



Scan to know paper details and  
author's profile

# Interaction of Rationality of Economic Behavior and Ethnic Preferences in the Organizational Culture of Latvia

*Vladislav Volkov*

*University of Latvia*

## ANNOTATION

Sociological research aimed to understand the extent to which the values and norms of the practiced organizational culture adopted at the enterprises/organizations of Latvia are shared by economic actors as rational ways of organizing the economic space, forming solidary relations within the teams of the enterprises, regardless of the ethnic origin and ethnocultural identity of these actors. It was necessary to understand whether there are limitations in the universality of these rational rules, which are somehow connected with the ethno-cultural identity of economic actors. This is important also because the author of the article in his previous sociological study established the fact of the presence of ethnic favoritism in the economic life of Latvia. The sociological research was organized within the framework of the State research program "Vectors of social cohesion: from cohesion around the state-nation (2012-2018) to a cohesive civil community for the security of the state, society and individuals (2024-2025)" (No. VPP-KM-SPASA-2023/ 1-0002) in 2025, January 6-15. Conducting an online survey on employee cohesion in economic activity in the target group of Latvian employed persons – employees and employers. The total sample in the survey  $n=1008$ . The sample was formed according to gender, age and place of residence quotas. Most of the organizational culture parameters of Latvians and ethnic minorities that concern them coincide, which indicates a high degree of integration of these population groups into common values and norms determined by the economic space in Latvia.

*Keywords:* organizational culture, rationality, cohesion, team building, socio-economic factors, economic actors, ethnic identity.

*Classification:* JEL Code: M14, Q01, O33

*Language:* English



Great Britain  
Journals Press

LJP Copyright ID: 146466

Print ISSN: 2633-2299

Online ISSN: 2633-2302

London Journal of Research in Management & Business

Volume 25 | Issue 6 | Compilation 1.0





# Interaction of Rationality of Economic Behavior and Ethnic Preferences in the Organizational Culture of Latvia

Vladislav Volkov

## ANNOTATION

*Sociological research aimed to understand the extent to which the values and norms of the practiced organizational culture adopted at the enterprises/organizations of Latvia are shared by economic actors as rational ways of organizing the economic space, forming solidary relations within the teams of the enterprises, regardless of the ethnic origin and ethnocultural identity of these actors. It was necessary to understand whether there are limitations in the universality of these rational rules, which are somehow connected with the ethno-cultural identity of economic actors. This is important also because the author of the article in his previous sociological study established the fact of the presence of ethnic favoritism in the economic life of Latvia. The sociological research was organized within the framework of the State research program "Vectors of social cohesion: from cohesion around the state-nation (2012-2018) to a cohesive civil community for the security of the state, society and individuals (2024-2025)" (No. VPP-KM-SPASA-2023/1-0002) in 2025, January 6-15. Conducting an online survey on employee cohesion in economic activity in the target group of Latvian employed persons – employees and employers. The total sample in the survey n=1008. The sample was formed according to gender, age and place of residence quotas. Most of the organizational culture parameters of Latvians and ethnic minorities that concern them coincide, which indicates a high degree of integration of these population groups into common values and norms determined by the economic space in Latvia. However, the content of these organizational cultural features of the Latvian population is related to their attitude towards*

*values that are oriented towards achieving goals, which are determined by the very nature of the economic and production tasks of the enterprise and the organization. In situations that actualize their national and ethnic identity values in the business and interpersonal communication of employees, ethnic differences arise in the understanding of the existing organizational cultural practices. At the same time, the study revealed that the greatest differences in terms of organizational cultural values and norms, existing management practices in organizations and enterprises are related to the level of education of the respondents, gender differences and areas of professional employment.*

**Keywords:** organizational culture, rationality, cohesion, team building, socio-economic factors, economic actors, ethnic identity.

**Author:** Doctor of Sociology, Leading Researcher, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Faculty of Humanities, University of Latvia (Riga, Latvia).

## I. THE RELEVANCE OF RESEARCH ON THE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE OF ENTERPRISES AND ORGANIZATIONS.

Organizational culture is a social phenomenon that characterizes the system of formation, operation and development of all enterprises and organizations. Each enterprise is characterized by individual features of organizational culture. At the same time, organizational culture has typical values, characteristic of the characteristics of the economic life of nations and historical and cultural regions of the world (Mouls 2003, p. 83 – 94). The organizational culture of enterprises is created to strengthen common values and norms in the behavior of economic actors (employees,

managers, entrepreneurs) performing various professional functions and occupying various social positions in the enterprise and organization. Thus, the economic sphere of society performs the most important role of social integration (Weber 1976, p. 133 – 155).

The need to study the processes of social integration and solidarity taking place in economic life is determined by the peculiarities of ethnic diversity in Latvia. In 2025, ethnic Latvians will make up 1,182,008 (63.7% of the country's total population), Russians - 434,243 (23.4%), Belarusians 53,207 (2.9%), Ukrainians 52,266 (2.8%), Poles 35,140 (1.9%), Lithuanians - 19,809 (1.1%), other ethnic groups - 4.2% (Atsevišķu tautību... 2025). Within this ethnic diversity, there are two ethnic poles - ethnic Latvians and Russians - whose share is 87.1% of the total population of Latvia. The features of this ethnic diversity raise the issue of the real possibilities of the formation of social solidarity of representatives of different ethnic groups in economic life, which should be reflected in their organizational culture. In Latvian sociology and political science, the role of the ethnic factor in the life of Latvian society is examined mainly in order to gain a deeper understanding of political processes in the country, the peculiarities of national and political identification, geopolitical sympathies, the nature of public communication and historical memory. However, interethnic interaction, mainly between ethnic Latvians and Russians, at the individual level in the public space is most intensively and almost daily implemented in the economic space. The contradictory nature of the interaction of economic and ethnic factors has already been revealed in the studies of Latvian sociologists. On the one hand, the significant role of the economy in the integration of Latvian society has been noted. On the other hand, studies indicate a significant division of the business environment along ethnic lines (Mouls 2003; Zepa et al. 2004, p. 8–11, 13–14, 18–28; Zepa et al. 2005, p. 11–15). Sociologists demonstrate the positive role of the Latvian economic system in promoting people's social and professional mobility, focusing on the values of individual self-realization regardless of

their ethnic affiliation, which certainly promotes the economic solidarity of society (Koroļeva et al. 2014; Žabko 2023). The economic interaction of people with different ethnic identities is the sphere in which the process of competition between individuals and groups and the everyday cohesion of people in the implementation of joint economic and social activities takes place (Volkov 2023, p. 100 – 103). Not only sociologists, but also economists draw attention to the need to study the role of the ethnic factor in the economic life of Latvia, the ethnic peculiarities of the social division of labor, the income level of Latvians and ethnic minorities (Hazans 2010, p. 125–128, 143). Some studies on the quality of the workforce in Latvia record the need to take into account not only economic factors in the formation of organizational culture, but also consider it important to pay special attention to the ethnocultural identity of employees (Cilvēkkapitāla ... 2025, p. 18 – 19; Latvijas aktīvās ... 2019, p.140 – 194; Latvija 2030 2009, p. 7– 11, 24 – 26).

Taking into account the interest of scientists from various social science disciplines in the role of organizational culture and the entire economic sphere in the integration of Latvia's society, the author of the article set himself the goal of showing how the organizational culture that has developed in enterprises and organizations in Latvia contributes to the spread of typical norms and values of economic behavior among ethnic Latvians and ethnic minorities. As the data of this study show (Volkov 2023; Volkov et al. 2024), as well as the data of previous studies by the author of this article, the role of the ethnic factor in the formation and implementation of organizational culture in Latvia as a country with pronounced ethnic diversity is not a constant, independent value for all situations and contexts of interethnic interaction of people with different ethnic identities in a multiethnic economic space. Summarizing the research data, two contexts of interethnic interaction were identified, which to varying degrees influenced the actualization of the ethnic factor in organizational culture:

Firstly, it is a complex of interethnic interactions, the task of which is to achieve goals determined

by the nature of the economic and production tasks of the enterprise and organization;

Secondly, it is a complex of situations that arise to one degree or another in economic activity, when the values of an individual's identity, understanding of life goals and strategies that go beyond narrowly understood production and economic tasks are actualized.

The proposed analytical division of interethnic interaction complexes to one degree or another corresponds to the ideas already conceptualized in management theory and sociology. These are the theories of George Elton Mayo and Mary Parker Follett, who, during the Hawthorne effect, conducted in the United States in the 1920s and 1930s, revealed the importance of employees recognizing their individual value in solving the production tasks of enterprises (Mayo 2007). The analytical division of social activity into success-oriented and agreement-oriented forms the basis of Jürgen Habermas's communication theory (Habermas 1992).

## II. FEATURES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Edgar Schein's model is one of the most widely used in organizational culture research. The author of the article adheres to the understanding of organizational culture as “a pattern of shared basic assumptions adopted by a group in solving its problems through external adaptation and internal integration” (Schein 2010, p. 10). The culture of organizations in Latvia turns out to be the intersection of two important factors, which, as practice shows, are often contradictory in nature. On the one hand, the high degree of integration of the Latvian economy into the European and world division of labor, the liberal nature of the market economy and Latvian labor legislation requires workers, regardless of their ethnic origin, to follow uniform norms of organizational and professional culture for the successful implementation of the goals of companies and organizations. On the other hand, the different access opportunities for ethnic Latvians and ethnic minorities to prestigious areas of employment contribute to ethnic

favoritism in economic life, which ultimately largely erodes the equal value of organizational culture in the minds of ethnic Latvians and ethnic minorities.

The interaction of employees in organizations and companies turns out to be primarily a form of intercultural communication, as shown in the studies of Geert Hofstede (Hofstede et al., 2010). An important feature of organizational culture that has become established in the economic life of a particular nation-state is the degree of its internal differentiation, which mainly depends on the ethnic diversity of society. The ethnic differentiation of Latvian society is the most important factor influencing the differentiation of organizational culture in commercial companies, state organizations depending on the proportion of certain ethnic groups employed in these enterprises. In addition, perceptions of ethnic groups as carriers of various types of organizational culture, business ethos, etc. are taking root in society.

The organizational culture of enterprises ensures the effectiveness of economic or management activities that implement certain rational behavioral strategies of economic actors, for example, activities for the production, provision, purchase or sale of goods or services (Krugman, Wells 2012, p. 2). Therefore, the most important feature of organizational culture is the rationality of its values and norms, which economic actors accept, approve and implement in their behavior in the company and organization (Ritzer 1975, p. 627). Thus, the level of internal social solidarity of these economic actors, who perform various functional duties in the enterprise and, consequently, occupy various social statuses, is determined by the rationality of their accepted values and organizational cultural norms.

An integral part of the research methodology of this article was the theory of rationality as a way of implementing effective social activity and a way of constructing social integration of communities that achieve economic and socio-cultural success by competing with other social participants. As the main theories for understanding such rationality, the authors of the article turned to

Max Weber's views on the nature and types of social activity (Weber 2004, p. 254 –284), Talcott Parsons' views on social activity as one of the structuring elements of an integrated social system (Parsons 1949, p. 43 – 76.), Jürgen Habermas's theory of communicative action and moral discourse as ways of mutual equal recognition and coordination of the interests of social actors in the process of their rationalization (Habermas 1992, p. 116 – 194). The choice of this theory is explained by the understanding of organizational culture, in which the rationality of its basic values, rules and norms directly follows both from the rational nature of the economic and organizational activities of individual and collective actors, and from the advantages of rationally emphasizing the specific social and cultural interests of these actors in the situation of their interaction and arising from their collective identity. This idea of organizational culture is oriented towards a comprehensive understanding of rationality, characteristic of modern sociology (Bezes et. al. 2021, p. 11 – 38; Coutant 2021, p. 71 – 101).

### III. SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DATA.

Sociological research aimed to understand the extent to which the values and norms of the practiced organizational culture adopted at the enterprises/organizations of Latvia are shared by economic actors as rational ways of organizing the economic space, forming solidary relations within

the teams of the enterprises, regardless of the ethnic origin and ethnocultural identity of these actors. It was necessary to understand whether there are limitations in the universality of these rational rules, which are somehow connected with the ethno-cultural identity of economic actors. This is important also because the author of the article in his previous sociological study established the fact of the presence of ethnic favoritism in the economic life of Latvia (Volkov 2023).

The author of the article developed the sociological research methodology and questionnaire questions. The sociological research was organized within the framework of the State Research Program project "Vectors of social cohesion: from cohesion around the state-nation (2012-2018) to a cohesive civil community for the security of the state, society and individuals (2024-2025)" (No. VPP-KM-SPASA-2023/1-0002) in 2025, January 6-15. Conducting an online survey on employee cohesion in economic activity in the target group of employed persons in Latvia - employees and employers. The total sample in the survey n=1008. The sample was formed according to gender, age and place of residence quotas, in accordance with the total population according to the data of the Central Statistical Office. The survey was conducted by a group of sociologists from the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Faculty of Humanities, University of Latvia. The distribution of respondents by social factors is shown in Table 1.

*Table 1:* Distribution of respondents by social characteristics

Gender	
Women	525
Men	483
Education level	
Primary or incomplete primary education	2,98%
Incomplete secondary; vocational education without secondary education	4,46%
General secondary education	16,37%
Secondary vocational/specialized education	28,87%
Bachelor's degree	25,69%
Master's degree	20,73%
PhD	0,89%
Ethnicity	
Ethnic Latvian	68,55%

Russian	25,20%
Ukrainian	0,89%
Belarusian	1,39%
Polish	0,79%
Jewish	0,69%
Other	2,48%
Occupational group membership	
Managers	14,78%
Senior professionals	14,98%
Specialists	37,50%
Servants	2,68%
Service and sales workers	11,31%
Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishing workers	1,59%
Skilled workers and craftsmen	5,95%
Plant and machine operators and product assemblers	2,58%
Simple occupations	5,36%
Other	3,27%
Status	
Employee/employee	95,44%
Entrepreneur/employer	4,56%
Residence	
Riga	35,12%
City of national significance: Daugavpils, Liepāja, Jelgava, Ventspils, Jurmala, Rēzekne, Valmiera, Jēkabpils, Ogre	21,33%
Other city	26,29%
Small village, hamlet, countryside	17,26%

In order to assess the impact of organizational culture and team cohesion not only qualitatively, but also quantitatively, the author of the article has identified several economic, managerial and financial indicators. The complex of these factors reflects the rational nature of the behavior of economic actors, which is embodied in the nature of the organizational culture. These indicators allow us to conclude how effectively the culture supports employee cooperation, innovation and organizational sustainability. One of the main measures of the impact of culture is employee productivity, or the company's revenue or profit per employee. A culture that promotes learning, adaptation and cooperation directly affects the organization's ability to operate effectively and competitively (Schein 2010). Similarly, the amount of resources invested in employee development is used as an indirect indicator of the organization's long-term vision and value system (Ouchi 1981). Turklāt organizācijās, kur darbinieki tiek iesaistīti lēmumu pieņemšanā, kultūra tiek

uztverta kā iekļaujošāka, kas veicina sadarbību un lojalitāti. Furthermore, in organizations where employees are involved in decision-making, the culture is perceived as more inclusive, which fosters collaboration and loyalty (Hofstede et. al. 2020). From a financial perspective, organizational culture influences aspects such as profit profitability, customer retention levels, and cost efficiency (Schwartz, Davis 1981, p. 30 – 48). Additional indicators are ESG (environmental, social, governance) results, which are increasingly linked to the maturity of an organization's internal culture, social responsibility and employee well-being (Eccles, Ioannou, Serafeim 2014, p. 2835–2857).

The sociological research data showed that the greatest differences between respondents who positioned themselves as ethnic Latvians and Russians were manifested where the organizational culture to one degree or another affected the problem of ethnic identity. At the

same time, factors related to the specifics of the implementation of production tasks did not create a large, statistically significant difference in the opinions of ethnic Latvians and Russians. Table 2

presents data on the respondents' views regarding the main organizational cultural norms and existing practices.

*Table 2:* Assessment of characteristics to call a team (a group of employees of a company, organization) socially cohesive, %.

1. The moral and material rewards of team members should depend on their contribution to the team's activities.					
	Very important	Important	Not very important	Not at all important	Total
Ethnic Latvians	40,8	52,6	5,8	0,7	100,0
Russians	45,9	49,6	4,1	0,4	100,0
Others	38,7	54,8	4,8	1,6	100,0
Total	41,9	52,0	5,3	0,7	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,696					
2. The moral and material rewards of team members should depend on compliance with work discipline requirements.					
Ethnic Latvians	26,6	62,7	9,6	1,0	100,0
Russians	30,5	59,0	9,2	1,2	100,0
Others	24,2	53,2	19,4	3,2	100,0
Total	27,5	61,2	10,1	1,2	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,118					
3. Team members must be loyal to the decisions made by the company's and organization's management.					
Ethnic Latvians	33,8	55,9	8,4	1,9	100,0
Russians	26,4	60,7	12,0	0,8	100,0
Others	22,2	57,1	12,7	7,9	100,0
Total	31,3	57,2	9,5	2,0	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,002					
4. Defending one's position in professional matters within a company or organization is more important than adhering to the principles of hierarchy within that company.					
Ethnic Latvians	19,7	59,5	18,2	2,6	100,0
Russians	22,6	55,3	19,6	2,6	100,0
Others	18,3	66,7	11,7	3,3	100,0
Total	20,3	58,9	18,1	2,6	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,711					
5. For team members, defending their moral position in conflicts between employees is more important than adhering to the principles of this company's hierarchy.					
Ethnic Latvians	19,6	54,7	19,9	5,8	100,0
Russians	21,1	53,3	17,6	7,9	100,0
Others	15,3	50,8	27,1	7,9	100,0
Total	19,7	54,1	19,8	6,4	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,632					



6. Active participation of team members in informal joint activities (e.g., joint celebration of employees' birthdays, national holidays, participation in tourist trips, etc.) should affect their moral and material rewards.					
Ethnic Latvians	17,0	36,3	27,1	19,6	100,0
Russians	16,7	34,2	27,1	20,0	100,0
Others	16,7	34,2	28,3	25,0	100,0
Total	16,9	35,4	27,7	20,0	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,934					
7. The participation of team members in Latvian public and political life should affect their material remuneration.					
Ethnic Latvians	10,1	27,1	31,2	31,5	100,0
Russians	4,8	21,8	33,2	40,2	100,0
Others	6,9	17,2	24,1	51,7	100,0
Total	8,6	25,2	31,3	35,0	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,004					
8. Showing respect to teammates who have achieved professional success					
Ethnic Latvians	25,3	55,5	15,2	3,9	100,0
Russians	29,0	58,5	8,9	3,6	100,0
Others	21,7	55,0	18,3	5,0	100,0
Total	26,1	56,2	13,8	3,9	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,224					
9. Showing respect to team members who have high social status in society					
Ethnic Latvians	8,9	25,6	38,0	27,5	100,0
Russians	5,8	30,3	38,6	25,3	100,0
Others	5,8	23,7	45,8	25,4	100,0
Total	7,9	26,6	38,6	25,4	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,457					
10. Providing assistance to team members who are unable to effectively perform their professional duties due to age					
Ethnic Latvians	22,2	56,9	16,2	4,6	100,0
Russians	22,1	60,6	10,8	6,5	100,0
Others	24,6	52,5	21,3	6,5	100,0
Total	22,3	52,5	15,2	4,9	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,217					
11. Providing assistance to team members who are unable to effectively perform their professional duties due to certain physical limitations.					
Ethnic Latvians	27,6	59,8	9,8	2,8	100,0
Russians	27,6	55,4	11,2	4,1	100,0
Others	33,9	45,8	16,9	3,4	100,0
Total	33,9	57,8	10,6	3,1	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,341					
12. Providing assistance to team members who are unable to effectively perform their professional duties due to insufficient knowledge of the state language.					
Ethnic Latvians	14,7	37,9	24,2	23,1	100,0
Russians	17,5	42,9	19,6	20,0	100,0

Others	12,9	46,8	22,6	17,7	100,0
Total	15,3	39,8	22,9	22,0	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,421					

Table 3 presents data on the impact of the respondent's team's internal solidarity on achieving the company's economic results. The data provided show that representatives of different ethnic groups have a typical understanding of the role of team (work collective) solidarity in ensuring the most important economic efficiency indicators of companies and organizations. Some significant differences were found only in the competency level assessment position/competence assessment organization.

*Table 3:* Cohesion of the team where the respondents work in achieving the economic results of the company (organization) (%).

1. Ensuring the careful use of material resources (materials, equipment, technical devices, information systems) in their work.					
	Very important	Important	Not very important	Not at all important	Total
Ethnic Latvians	45,8	47,1	5,9	1,2	100,0
Russians	49,2	45,6	3,6	1,6	100,0
Others	42,6	44,3	11,5	1,6	100,0
Total	46,4	46,5	5,7	1,3	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,356					
2. Ensuring the careful use of financial resources in your work.					
Ethnic Latvians	38,9	54,1	4,8	2,3	100,0
Russians	40,5	50,6	4,8	1,6	100,0
Others	40,3	50,0	6,5	3,2	100,0
Total	39,4	52,9	5,5	2,2	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,752					
3. Increasing the competitiveness of a company/organization, product/service.					
Ethnic Latvians	43,9	51,2	4,3	0,6	100,0
Russians	47,6	46,4	4,8	1,2	100,0
Others	41,3	44,4	11,1	3,2	100,0
Total	44,6	49,5	4,9	0,9	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,066					
4. Building a positive reputation for a company/organization.					
Ethnic Latvians	48,2	45,1	6,0	0,7	100,0
Russians	48,6	45,4	4,8	1,2	100,0
Others	56,5	35,5	4,8	3,2	100,0
Total	48,8	44,6	5,6	1,0	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,417					
5. Rationally organizing your workspace to perform your professional duties.					
Ethnic Latvians	43,0	51,1	5,0	0,9	100,0
Russians	46,4	48,4	4,4	0,8	100,0
Others	43,5	45,2	9,7	1,6	100,0
Total	43,9	50,1	5,1	0,9	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,641					

6. Promoting fair treatment of employees by management.					
Ethnic Latvians	59,2	36,1	3,8	0,9	100,0
Russians	59,5	37,2	2,4	0,8	100,0
Others	51,7	45,0	0,0	3,3	100,0
Total	58,8	36,9	3,2	1,0	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,215					
7. Creating principles of mutual respect among employees.					
Ethnic Latvians	51,8	44,2	3,4	0,6	100,0
Russians	51,8	42,6	3,6	0,8	100,0
Others	60,3	31,7	4,8	3,2	100,0
Total	52,7	43,0	3,5	0,8	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,240					
8. Promoting the motivation of initiative and creativity among management staff.					
Ethnic Latvians	44,2	49,1	5,2	1,5	100,0
Russians	37,2	55,2	6,0	1,6	100,0
Others	42,9	47,6	7,9	1,6	100,0
Total	42,4	50,6	5,6	1,5	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,612					
9. Promoting company/organization participation in financing environmental protection and ecology projects.					
Ethnic Latvians	25,3	50,2	19,8	4,8	100,0
Russians	25,0	43,5	25,0	6,5	100,0
Others	25,0	43,3	23,3	8,3	100,0
Total	25,2	48,1	21,3	5,4	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,409					
10. Building diverse competencies of company/organization employees.					
Ethnic Latvians	28,7	57,9	11,6	1,8	100,0
Russians	28,3	52,7	15,6	3,4	100,0
Others	31,1	41,0	24,6	3,3	100,0
Total	28,7	55,6	13,4	2,3	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,033					
11. Ensuring the participation of people of different ethnic backgrounds in the management of the company/organization.					
Ethnic Latvians	15,5	42,0	31,4	11,1	100,0
Russians	20,2	42,5	23,6	13,7	100,0
Others	23,0	45,9	19,7	11,5	100,0
Total	17,1	42,4	28,7	11,8	100,0
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 0,117					

As can be seen from the data provided, ethnic differences in Latvia have practically no impact on the attitude of respondents towards the prevailing norms and values of the organizational culture that has developed in the country. This indicates that these values serve as the most important

basis for strengthening ethnic Latvians and ethnic minorities in economic life. However, the data of the sociological study revealed the fact that the level of education of respondents has a greater impact on the attitude towards these organizational culture norms than was typical for

the influence of the ethnic factor. Table 4 compares the impact of the respondents' ethnic identity and their level of education on ten questions. Significant differences between ethnic groups were found only in two positions regarding their ethnopolitical and civic preferences in relation to the values practiced in the organizational culture (No. 3 and 6). However, differences in educational level are significant in

all ten characteristics of organizational culture, which relate to both respondents' ethnopolitical preferences and the role of moral values (No. 1, 2), perceptions of loyalty to the social hierarchy (No. 4), the importance of the ethnic factor in company management, choice of profession (No. 5, 9, 10), and the role of respondents' individual competencies and interests as a subjective basis of organizational culture (No. 7, 8).

*Table 4:* Comparison of the role of ethnic and educational factors in respondents' perceptions of the importance of some organizational cultural values (according to Pearson Chi-Square Asymp. Sig.).

Ethnic factor	Educational factor
1. Defending one's position in professional matters within a company or organization is more important than adhering to the principles of hierarchy within that company.	
0,711	0,019
2. For team members, defending their moral position in conflicts between employees is more important than adhering to the principles of hierarchy in this company	
0,632	0,035
3. The participation of team members in the public and political life of Latvia should affect their material remuneration	
0,004	0,000
4. Showing respect to team members who have high social status in society	
0,457	0,000
5. Ensuring the participation of people of different ethnic backgrounds in the management of the company/organization	
0,117	0,009
6. Regularly participate in celebrating national holidays with colleagues at a company, organization, or educational institution	
0,021	0,049
7. Competence in the chosen profession or field of activity	
0,927	0,000
8. The respondent was mainly guided by the desire to develop his/her abilities and interests in choosing a profession	
0,534	0,001
9. The respondent was guided mainly by the example of people of similar ethnic origin in choosing a profession	
0,925	0,004
10. In choosing his/her profession, the respondent is oriented towards working in companies and organizations where people of similar ethnic origin work.	
0,983	0,007

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

The materials of the sociological study confirmed both the hypotheses put forward and the conclusions of the author of similar previous studies. Most of the organizational culture parameters of ethnic Latvians and ethnic

minorities that concern them coincide, which indicates a high degree of integration of these population groups into common values and norms determined by the economic space in Latvia. The basis of such an attitude towards the existing organizational cultural values is the typification of rational economic behavioral

practices, which is characteristic of Latvians and ethnic minorities in economic behavior. This applies to assessments of calling a team socially cohesive; to the role of team (collective) cohesion in achieving the economic results of an enterprise (organization); to the assessment of the influence of social and economic factors on social cohesion in an enterprise/organization; to perceptions of the conditions for achieving the desired or intended social position/status and the role of various factors in the respondents' choice of profession. In this sense, the logic of economic necessity turns out to be stronger than the need to emphasize the special ethnocultural preferences of representatives of ethnic groups in the economic space of Latvia.

However, the content of these organizational cultural features of Latvian residents is related to their attitude towards values that are oriented towards achieving goals, which are determined by the very nature of the economic and production tasks of the enterprise and the organization. Here, ethnic differences are insignificant. At the same time, in situations that actualize the values of their national and ethnic identity in the business and interpersonal communication of employees, ethnic differences arise in the understanding of the existing organizational cultural practices. This applies, for example, to perceptions of employee loyalty in relation to management decisions, views on the relationship of material remuneration with the level of active participation in the political life of Latvia, including employee participation in the celebration of national holidays in the enterprise and organization. Therefore, the logic of economic rationality in the behavior of representatives of ethnic groups, and thus in the established system of organizational culture in Latvia, is not absolute. There, in the economic space, where conditions exist for the actualization of the values of ethnocultural identity, these values are actualized. These are not situations that go beyond the scope of economic life and are associated with the socio-political context of interaction between ethnic Latvians and ethnic minorities, with ethnic stereotypes and preferences that dominate public consciousness, and with established practices of interpersonal relations between representatives of

these ethnic groups. Therefore, the penetration of ethnic favoritism into the organizational culture of Latvian enterprises is a difficult to conceal phenomenon. But if by itself the ethnic factor does not distort the typification of the norms and values of the organizational culture practiced among ethnic Latvians and ethnic minorities, then its imposition on the different level of education of the respondents leads to the ethnocultural fragmentation of this culture (Volkov, 2023, p. 104 – 108).

## REFERENCES

1. *Atsevišķu tautību iedzīvotāju skaits – Tautība un Laika periods*. [Population of Certain Nationalities – Nationality and Time Period] 2025. IRE020. *Atsevišķu tautību iedzīvotāju skaits, tā izmaiņas un dabiskās kustības galvenie rādītāji 1980 - 2025*. [Population of individual nationalities, its changes and main indicators of natural movement 1980 - 2025] [https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP\\_PUB/START\\_\\_POP\\_\\_IR\\_\\_IRE/IRE020/table/tab leViewLayout1/](https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP_PUB/START__POP__IR__IRE/IRE020/table/tab leViewLayout1/) (12.05.2025) in Latvian]
2. Bezes, P., Billows, S., Duran, P., Lallement M. 2021. Introduction. For a sociology of rationalization: From Max Weber to contemporary research. *L'Année sociologique*. Vol. 71. pp. 11 – 38.
3. *Cilvēkkapitāla attīstības rīcības plāns 2025.–2027. gadam*. [Human Capital Development Action Plan 2025–2027] 2025. Rīga: Ekonomikas ministrija. in Latvian].
4. Coutant H. 2021. Lost in the matrix: rationalisations en tension pour les ingénieurs aéronautiques. *L'Année sociologique*. Vol. 71. pp. 163 – 191.
5. Denison, D. R., Neale, W.S. 2025. *Denison Organizational Culture Survey. Facilitator Guide*. [https://www.academia.edu/35981824/Denison\\_Organizational\\_Culture\\_Survey\\_Facilitator\\_Guide](https://www.academia.edu/35981824/Denison_Organizational_Culture_Survey_Facilitator_Guide) (12.05.2025).
6. Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. 2014. The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. *Management Science*, 60(11). pp. 2835–2857.

7. Habermas, J. 1992. *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
8. Handy, C. 1993. *Understanding Organizations* (4th ed.). Penguin Books.
9. Hazans, M. 2010. Etniskās minoritātes Latvijas darba tirgū no 1997. līdz 2009. gadam: situācija, integrācijas virzītājspēki un šķērslī. [Etniskās minoritātes Latvijas darba tirgū no 1997. līdz 2009. gadam: situācija, integrācijas virzītājspēki un šķērslī] In: Muižnieks N. (ed.) *Cik integreta Latvijas sabiedrība*. [https://translate.google.lv/?Sl=lv&tl=en&text=Cik%20integreta%20Latvijas%20sabiedr%C4%ABba&op=translate#:~:text=How%20integrated%20is%20Latvian%20society%3F] Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds. Pp. 125 – 160. in Latvian].
10. Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. 2010. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
11. Koroļeva, I., Mieriņa, I., Rungule, R. 2014. *Profesiju prestižs un izvēle jauniešu vidū: divu paaudžu salīdzinājums*. [Prestige and choice of professions among young people: a comparison of two generations] Rīga : LU Akadēmiskais apgāds. in Latvian]
12. Krugman, P., Wells, R. 2012. *Economics* (3rd ed.). Worth Publishers.
13. *Latvija 2030. Latvijas ilgtspējīgas attīstības stratēģija līdz 2030. gadam*. [Latvia 2030. Latvia's sustainable development strategy until 2030.] 2009. Rīga: Latvijas Republikas Saeima.
14. *Latvijas aktīvās darba tirgus politikas izvērtējums*. [Evaluation of Latvia's active labor market policy] 2019. Rīga: Latvijas Republikas Labklājības ministrija. in Latvian]
15. Mayo, G. E. 2007. *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. Routledge.
16. Moulis, Dž. 2003. *Biznesa kultūra un etiķete Eiropas valstīs*. [Business culture and etiquette in European countries] Rīga: Jāņa Rozes apgāds. in Latvian]
17. Ouchi, W. G. 1981. *Theory Z: How American Business Can Meet the Japanese Challenge*. Addison-Wesley.
18. Parsons, T. 1949. *The Structure of Social Action*. New York: Free Press.
19. Ritzer, G. 1975. Professionalization, Bureaucratization and Rationalization: The Views of Max Weber. *Social Forces*. Oxford University Press. pp. 627 – 634.
20. Schein, E. 2010. *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco.
21. Schwartz, H., & Davis, S. M. 1981. Matching corporate culture and business strategy. *Organizational Dynamics*, 10(1). pp. 30 – 48.
22. Volkov, V. 2023. Economic Environment in Latvia: Interaction of Ethical and Ethnic Values in Organizational Culture. *Research Papers of Wroclaw University of Economics and Business*. Vol. 67. No. 3. pp.100 – 108.
23. Volkov, V., Ratanova, I., Buka, S., Timoshchenko, Y. 2024. Ethical and Ethnic Values in Organizational Culture in Latvia. Part II. *Doctrina studia socio-polityczne*. No. 21. pp. 130 – 150.
24. Weber, M. 2004. *Sociology of religion*. Rīga: LU Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts. [in Latvian]
25. Weber, M. 1976. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundriss d. verstehenden Soziologie*. Tübingen: Mohr.
26. Zepa, B., Selecka, A., Šūpule, I., Krišāne, J., Tomsone, I., Krastiņa, L. 2004. *Sabiedrības integrācija un uzņēmējdarbība: etniskais aspekts*. [Social integration and entrepreneurship: the ethnic aspect] Rīga: Baltijas Sociālo Zinātņu institūts. in Latvian]
27. Zepa, B., I. Šūpule, I., E. Kļave, E., L. Krastiņa, L., J. Krišāne, J., I. Tomsone, I. 2005. *Etnopolitiskā spriedze Latvijā: konflikta risinājuma meklējumi*. [Ethnopolitical tensions in Latvia: the search for a solution to the conflict] Rīga: Baltijas Sociālo Zinātņu institūts. in Latvian]
28. Žabko, O. 2023. *Profesionālās mobilitātes analīze: darba tirgus aģentu mijiedarbība un indivīdu kapitāla pārvaldības stratēģijas*. *Promocijas darba kopsavilkums*. [Analysis of professional mobility: interaction between labor market agents and individual capital management strategies. Doctoral thesis summary] Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte. in Latvian]