

4. **Kolesnikov V. A.** From the changing world to the renewed paradigm of education // Philosophy of education. – 2005. – no. 3 (14). – pp. 27–33.
5. **Petrov V. V.** Innovative approaches to education in the context of the emerging knowledge society // Philosophy of education. – 2005. – no. 4 (29). – pp. 81–87.
6. **Liga M. B.** A culture oriented paradigm of modern education // Philosophy of Education. – 2006. – no. 2 (16). – pp. 62–66.

UDK 13 + 316.7 + 39

RUSSIAN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST: ETHNOGRAPHIC APPROACH

V. V. Lygdenova (Novosibirsk, Russia)

***Abstract.** In the article the comparative analysis of Japanese, Chinese, American, German and Russian organizational cultures is carried out. The role of Russian organizational culture on the global scale is revealed. The author assumes and proves that Russian organizational culture should be developed according to the Eastern model because of their orientation to traditions and similarity of their values.*

***Key words:** Organizational culture, organization, education, globalization, values, ethnographic approach.*

РОССИЙСКАЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИОННАЯ КУЛЬТУРА МЕЖДУ ВОСТОКОМ И ЗАПАДОМ: ЭТНОГРАФИЧЕСКИЙ ПОДХОД

В. В. Лыгденова (Новосибирск, Россия)

***Резюме.** В статье проводится сравнительный анализ японской, китайской, американской, немецкой и российской организационных культур. Выявляется роль российской организационной культуры на международном уровне. Автор предполагает и доказывает, что наиболее близкой для российской организационной культуры является восточная, так как обе культуры ориентированы на сохранение традиций и имеют общие ценностные ориентиры.*

Lygdenova Victoria Vasilyevna is a researcher, Ph.D., Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography, Siberian Branch of Russian Academy of Science, Novosibirsk, Russia.

E-mail: victoria.lygdenova@gmail.com

Лыгденова Виктория Васильевна – научный инженер-исследователь, кандидат философских наук, Институт археологии и этнографии СО РАН, Новосибирск, Россия.

Ключевые слова: *Организационная культура, организация, образование, глобализация, этнографический подход.*

The purpose of the article is to reveal and describe the characteristics and differences between Eastern and Western organizational cultures and to compare them with Russian organizational culture. We are going to use ethnographic approach for the analysis of Eastern and Western organizational cultures. The choice of China and Japan for Eastern organizational cultures, and USA and Germany as the examples of Western organizational culture is explained by their achievements in modern global economy. Thus, in the present research the choice of countries depends on cultural and economic factors rather than on geographical location.

Ethnographic approach for organizational culture analysis was developed by the Dutch researcher G. Hofstede. G. Hofstede identifies five categories of value analysis in an organizational culture: “power distance”, “individualism-collectivism”, “masculinity-femininity”, “uncertainty avoidance” and “long term/short term orientation” [Hofstede, 1997]. The first category of “power distance” suggests equal or unequal distribution of power in the organization. Low “power distance” assumes its proportional allocation, equality of rights and respect, fair reward and punishment. High “power distance” represents its unequal distribution, hierarchy of rights, asymmetry in the relationship, rewards and punishments are made with regards to age, rank, status, title and seniority. The second category of “individualism-collectivism” is based on the orientation of the individual on him/herself or on the team.

“Individualistic culture” means that people prefer to act as individuals rather than as members of any group. Individualistic culture is characterized by the following features: employees do not want any invasion into their privacy, avoid guardianship and they usually take all responsibility for their decisions. Collective community requires greater emotional dependence on the members of the organization and more responsibility of the management for their employees. In a collectivist culture workers expect that the organization will deal with their personal affairs and protect their interests. Interaction in the organization is based on members’ responsibility and loyalty. Social networks within an organization are characterized by solidarity, relations between management and workers are usually based on personal relationships. The third criterion of “femininity-masculinity” represents the degree of equality in the gender roles. For organizations this factor reflects the orientation of the staff to achieve goals or perform tasks.

In masculine organizational cultures there are several dominant values: self-actualization, career, high ambition, fierce competition, and respect to power. In “feminine” cultures the following values are in priority: constant attention of the management to employees, good relationships, reluctance to compete, and sympathy for losers. In masculine organizations the conflict is described as open

confrontation. In “feminine” organizations it is often hidden, and the solution is carried out by compromise and negotiation. The fourth category of “uncertainty avoidance” characterizes the perception of indefinite action in an organization as menacing and confusing, leading to resistance to new and unknown, to focus on compromise and safety. The fifth category of “long-term orientation” defines orientation for the future and desire to save and accumulate in the tenacity and perseverance while achieving goals. Short-term orientation is characterized by the orientation and respect for tradition and social obligations.

Chinese and Japanese types of organizational culture

According to G. Hofstede, the criteria of East Asian organizational culture are characterized by the long-term projects orientation. Chinese strategy for decision-making is the brightest example of it. The level of individualism in Asian countries is significantly lower than in Western cultures.

1) High power distance.

Among other criteria we should specify high power distance in Japanese and Chinese organizational cultures. Moreover, this type of control is characterized by centralization and vertical hierarchy. The most imaginative definition of such type of organization is given by N. Machiavelli in his book “The Prince”, where he metaphorically describes two models of power as a fox and a lion. He says that a prudent leader must use such tactics that is appropriate for the situation and time: the cunning fox to avoid traps, and the strength of the lion to frighten wolves. We can say that tactics of the fox is typical for the countries with low power-distance, and the tactics of the lion is usual for the countries with high power-distance. China and Japan have high power distance because of the traditional Eastern organizational structure where the leader is authoritative towards subordinates.

2) High level of uncertainty avoidance.

In Japanese and Chinese organizational cultures risk taking is mostly avoided, and that fact shows high level of uncertainty avoidance in Eastern organizations. This parameter indicates their preference to structure and to comply with certain rules. Long-term orientation proves their desire for certainty and clarity of the situation in their organizations. These parameters are associated with conservatism and the purpose to preserve traditions in the society. G. Hofstede suggests that in the countries with high uncertainty avoidance demands for clear rules and regulations are connected with emotions [Hofstede, 1997, pp. 110–111].

3) Masculinity.

As for Japanese and Chinese organizational cultures they are characterized by “masculinity” that is inherent in the spirit of competition, ambition and toughness in decision-making. It is interesting that Japan, according to the study, is the highest “masculine” ranking country among all Eastern and Western organizations. Such characteristic determines the style of a collectivist organization where the entire team strives to achieve its plans and is aimed to the greatest efficiency.

4) High level of long-term orientation.

China is characterized by the highest level of long-term orientation which is associated with the peculiarities of Chinese-style culture. As stated above, the Chinese management's focus on long-term strategy is especially important in the process of decision-making. Long-term planning also characterizes Japanese organizational culture. The high level of long-term orientation is probably related with high uncertainty avoidance in these organizations.

5) Collectivism.

G. Hofstede reveals the lowest level of individualism in the Chinese organization among other Eastern Asian countries which is connected not only with the Confucian principles of collectivism but also with the communist ideology-oriented collectivism. The low level of individualism means that the Chinese organization is characterized by close relationships in a group where everyone is responsible for other members. In addition, Japanese organizational culture is determined by collectivism, and this value is associated with conservatism and traditionalism of Japanese culture.

Thus, the national characteristic of the Japanese and Chinese organizational cultures are mainly similar. Their values, such as high power distance, collectivism and high uncertainty avoidance are interrelated. We can assume that they describe the core values of the East Asian organization. However, such features as long term strategy orientation and collectivism determine Chinese organizations, and these values are connected with historical and cultural development of China: Confucianism, communism, and the early development of Chinese civilization. Japanese organizational culture also has unique characteristic such as concern about its reputation in the group, high contextuality, the purpose to preserve traditions.

American and European types of organizational culture

According to G. Hofstede, Western organizational culture is defined by such a value as individualism and it is widely represented in the USA, Australia, Britain, the Netherlands, Canada and Italy. The U.S. is among the most masculine organizational cultures as well as Japan. At the same time, in Western Europe the German organizational culture is the most masculine. It is suggested that in the US and in Germany ambition, desire for competition and aggression towards the goal achievement are basic value orientations in the employees' behavior. The U.S. and Western Europe are characterized by low power distance, so the communication between members of the hierarchy in these organizations is mostly informal. Western Europe has higher degree of uncertainty avoidance than the U.S. European organizational culture has higher rejection of risky situations than American organizational culture. American and Western European leaders primarily focus on short-term projects unlike Asian companies. Thus, value orientations in Western Europe and in the U.S. are primarily similar. W. Ouchi compares American organizational culture with Japanese organizational values

and he assumes that in the U.S. more attention is traditionally paid to technology development, automation and management techniques, and the “human factor” is regarded as evident there [Ouchi, 1991]. In comparison with American values, Western European organizational culture has higher levels of uncertainty avoidance and lower levels of individualism. The parameters of high degree of uncertainty avoidance and low power distance in German organizational culture are close to Russian organizational values. Opposite to the U.S. and Russia, in Western European organizational culture more attention is paid to the social support programs. Such value priorities can be explained by the fact that the employment communications in Western Europe are mostly arranged by partnership relations, the economics is based on a system of detailed legal documents under which employees, employers and the state are treated as partners. European organizational culture is also characterized by workers’ participation in the enterprise management. Religion has had an important factor in European institutional culture development. For instance, M. Weber identifies relationship between concepts “Spirit of capitalism” and “Protestant ethics” [Weber, 1943]. The first type is used to describe Western religious values, and the second is used for the analysis of those values that determine the nature of economics in Western Europe. According to M. Weber, Protestantism has had a great influence on the “spirit of capitalism” formation. Such values as pursuit of life and the accumulation of assets are identified as key factors in Protestant ethics. M. Weber cites the example of a significant predominance of Protestants among entrepreneurs, and he also considers “materialism” of Protestant ideology in comparison with the Catholic asceticism. Thus, organizational culture of Protestant countries provides a clearly defined “capitalist spirit”, whose basic principles are expressed in the works of Benjamin Franklin. Monetary benefits, capital accumulation, time accuracy, punctuality, thrift, and morality of Western rationalism define the Western entrepreneur. Most of these values characterize the American and European (Germany, Britain, France) organizational culture. M. Weber proves that the fundamental socio-economic developments in Western Europe would not have happened without the creation of the new capitalism ethics.

An analysis of the socialism influences on the Russians’ attitude towards work ethics was carried by V. S. Magun, who, as a result of his sociological studies, concluded that the ideology of Soviet society was in many ways similar to Protestant ethics, including augmentation of the property: “The neglect of personal interests of the employee is described in Soviet texts by the idea that there is a public ownership of product means, all citizens are owners, and as a result their personal (private) interests and social purposes coincide”. The author concludes that “under socialism people, in fact, always worked for themselves” [Magun, 1998, pp. 113–144]. However, as far as the concepts of “private” and “public” property are different concepts, there are certain differences between Protestant and socialist organizations in this issue. All in all, Western European organizational culture in many respects is similar to American culture which is associated with

the similar national traditions. The similarity of American and Western European organizational culture can be seen in the management's desire for personal profit as a result of rationally organized production. M. Weber confirms this thesis by the specifics of European business, which are manifested in the presence of a complex and highly formalized accounting that allows both to evaluate the effectiveness of the whole enterprise, and to carry out the distribution of profits among its members. Aspiration of Western culture on rationality may not have a reasonable justification. The methodology of knowledge argues that rationality of judgment is not necessarily a criterion for truth, and that irrationality is not a criterion of falsity. Rationally derived judgments may be false, and irrational judgments can be true. The only criterion of rationality is an argument based on clear and fixed rules-based system. Rational decision making is not always the most effective from a practical point of view, for example, it can be seen in the bureaucratic organization where rites and traditions are sometimes meaningless. Anyway, the quest for rational decision-making in all areas of personal and public life have traditionally been supported by Western leaders as a positive value. Western European and American organizational culture value orientations on rationality are manifested in the establishment of clear rules and in an effort to streamline the interactions of people in the organization. Democratic system of relations and the horizontal hierarchy allow rationalizing decision-making and raising the individual responsibility of each member.

In conclusion it should be noted that the United States and Western Europe, China and Japan have highly effective management systems in the current economic situation despite the differences in values and opposite structure in their organizational cultures. As a result of comparison of Eastern, Western and Russian organizational culture, we conclude that they have many similar features. Being on the periphery of the East and West, the Russian organization combines Eastern paternalism, tendency to authoritarian structure and Western values of democratic relations in the hierarchy and rationalism. As it was mentioned above Japanese and Chinese organizations are guided in their values by traditionalism, which is manifested in teamwork, in their high respect to older people, in compliance with vertical hierarchy, family-like relationships and network structure of business. Russian organization tends towards collectivism and vertical hierarchy which is manifested in the teamwork organizational system and bureaucracy of power. On the other hand, according to the sociological research by A. Naumov, Russian organizational culture is closer to German, Austrian, Swedish and Finnish organizations [Naumov, 2004, pp. 259–303]. These countries found a definite affinity not only with respect to the parameters of “power distance” and “desire for uncertainty avoidance”, but also on other parameters described by G. Hofstede. Thus, it is difficult to give a precise answer to the question of whether Russian organizational culture follows Western or Eastern traditions, but sociological data by A. Naumov confirm the difference between Russian organizations and the American model. Consequently, the American experience in management system

and its model of organization should be adapted to the specifics of the Russian organizational culture. To sum up, we should point out that Russian organizations are closer to Japanese types of organizational culture and the main reason is that American model of governance is primarily represented by individualism, narrow specialization, but Japanese model is based on traditional values of culture, as well as in Russian organization. In our opinion, Russian organizational culture should adopt such qualities of the Japanese and the Chinese organizational culture as high adaptation to new conditions that is revealed in the network structure of their organizations and flexibility in decision making. The examples of China and Japan are useful for our country as alternative models to American type of organizational culture. Collectivist aspirations have helped these countries to achieve high efficiency in their economics. Since the late XX-th century both countries have become eligible for the role of the second world power. Referring to this aspect we should not forget that Russia is a collectivist country. We should also understand the behavior of Japanese firms towards their employees. Active involvement of the company's management into social problems of the group and their care about continuous growth of professional knowledge are instructive models for Russian companies. First of all, it is necessary to develop Russian organizational culture. We should also study and use the ability of Japanese leaders to create motivational environment for enterprises, organizations, civil services, universities, etc. These values and qualities can be accomplished through the provision of employee benefits depending on the results of their labor and skills, effective system of training and education of personnel. There are a lot of specific features in the models of these countries. This fact shows the validity to have specific economic development for Russian organizations. Thus, the needs in modernization of the management model are obvious and it is necessary to identify values of national tradition and culture that are most compatible with modern techniques and management systems. Unclear strategy of the country development makes the process of national model of organization construction more difficult, and it could be the reason of the country development problems in the future.

REFERENCES

- Hofstede G.** (1997) *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. Library of Congress, New York.
- Lygdenova V.** (2010) *The Value System in Russian Organizational Culture: Cultural and Historical Approaches* // *Philosophy of Education*. # 3, May 2010. Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Prague.
- Magun S. V.** (1998) *Russian values: ideology and mass consciousness* // *The world of Russia*, № 4, Moscow. [in Russian]
- Naumov A. I.** (2004) *The influence of the national culture on business management* // *Management: XX century – XXI century: collection of papers* / edited by O. S. Vihanskogo, A. I. Naumova. – Ekonomist, Moscow. [in Russian]

Ouchi W. (1991) Type “Z” Organization: Stability in the Midst of Mobility. – Administrative Science Quarterly, Cornell University.

Weber M. (1947) The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

UDK 37.0 + 316.7

WESTERN AND EASTERN EDUCATION: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

M. S. Ashilova (Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan)

***Abstract.** The article is dedicated to the research of Western and Eastern education, revealing their common and different features between them. Much attention is paid to the disclosure of these issues through the prism of historical, social and spiritual development. It is emphasized that the Eastern education is characterized by strict requirements in fulfilling traditional norms, customs and canons, and a more free search for truth is specific for the West. While the Western education was inclined towards the school uniform of learning, division of school into classes and the assignment of subject teachers, the Eastern education system prefers an individual interactive system. The 21st century and globalization set common objectives for the Western and Eastern systems of education such as: the need of training professionally qualified person, humane and harmoniously developed personality, which supposes necessary synthesis of these two educational systems.*

***Key words:** Eastern and Western education, rationality, intuition, mentality, traditionalism, globalization, technologization, humanization, comparative philosophy.*

ЗАПАДНОЕ И ВОСТОЧНОЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ: СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ

М. С. Ашилова (Алматы, Республика Казахстан)

***Аннотация.** Статья посвящена исследованию западного и восточного образования, выявлению общего и особенного между ними. Большое внимание уделяется раскрытию этих проблем через призму исторического*

Madina Ashilova is post-graduate student of the Scientific Research Institute of Philosophy of Education at the Novosibirsk State Pedagogic University.

E-mail: alibek557@rambler.ru

Ашилова Мадина Серикбековна – аспирант Научно-исследовательского института философии образования ГОУ ВПО “Новосибирский государственный педагогический университет”.