (K.S. Cameron, P.E. Quinn [11], F. Trompenaars [12] and anthropological (K. Geertz [13]) scales; 2. a wide methodological frame (quantitative, qualitative and mixed (qualitative-quantitative) methods). Each of it methodological standards has its own expectations for the exploration of the validity of social psychological techniques [14].

The impact of this study is in the quantitative approach to the validation of the order scale for the diagnosis of the degree of organizational culture suborder`s predominance. It should be noted that order approach to the organizational culture is mostly qualitative [15, 16]. The scale of diagnostic of the degree of expressiveness of suborders of organizational culture demonstrates good results of validation in qualitative paradigm [17]. The results of a study of the validity of the order scale

within the quantitative paradigm presents for the first time. The scale of diagnostic of the degree of expressiveness of suborders of organizational culture presents in this article is the part of the group of order techniques of socially-psychological diagnostics of organizational culture, developed by L.N. Aksenovskaya [17]. The theoretical basis of the techniques is order approach to the organizational culture [15, 16].

The definition of the Organizational culture in the Order approach is follows “Complicated socio-psychological order of organizational and managerial interactions that are constituted and regulated by systems of ethical senses of participants of interactions” [18, p. 10].

Within order approach there are three main models of managerial interaction, situational used by each participant in the management activities. They are metaphorically labeled as the “parent”, “commander” and “pastoral” model of managerial interaction. The senses dominant “parental” model of managerial interaction – caring about the emotional and value unity of organization, “commander” – caring about the goal-oriented unity of organization and “pastoral” model – caring about the sense unite of organization. Each model of managerial interaction generates a specific aspect/suborder of organizational culture The “Family”, the “Army” and the “Church” [16].

The order model of organizational culture is the basis of the set of techniques of order diagnosis of organizational culture. The managerial interaction is the main parameter that generates a three types (suborder) of organizational culture (“Family”, “Army”, “Church”). The model includes three levels: the leader`s personality level, the management team level, and the organization level. Each level is diagnosed using two techniques and, therefore, complete set of order diagnostic techniques includes six scales. The most used ones today are: the scale of diagnosis of the 1) the scale of diagnostic of the degree of expressiveness of suborders of organizational culture, 2) the scale of diagnostic of the degree of formation of suborders of organizational culture, (both use for organizational level) 3) The scale of diagnostic of the Degree of

expressiveness of order characteristics in the leader`s personality, 4) Soteriological scale of the diagnostic of degree of formation of leadership attributes [17].

This article presents our study that is devoted to the validation of the scale of diagnostic of the degree of expressiveness of suborders of organizational culture.

The scale is part of the system of order diagnosis of organizational culture, developed in accordance with the methodological principles of the humanistic paradigm of psychology, which is based on refusal from the cult of empirical methods; recognition of the scientific not only verified knowledge; legalization of the intuition of the researcher; the possibility of generalizations on the basis of the case study; unity of research and practical impact; the study of an integral personality included into the “life context”, the quality research methods prevalence [15].

The diagnostic of the degree of expressiveness of suborders of organizational culture in its nature is a research interview of a psychologist with participants in the diagnostic procedure, more often individual, in which the questionnaires given in this article (six sheets in total, appendix 1) use as a scheme for the semi-structured interview. The dialogue lets to discuss the related to the statements of the scale issues problematic in details. This ensures the capacity and completeness of order diagnostics, while the numerical estimate, allows to compare the degree of organizational culture suborder`s dominance at different levels of organizational hierarchy. During the collection and the processing the data, the following are taken into account: a) indexes, b) comments on these indexes, c) observation results during the interview [17]. Thus, the combination of a qualitative approach and quantitative approach makes it possible to obtain the data that gives an opportunity for the comprehensive analysis of the features of organizational culture and the problems of managerial interaction of the organization. Thus, the scale combines the methods of individual and group interviews; group discussion on the issue of the desired state of the corporate culture and the ways to change it. However, the latter is not considered in the present article, because only the actual level of organization culture development can be the subjected to the validation procedure, and if this part of the

scale is valid and reliable, both part of the scale (for the diagnosis of the current (actual) state of culture and the scale for the diagnosis of the future (desirable) state of culture are valid.

The described scale was developed by the authors with a detailed theoretical study of the constructs for the measurement of which it is intended, in accordance with the principles of designing psycho diagnostic techniques. The purpose of the validated scale is: a) to diagnose the current and future (desirable) state of each cultural hierarchical level of the organization; b) to identify mismatch in the culture in a different levels of the organizational hierarchy, and also the planning the ways of leading the cultural characteristics of these levels closer to the culture of the leader (vision). The following methodological principles of the hermeneutic paradigm are realized in the present study: systemic; unity of diagnosis and change; a combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches with a dominant of qualitative analysis [17]. The scales was validated in accordance with the standards of qualitative research and widely use in the organizational psychology practice, however, its validation in a quantitative context was first presented in this article.

Structure of the scale

The scale consists of six questionnaires: the functional meaning of the leader`s activity, 2) beliefs (about the organization, the attitude to the organization, the attitude of the organization to the employee, the attitude to the work, the attitude to the leaders, the attitude to the colleagues, the attitude to the subordinates, the attitude to the organizational rules); 3) the predominant model of managerial interaction (subordinate-leader); 4) the psychological climate (the impact of each suborders into the formation of the socio-psychological climate); 5) interaction of leaders; 6) the dominant suborder. The 10-point scale (from 1 to 10) use for accessing of each statement of the scale. At the same time interviewee can comment the statement. These comments provides the important information for qualitative analysis [19], but they cannot be taken into account in the quantitative approach. In the quantitative

approach, the priority for the analysis is the sum of the indexes of the statements of the questionnaires relating to each of the three suborders (“family”, “army” and “church”), and its mixes.

Organization and results of empirical research

The validation of the methodology presented in this article included: analysis of reliability-internal consistency (The Cronbach alpha). The results of the reliability are presented in Table 1. The exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis were used to explore the factor structure of the scale. The convergent and discriminant validity of the scale was assessed by correlation analysis.

The empirical sample consisted of managers of different hierarchical levels (the participants of the training for managers), a total of 85 (women 12, men 73) people, the average age of 48.9 years.

Another scales used in the present study: Wilson's survey of management practices [20]. The reliability of the order scale gives in the Table 1.

Table 1.

The Reliability-Internal Consistency of the Scale of Diagnostic of the Degree of Expressiveness of Suborders of Organizational Culture

Suborder name	Cronbach alpha	Alpha Cronbach based on standardized items	Dispersion	M	SD	Alpha Cronbach when the item is removed
Family	.784	.831	94.250	45.85	9.708	.748-.792*
Army	.822	.825	109.392	110.44	10.459	.801-.832
Church	.800	.81	38.508	23.06	6.206	.777-.813

The exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis were used to explore the factor structure of the scale. The results of the exploratory factor analysis (using questionnaire 2 (Table 2) revealed five factors: three suborders (“family”, “army” and

“church”), as well as two or three its mixes. Analysis of the model fit quality based on the value of the agreement criterion for the 5-factor model: Chi-square = 198.0 ($p \leq 0.041$ is in the zone of uncertainty). The chi-square for the 6-factor model is 162,350, ($p \leq .08$). The method of factorization is the maximum likelihood. Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser normalization, factors were extracted based on its own value.

Table 2.

Analysis of the Factor Structure of the of the Scale of Diagnostic of the Degree of Expressiveness of Suborders of Organizational Culture

Parameter	Factor				
	“Church”	“Armed Family”	“Army”	“Faithful Commanders”	“Family”
My leaders help me become a stronger specialist and a more mature personality	.668	-.229			.265
Work (about attitudes toward organization) is the meaning of my life	.647				
Enterprise is an organization that for me is almost like a religion (the meaning of my life)	.595				.179
Enterprise - second home	.546	.321			
Work (about attitudes toward work) is the meaning of my life	.542		-.385		.162
Basic rules of the enterprise: Accepting each other Mutual support Tolerance towards each other Loyal attitude to the organization	.451	.131		-.425	.347
Fundamental rules: Consensus and Unanimity Striving for excellence in everything Constant gaining of all new supporters The maximum coincidence of what we like and what we are (the coincidence of our ideals and our behavior)	.387	.149	-.324	.102	.104

Parameter	Factor				
	“Church”	“Armed Family”	“Army”	“Faithful Commanders”	“Family”
The enterprise is a circle of people. in the work with which you acquire the meaning of life and are constantly improving	.375		.22	-.138	
Equal to me on the situation in the organization are my companions and like-minded people in my life and work	.353		-.148	-.259	.332
Basic rules of the enterprise: Discipline Smartness Functionality of relations and orders Subordination	-.298	.737		.38	
Enterprise - the front line at the front of economic warfare		.65	.168		-.212
My leaders set me tasks and demanded for results	.187	.465			.132
Enterprise - an organization that “applies” me to solve professional problems	-.334	.326	.805	.298	.21
Work is an exciting struggle against unresolved problems	-.158	.468	.591		-.325
My subordinates are my colleagues who believed in me and who along with me along the professional and life pathway		-.146	-.481	.259	0.157
Enterprise is an organization that I respect	.282	.338	.394	.214	
My leaders teach and support me			-.275	-.206	.195
Work - this is a big. but not the only part of life				-.617	
My subordinates are my soldiers. who exactly and promptly must carry out my orders	-.179	.223		.526	
Equal to me on the situation in the organization focused on solving their problems	.162			.352	
My subordinates are younger brothers and sisters (sometimes children). with whom there is a lot of “messaging around”. so that they do the necessary	.154		-.235	.39	.645
Enterprise is an organization to which I feel grateful	.358			-.288	.491
Enterprise is an organization that supports me					.446

Further, to confirm the presence of the family, army and church suborders, we used confirmatory factor analysis of the structure of the scale (questionnaire 2).

The results of confirmatory factor analysis are presented in Table 3.

Because of the small size of the empirical sample, we explore the validity of each suborder (“family”, “army” and “church”) constructing three confirmatory models.

Table 3.

The Results of Confirming the Validity of the Scale for the Diagnosis of the Degree of Organizational Culture Suborder`s by Means of Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Parameter	“Family”	“Army”	“Church”
χ^2	21.965	22.499	24.841
df	18	18	20
CMIN/DF	1.220	1.250	1.242
p =	.234	.211	.208
GFI	.935	.940	.932
ACFI	.870	.881	.878
RMR	.168	.148	.060
CFI	.947	.965	.952
RMSEA	.051	.055	.054
LO 90	.000	.000	.000
HI 90	.115	.117	.114
PCLOSE	.447	.418	.426
TLI	.917	.945	.933
NVT	4.7	4.7	5.3
HOELTER	111-134	108-130	107-128
number of explicit parameters of the model (P)	8	8	8
Assessment of normality	.955	.955	2.824
Statement 8 ***	.617 ***	.604***	.442***
Statement 7	.306 (0.020)	.374 (002)	.127 (.317)
Statement 6	.574***	.055 (.631)	.439***
Statement 5	.155 (264)	.231 (.058)	.732***

Parameter	“Family”	“Army”	“Church”
Statement 4	.345 (.013)	.704***	.615***
Statement 3	.254 (.063)	.850***	.639***
Statement 2	.799 ***	.410***	.605***
Statement 1	.110 (.390)	.681***	.309 (.012)

Note: significant are marked ***

The ratio of the sample size (N) to the number of parameters to be evaluated (T) – the number of parameters to be evaluated for the “family”, “army” and “church” models is 4.7 (“family” and “army”) and 5.3 for the “church” model, estimated by the formula $T = P(P + 1) / 2 - df$, reaches an extremely small value, but is less than 10, so the most stringent criteria must be use for making decisions about model feet [21].

The data presented in the table show that the values of the model feet criteria for the models “family”, “army”, “church” (chi-square, df, CMIN/df, GFI, AGFI, CFI, RMSEA, PCLOSE) are within the permissible values even taking into account the smallness of the sample. So, GFI is more than 0.9, and for the army model it is 0.94 that is high, especially given the sample size, since this indicator tends to increase as the sample increases and, on the contrary, underestimate the model based on a small empirical sample. The RMR values of the analyzed models range from 0.06, which is also a good value, although the HOELTER does not reach 200, above 75, which is a good indicator in combination with the chi-square values. Considered as free from the size of the CFI sample in all three of the suborders models above 0.9, RMSEA ranges from 0.05 to 0.06, which indicates a good fit of the model. While the lower 90% confidence limit of RMSEA is very close to 0, and the upper one is slightly higher than 0.1, and PCLOSE is above 0.05, which confirms acceptable RMSEA values. The value of this indicator for us is, perhaps, the most important in the assessment of the quality of the model [21, p. 350]. The statistical insignificance of the individual statements of the scale, which is found in the standardized regression weight, in our opinion, is an indicator of the unformed organizational-

cultural suborders and the need to form a stronger and a coherent organizational culture. Thus, the existence of the “family”, “army” and “church” suborders are empirically confirmed.

Exploration of the convergent and discriminate validity of the scale was carried out on the basis of the correlation analysis, which is selectively presented in Table 4, as well as an analysis of the correlations of the results of this scales with Wilson`s scales.

Table 4.

The Results of the Correlation Analysis of the Statements of the Scale

	Parameter	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Beliefs, Family Suborder (Questionnaire 2)	1	-.196	.546**	.658**	-.002	.252*
2	Beliefs, the army suborder (Questionnaire 2)	-.196	1	-.296**	-.278**	.379**	-.330**
3	Beliefs, the Church Suborder (Questionnaire 2)	.546**	-.296**	1	.466**	-.133	.476**
4	Psychological climate, suborder “Family” (Questionnaire No. 4)	.658**	-.278**	.466**	1	-.230*	.277*
5	Psychological climate, suborder “Army” (Questionnaire No. 4)	-.002	.379**	-.133	-.230*	1	-.292**
6	Psychological climate, suborder “Church” (Questionnaire No. 4)	.252*	-.330**	.476**	.277*	-.292**	1
7	Functional meaning of activities, family suborder (Questionnaire No. 1)	.522**	-.221*	.366**	.653**	-.273*	.240*
8	Functional meaning of activities, suborder “Army” (Questionnaire No. 1)	.038	.320**	-.114	-.112	.876**	-.250*
9	Functional meaning of the activity, the church suborder (Questionnaire No. 1)	.186	-.249*	.425**	.194	-.197	.585**
10	Dominant model of managerial interaction, family suborder (Questionnaire 3)	.678**	-.200	.410**	.516**	.046	.204
11	The dominant model of managerial interaction, the army suborder (Questionnaire 3)	-.186	.464**	-.262*	-.139	.116	-.194
12	The dominant model of managerial interaction, the church suborder (Questionnaire 3)	.268*	-.196	.550**	.130	-.160	.460**
13	Interaction of leaders, family suborder (Questionnaire 5)	.391**	-.103	.331**	.496**	-.046	.227*

	Parameter	1	2	3	4	5	6
14	Interaction of leaders, army suborder (Questionnaire 5)	-.004	.357**	-.066	-.235*	.701**	-.228*
15	Interaction of the leaders, the church suborder (Questionnaire 5)	-.019	.112	.118	-.131	.059	.024
16	Dominant Suborder Family (Questionnaire 6)	.658**	-.278**	.466**	1.000**	-.230*	.277*
17	Dominant suborder army (Questionnaire 6)	-.002	.379**	-.133	-.230*	1.000**	-.292**
18	The dominant suborder church (Questionnaire 6)	.252*	-.330**	.476**	.277*	-.292**	1.000**

Note: ** correlation is significant at 0.001, * correlation is significant at 0.05;

As can be seen from Table 3, the correlation of the statements within the factors is higher than the correlation between the factors. Correlations between the statements of various factors are low or absent, which confirms the three-factor structure of the scale.

Table 5.

The Results of the Correlation Analysis of the Relationship between the Expression of Subordinates and the Features of the Management Style

Parameter	Family Suborder	Army suborder	The Church suborder
Family Suborder	1	-.201	.530**
Army suborder	-.201	1	-.343**
The Church suborder	.530**	-.343**	1
Management skills (general, assessment by Wilson's scale)	.222*	.270*	.334**
Clarification of goals and objectives	.044	-.039	.226*
Relationships (Involvement of subordinates in decision-making)	.074	-.028	.525**
Careful workflow planning	-.002	.398**	-.117
Competence manager	-.039	.563**	-.153
Ensuring the necessary working conditions	-.112	.464**	-.130
Feedback	-.013	.039	.147
Time control	-.117	.618**	-.206
Inspection of parts	-.067	.336**	-.049

Parameter	Family Suborder	Army suborder	The Church suborder
Motivation of the goal	-.181	.088	.010
Delegation of responsibilities	.322**	-.231*	.494**
Encouragement for a job well done	.269*	-.050	.278*
Focus on people	.249*	.155	.413**
Creating a Team	.304**	.020	.265*
Interest in the official growth of subordinates	.093	-.085	.231*
Trust of subordinates	.511**	.023	.369**

Note: ** correlation is significant at 0.001, * correlation is significant at 0.05;

Discussion

The “church” subordinate demonstrates the strong correlations with the overall level of development of managerial skills. This corresponds to the assumption of the order concept of organizational culture that the “church” suborder is the most perfect in comparison with the “army” and “family” and is formed last in the process of development of organizational culture. According to the correlation analysis presented in Table 5, management interaction determining the formation of a “family” suborders is characterized by such features of management style of managers as trust of subordinates, delegation of responsibilities, creation of a team, good knowledge of managers of their subordinates, encouragement for well-executed work and people orientation, openness and friendliness of managers in relation to staff, the desire to interact with people, the ability to establish contact and understand personal needs of employees.

It is noteworthy that the “parent managers” in our sample do not have an interest in the official growth of their subordinates, which is contrary to our assumptions about the orientation of the “family” suborder to social reproduction, perhaps such results can be explained by the insufficient administrative responsibility of the manager in our sample, in this case instrumental activity of the manager, which should include the providing the facilities for professional and career development of the staff, tend to replace these practice being people-oriented, goodness in

interpersonal relations in the team. However, this is only one possible explanation that requires additional empirical verification. It is worth taking into account the specifics of the industry in which the research was conducted, the low speed of career development in it, and other organizational factors.

For the “army” suborder (it is dominant in our sample), the managerial activity is focus on controlling function, following the schedule, striving for detailed fulfillment of the task, knowledge of the organization's policy, detailed planning of the work process. The organization of work without failures, careful planning of the work process, does not exclude the leader's ability to discuss the managerial decisions and use the ideas of employees. This item reflects the manager's ability to encourage subordinates to participate in the planning and decision-making process, allows for its better understanding of the situation in the group. Although “commanders” are tends to avoid delegation of authority in general, delegation of all or part of the task to the hands of subordinates is not typical.

The “church” suborder is characterized by trust, good relationships, a sense of the importance of the task, encouragement for a job well done. That managerial practice and communication build the “church” suborder. The interaction with subordinates in it involves subordinates in decision-making, provides the opportunity to put forward ideas. Recognition of work performed, praise, reward. “Pastors” willingly and generously shears their gratitude to the working group. “Pastors” always widely uses different forms of non-material motivation for the task performed, if they have not the opportunity to increase the salaries of staff. This managerial practice, as Wilson suggests, provides moral satisfaction for people from work and a good relationship between managers and staff. This is justified from the point of view of the social exchange theory, perceived organizational support, goes in the context of assumptions of the order concept of organizational culture, however, special measurements of the level of subjective well-being of staff and other characteristics evidencing the psychological form of workers in this study have not been carried out considered as a limitation of this research, at the same time, the

development of this topic will be the task of our further research. The suborder is also characterized by the delegation of authority, the transfer of all or part of the task to the hands of subordinates. This is a very important feature in the management practice of managers of the “church” suborder. The skill of delegation is balanced with an explanation of goals and objectives, which should be the case according to Wilson's concept. Thus, “pastor”, through rational delegation, unobtrusively controlling and training staff, acquiring competent “followers”. It is noteworthy that the delegation of authority and responsibility is characterizes for the “church” and family suborders, at the same time, commanders tends to minimize delegation in their managerial practice. The “church” suborder is characterized by the trust of subordinates to managers, good relationships based on trust. The trust relationships inherent in the “church” suborder allows to get better results from the work of the staff, to join the group to solve complex tasks, to avoid conflicts, and to regulate it effectively if it is arise. A distinctive feature of the “church” suborder is the interest of managers in the subordinates career development, the creation of the opportunity for the professional development, the definition of the tasks before the group in such manners that allow the subordinates to learn something and develop professionally. Thus, the analysis of the correlations of managerial skills using the Wilson method and the features of the suborders in the order concept of the organizational culture confirms both theoretically and empirically the “family”, “army” and “church” suborders and the validity of the scale of diagnostic of the degree of expressiveness of suborders of organizational culture.

Conclusions

Analysis of reliability-internal consistency by calculating Cronbach's alpha showed that the technique is reliable.

Analysis of the factor structure of the techniques using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis confirmed the presence of three suborders in the organizational culture.

The correlation analysis showed convergent validity and discriminant validity of the scale of diagnostic of the degree of expressiveness of suborders of organizational culture.

Analysis of the correlations between the results of the scale of diagnostic of the degree of expressiveness of suborders of organizational culture and Test of management skills of Wilson aimed to identify features of the management style that is meaningful and empirically (quantitatively) confirmed the theoretical validity of the allocation of “family”, “army” and “church” suborders and the validity of the scale.

Summarizing the above, it can be concluded that, despite the attribution of the order scale to the qualitative methodological standard, where the application of the methodology reveals characteristics of the culture, the scale of diagnostic of the degree of expressiveness of suborders of organizational culture can also be applied in a quantitative research strategy, since it demonstrated its validity and reliability, however, its application in this aspect has certain limitations, since only without a qualitative interpretation of the dialogue between the researcher and the respondent, significantly, in our opinion, narrows the scope of the study.

References

- [1] Anderson C., Spataro S.E.; Flynn F.J. (2008). Personality and Organizational Culture as Determinants of Influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol. 93. N 3. Pp. 702-710.
- [2] Bloor G., Dawson P. (1994). Understanding Professional Culture in Organizational Context. *Organization Studies*. № 15. Pp. 275 – 295.
- [3] Cohen A. (2007). One Nation, Many Cultures: A Cross-Cultural Study of the Relationship between Personal Cultural Values and Commitment in the Workplace to In-Role Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Cross-Cultural Research*. № 41. Pp. 273 – 300.
- [4] Chao G.T., Moon H. (2005). The Cultural Mosaic: A Metatheory for Understanding the Complexity of Culture. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol. 90. N 6. Pp. 1128-1140.
- [5] Basten F.M.R.C (2001). The Role of Metaphors in (Re)producing Organizational Culture. *Advances in Developing Human Resource*. № 3. Pp. 344 – 354.

- [6] Bastien D.T (1992). Change in Organizational Culture: The Use of Linguistic Methods in a Corporate Acquisition. *Management Communication Quarterly*. № 5. Pp. 403 – 442.
- [7] Hofstede G. (2001). *Culture`s Consequences: comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA. 596 p.
- [8] Hofstede G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>. (Accessed 02, December, 2017)
- [9] Schein E.H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed). San Francisco, John Wiley & Son. 437 p.
- [10] Ruttinger R. (1992). *Culture of entrepreneurship*. Moscow: ECOM. 240 p. (in Russian).
- [11] Cameron K.S, Quinn P.E. (2001). *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture Based on The Competing Values Framework*. Sankt Petersburg: Piter. 320 p. (in Russian).
- [12] Trompenaars F., Hampden-Turner C. (2004). *National-cultural differences in the context of global business: popular science ed*. Minsk: Potpourri. 528 p. (in Russian).
- [13] Geertz K. (2004). *Interpretation of Cultures*. Moscow: ROSSPEN. 560 p. (in Russian).
- [14] Melnikova O.G., Horoshilov D.A. (2015). Strategies for the Validation of Qualitative Research in Psychology. *Psychological research*. Vol. 8 N 44. Pp. 1-7. Available at: <http://psystudy.ru/eng/2015-vol-8-issue-44/1219-melnikova44e> (Accessed 02, December, 2017).
- [15] Aksenovskaya L.N. (2005). *The Order Concept of Organizational Culture: the Issues of Methodology*. Saratov: Publishing House of the SSU. 348 p. (in Russian).
- [16] Aksenovskaya L.N. (2007). *Order Model of Organizational Culture*. Moscow: Academic project. 303 p. (in Russian).
- [17] Aksenovskaya L.N. (2016). *Order Organizational Culture Diagnostics*. Saratov: Nauka. 190 p. (in Russian).
- [18] Aksenovskaya L.N., Nesterova K.S. (2017). *English-Russian Dictionary of the Order Approach to the Social Psychological Study of Organizational Culture*. Saratov: Nauka. P.10 (in Russian).
- [19] Ulanovsky A. (2008). Phenomenology as a Style of Research and Practice. *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art*. Ed. by Y. Zinchenko & V. Petrenko. Moscow: Department of Psychology, MSU & IG-SOCIN (in Russian).
- [20] Chiker V.A. (2004). *Psychological Diagnostics of the Organization and Staff*. Sankt Petersburg: Rech. 176 p. (in Russian).

[21]Nasledov A.N. (2013). *IBM SPSS Statistics 20 and AMOS: Professional Statistical Analysis of Data*. Sankt Petersburg: Piter. 416 p. (in Russian).

Appendix 1.

The example of the Order Diagnostic Questionnaire statement

Beliefs

№№	At present time		Must be	
I believe that				
About organization	a)	Company is my second home.		Company is my second home.
	b)	Company is at the front line of the economic war.		Company is at the front line of the economic war.
	c)	Company is a circle of people with whom you gain the meaning of life and constantly perfect yourself.		Company is a circle of people with whom you gain the meaning of life and constantly perfect yourself.
	d)	Other.		Other.