Europe at a Crossroads: Governance, Business, and Policy Transformation in a Changing Global Economy. Proceedings of the International Conference EU-PAIR 2026

DOI:10.47743/eu-pair.2026-1-28

FROM FRAGMENTED CLARITY CONSTRUCTS TO CULTURAL CAPABILITY: A THEORETICAL MODEL OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE CLARITY

IURIE VLASOV
Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi
Iași, Romania
iurie.vlasov@student.uaic.ro

Abstract
This article presents a theoretical model for Organizational Culture Clarity in organizations facing ambiguity, transformation, and institutional pressure. While organizational culture research has advanced understanding of shared meanings, values, assumptions, climates, and behavioral norms, much of the literature addresses clarity only indirectly through constructs such as role clarity, communication clarity, leadership consistency, psychological safety, and relational coordination. This fragmentation constrains organizational theory's ability to explain how clarity operates as a cultural condition that supports coherence, alignment, and collective action. The article contends that contemporary organizations must reconceptualize clarity from an isolated managerial attribute to a strategic cultural capability. This perspective is especially pertinent in the European context, where discussions of resilience, institutional transformation, strategic autonomy, and sustainable work increasingly depend on organizations' ability to maintain coherence and adaptability amid uncertainty, alongside governance, regulation, and technological policy. Organizational Culture Clarity is defined as the degree of transparency, alignment, and coherence that enables employees to understand and enact the organization's mission, values, roles, relationships, processes, and leadership expectations. The proposed model identifies three interdependent dimensions: organizational clarity, leadership clarity, and relational clarity. Organizational clarity encompasses mission, structure, roles, processes, communication, and internal identity. Leadership clarity involves direction, consistency, developmental support, and value-based behavioral modeling. Relational clarity addresses collaboration norms, shared expectations, trust, conflict resolution, and interpersonal coordination. This article contributes to the organizational culture and people management literature by synthesizing fragmented clarity-related constructs into a unified theoretical model and by positioning clarity as a cultural capability essential for organizational coherence, employee experience, and future empirical research.

Keywords: *organizational culture; organizational coherence; organizational clarity; organizational ambiguity; people management.*
JEL Classification: M14; M12; M54.

1. INTRODUCTION

Organizational culture provides members with interpretive frameworks through which they understand what matters, what is expected, and how they should act within the organization (Schein, 2010). Yet the existence of a recognizable culture does not necessarily imply that the culture is clear. Organizations may articulate values, establish formal roles and processes, and communicate strategic priorities while employees still experience uncertainty about responsibilities, decision criteria, behavioral expectations, or the practical meaning of declared values. Cultural signals may therefore be visible but inconsistent, producing ambiguity between what the organization declares, what leaders enact, and what employees experience.

Organizational scholarship addresses many aspects of this problem, but predominantly through separate constructs and research traditions. Role theory examines role clarity and role ambiguity; communication research addresses information flow and communication climate; performance research considers goal and task clarity; strategy research examines mission, values, and organizational alignment; leadership research investigates communication, behavioral consistency, and value enactment; while relational research addresses psychological safety, employee voice, trust, collaboration, and relational coordination. The literature on clarity is therefore substantial, but conceptually fragmented. The central theoretical gap is not the absence of clarity-related research, but the limited integration of these local forms of clarity within a common cultural framework.

Drawing on Schein's (2010) distinction between artifacts, espoused values, and basic underlying assumptions, this article proposes that clarity can be examined as a transversal property of organizational culture. From this perspective, cultural clarity concerns the extent to which organizational structures and practices, leadership signals, and relational norms provide sufficiently intelligible and coherent reference points for organizational members. Importantly, clarity is not equated with uniformity, rigid standardization, or the elimination of ambiguity. Rather, it refers to the cultural conditions that allow members to interpret priorities, understand expectations, coordinate their actions, and exercise judgment without excessive dependence on ad hoc clarification.

The study therefore conceptualizes Organizational Culture Clarity (OCC) as an integrative cultural capability and investigates how fragmented clarity-related literatures can be organized within a coherent theoretical model. It employs a systematized scoping review, theoretically anchored in Schein's model of

organizational culture, to map clarity-related constructs across organizational, leadership, and relational domains. The analysis addresses the following research question:

How can Organizational Culture Clarity be conceptualized as an integrative cultural capability through a systematized scoping review of fragmented clarity-related literatures?

The resulting synthesis proposes three interdependent dimensions, *Organizational Clarity*, *Leadership Clarity*, and *Relational Clarity*, as the preliminary architecture of OCC and establishes a basis for subsequent construct refinement and empirical validation.

2. ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, INTERPRETABILITY, AND FRAGMENTED CLARITY

Organizational culture is commonly understood as a system through which organizational members develop shared meanings about their environment, expectations, and appropriate ways of acting. Although definitions vary across theoretical traditions, culture generally extends beyond formal structures and observable practices to include values, beliefs, norms, assumptions, and interpretive patterns that develop through organizational experience and socialization (Schein, 2010; Yanow and Ybema, 2011). This perspective is particularly relevant to the problem of clarity because organizational members do not respond only to the information formally available to them; they interpret what structures, practices, decisions, and interactions signify about how the organization actually functions.

The distinction between organizational culture and organizational climate further clarifies this interpretive problem. Climate primarily concerns shared perceptions of policies, practices, procedures, and behaviors that are supported or rewarded, whereas culture addresses deeper values, beliefs, and assumptions through which organizational life acquires meaning (Schneider and Barbera, 2014). The two constructs are distinct but overlapping. From the perspective advanced here, clarity may operate across both levels: employees must be able to interpret what behaviors and practices are expected, but also the values and assumptions that give these expectations meaning. Consequently, a formally explicit environment is not necessarily culturally clear. Roles, policies, or values may be clearly stated while remaining inconsistent with managerial behavior or everyday organizational practice.

Schein's (2010) three-level model provides a useful theoretical architecture for examining this relationship. At the level of artifacts, cultural meaning becomes visible through structures, roles, processes, routines, communication practices, objectives, and performance systems. At the level of espoused values, organizations express mission, vision, strategic priorities, and principles intended to orient decisions and behavior. At the level of basic underlying

assumptions, culture reflects taken-for-granted beliefs regarding authority, trust, interpersonal risk, collaboration, conflict, responsibility, and acceptable conduct. These levels are analytically distinguishable but interdependent. Cultural ambiguity may therefore emerge when artifacts communicate different priorities from espoused values, when leadership behavior contradicts declared principles, or when tacit relational norms undermine formally promoted behaviors.

This layered interpretation also helps explain why clarity appears fragmented in organizational research. Role clarity and role ambiguity address employees' understanding of responsibilities and expectations; communication and information-flow literatures examine how organizational meanings circulate; goal and performance research considers the clarity of objectives and expected outcomes; strategic alignment research examines consistency among mission, values, strategy, and organizational systems; leadership research addresses direction, communication, behavioral consistency, and value enactment; while psychological safety, employee voice, trust, and relational coordination illuminate the tacit rules governing interpersonal interaction and coordinated work. These literatures describe different manifestations of the same broader interpretive problem, but they have largely developed as distinct research streams.

Accordingly, the theoretical opportunity is not to replace these established constructs with a broader label, nor to suggest that all forms of organizational ambiguity are dysfunctional. Ambiguity is an inherent feature of complex and changing organizations, and cultural differentiation between groups or professional communities may be both unavoidable and functional. The proposed concept of Organizational Culture Clarity instead focuses on whether organizational members encounter sufficiently coherent cultural signals to interpret priorities, expectations, leadership behavior, and relational norms and to translate them into coordinated action. This perspective shifts the analytical focus from isolated forms of clarity toward their potential interdependence across the cultural system.

The following review therefore does not search for evidence that Organizational Culture Clarity already exists as a mature construct. Instead, it systematically maps the conceptual fragments through which organizational literatures have examined clarity and ambiguity and assesses whether these fragments can be integrated into a theoretically coherent cultural model.

3. METHODOLOGY

The study employs a systematized scoping review oriented toward conceptual synthesis. This approach was selected because Organizational Culture Clarity is not yet established as a mature construct with standardized terminology. Instead, relevant forms of clarity appear across several organizational research traditions. The purpose of the review was therefore not

to aggregate findings for a predefined construct, but to identify and integrate conceptually related literatures capable of informing its theoretical development (Claxton and Dolan, 2022). Where applicable, the PRISMA-ScR reporting logic was used to strengthen transparency in identifying and selecting sources (Tricco et al., 2018).

Schein's (2010) three levels of organizational culture provided the theoretical anchor for constructing the search strategy. Artifacts were translated into searchable areas concerning roles, processes and routines, communication, and goals or performance expectations; espoused values into mission, vision, values, strategic alignment, and leadership; and underlying assumptions into psychological safety, trust, employee voice, relational coordination, collaboration, and shared understanding. This deconstruction resulted in eight thematic search pairs covering: role clarity and ambiguity; processes and routines; communication and information flow; goals and performance expectations; mission, values, and strategic alignment; leadership communication and consistency; psychological safety, trust, and voice; and relational coordination and shared understanding.

Searches were conducted in Scopus and Web of Science between 17 March and 2 April 2026, using English-language search terms adapted to each thematic area. Records were exported to Zotero and organized according to their originating search domain. After deduplication within each thematic pair, 2,995 unique records remained. Subsequent cross-pair deduplication produced a master corpus of 2,849 unique sources.

Preliminary screening was conducted using titles, abstracts, keywords, document type, and disciplinary context, with conceptual relevance to Organizational Culture Clarity as the principal criterion. The resulting corpus comprised 982 directly relevant sources (Include A), 1,529 contextually relevant sources (Include B), 120 sources requiring further assessment (Maybe), and 218 excluded sources**.** A subsequent prioritization within *Include A* applied the *Priority High* criterion to sources judged to have high theoretical relevance for deeper conceptual examination. Across the eight thematic pairs, this produced 1,012 *Priority High* occurrences, corresponding to 964 unique sources after cross-pair deduplication. Within this prioritized corpus, a *Core Cite* designation identified works serving as central conceptual anchors for defining constructs and articulating relationships within the emerging framework; this designation reflected their role in the theoretical synthesis rather than a separate assessment of methodological quality.

The final synthesis was interpretive rather than aggregative. Sources were compared across theoretical traditions to identify conceptual overlap, distinctions, and relationships among local forms of clarity. The three-domain architecture functioned as a provisional theoretical hypothesis rather than an assumed factor structure. The synthesis therefore assessed whether the reviewed

literatures provided sufficient conceptual support for retaining, refining, or reconfiguring these domains and their boundaries. The resulting dimensions should therefore be understood as theoretically derived propositions requiring subsequent empirical validation, rather than as an established factor structure.

4. FINDINGS: FROM FRAGMENTED CONSTRUCTS TO THREE DOMAINS OF CULTURAL CLARITY

The review supports the initial premise that clarity is widely represented in organizational scholarship but distributed across research traditions that address different levels of organizational life. Role clarity, processes and routines, communication, goals, mission and values, leadership consistency, psychological safety, voice, and relational coordination each explain particular forms of clarity or ambiguity. No single research stream identified within the reviewed corpus was found to capture the broader question of whether organizational members encounter a sufficiently coherent system of cultural signals across these areas. The conceptual synthesis provides provisional theoretical support for organizing these literatures into three interdependent domains: *Organizational Clarity, Leadership Clarity,* and *Relational Clarity***.**

4.1. Organizational Clarity

Organizational Clarity concerns the formal and semi-formal reference points through which members understand how organizational activity is structured, directed, and evaluated. The reviewed literature identifies several closely connected components: organizational structure, roles and responsibilities, processes and routines, communication and information flow, goals and performance expectations, and the relationship between mission, values, strategic direction, and internal organizational identity.

Role clarity represents one of the most established local forms of organizational clarity. Research on organizational entry and socialization shows that understanding responsibilities, expectations, and role boundaries is central to adjustment and effective participation in organizational life (Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg, 2003; Wanberg and Kammeyer-Mueller, 2000). Yet role clarity alone is insufficient. Roles are enacted through processes and routines that stabilize recurring patterns of action and coordination. Research on business process *management further demonstrates that formalized processes acquire organizational meaning through the values and practices that support their enactment (Schmiedel et al., 2013, 2014).*

Communication provides the infrastructure connecting these structural elements. Organizational communication and communication-climate research indicates that information must be not merely available but credible, accessible, sufficiently accurate, and interpretable within the organizational context (Guzley, 1992; Westrum, 2004). Accordingly, greater communication volume

does not necessarily produce greater clarity when messages are inconsistent or when formal communication contradicts everyday practice.

The same principle applies to goals, mission, and values. Goals and performance expectations identify what is prioritized and how contribution is evaluated, while mission and values provide broader interpretive reference points for organizational direction. These strategic and value-based reference points also contribute to internal organizational identity by helping members interpret what the organization understands itself to be, what it stands for, and how its priorities distinguish the expected character of organizational action. Research on organizational alignment suggests that clarity depends on consistency among strategy, structure, culture, performance systems, and behavior rather than on the explicitness of any single element (Semler, 1997). Organizational Clarity therefore represents more than administrative formalization. It concerns whether roles, processes, information, objectives, and strategic reference points collectively provide an intelligible basis for coordinated action.

4.2. Leadership Clarity

The second domain concerns leadership's role in translating organizational values, priorities, and structures into credible behavioral signals. The literature consistently positions leaders as key interpreters and transmitters of organizational meaning, though their influence remains embedded in the wider cultural and structural context (Schein, 2010; Tsui et al., 2006).

Leadership Clarity emerges through four closely connected mechanisms: direction, communication, developmental support, and behavioral consistency. Leaders contribute to clarity when they explain priorities, connect strategic direction with operational implications, and help employees interpret competing organizational demands. Transformational and change-leadership research demonstrates the importance of articulating collective goals and providing direction, particularly during organizational change (Herold et al., 2008; Schaubroeck et al., 2007). Leadership clarity also involves developmental and clarifying support, through which leaders help employees interpret expectations, receive feedback, navigate change, and translate organizational priorities into workable action (Taormina, 2008; Söling et al., 2022). Yet communication and support alone are insufficient if managerial behavior contradicts the message.

Behavioral integrity is therefore particularly important to this domain. Employees interpret culture partly through the perceived correspondence between what leaders say and what they do. When declared values, managerial decisions, rewards, and observable behavior are congruent, leadership can make abstract cultural expectations more intelligible. When they diverge, leadership becomes a source of ambiguity even where formal messages are explicit (Leroy et al., 2012).

Leadership Clarity can consequently be understood as the capacity of leaders to transform declared direction into credible meaning for action. It occupies an intermediary position within the proposed model: leadership translates organizational structures and espoused values into behavior while simultaneously shaping the relational conditions under which employees communicate, challenge, collaborate, and learn.

4.3. Relational Clarity

The third domain concerns the less formalized but culturally consequential rules governing interaction. Relational Clarity addresses whether organizational members understand the shared expectations and norms surrounding interpersonal risk, trust, voice, conflict resolution, collaboration, and coordination. These norms frequently operate at the level of taken-for-granted assumptions rather than explicit organizational rules.

Psychological safety provides an important theoretical foundation for this dimension. Edmondson (1999) conceptualizes psychological safety as a shared belief that a team is safe for interpersonal risk-taking. From the perspective of cultural clarity, its significance lies in the predictability of relational consequences: members learn whether questioning, admitting mistakes, requesting help, or disagreeing is likely to generate learning and problem-solving or interpersonal sanctions. Research on employee voice and organizational silence similarly demonstrates that speaking up depends not only on individual willingness but on shared beliefs about whether expression is safe and effective (Morrison and Milliken, 2000; Morrison et al., 2011). Relational norms may therefore become clear even in dysfunctional environments, for example, when employees learn that silence is safer than challenging authority. Such *defensive clarity* reduces uncertainty but undermines learning and organizational adaptation.

Relational coordination extends the domain from interpersonal safety to collective action. Gittell (2002, 2006) conceptualizes effective coordination through shared goals, shared knowledge, mutual respect, and communication that is timely, accurate, and oriented toward problem solving. This literature demonstrates that collaboration requires more than positive interpersonal relationships. Members must understand their interdependencies, the contribution of other roles, and the common outcomes toward which activity is coordinated.

Relational Clarity therefore concerns the intelligibility and predictability of the norms governing expression and coordinated interaction, rather than the presence of high psychological safety or trust per se. It captures whether members understand how disagreement, vulnerability, knowledge sharing, conflict, and interdependent work are expected to function and what relational consequences such behaviors are likely to carry. This domain connects the

deepest cultural assumptions concerning trust and authority with the practical requirements of collective organizational action.

4.4. Interdependence of the Three Domains

The synthesis indicates that the three domains should not be treated as independent forms of clarity. Organizational structures may be explicit while leadership behavior sends contradictory signals; leaders may communicate consistently while relational norms discourage questioning or reporting problems; teams may experience high psychological safety while unclear roles and competing objectives prevent effective coordination. Conversely, the same cultural signal may operate across several domains. Communication connects formal structures with leadership interpretation, while shared goals connect strategic direction with relational coordination.

The emerging architecture therefore suggests that Organizational Culture Clarity resides not simply in the strength of any individual component, but in the coherence among organizational, leadership, and relational signals. Accordingly, the distinctive theoretical property of OCC is not the additive presence of multiple forms of clarity, but the cross-domain coherence through which these signals become mutually interpretable and jointly guide organizational action. The review consequently supports conceptualizing these domains as complementary manifestations of a broader cultural condition rather than as a collection of independent managerial practices.

5. ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE CLARITY AS AN INTEGRATIVE CULTURAL CAPABILITY

The synthesis suggests that Organizational Culture Clarity cannot be reduced to any single clarity-related construct identified in the literature. Role clarity may exist without strategic clarity; explicit values may coexist with inconsistent leadership behavior; and psychologically safe relationships may coexist with unclear responsibilities or competing objectives. In such situations, organizations may develop localised pockets of clarity without achieving broader cultural coherence**.** Organizational Culture Clarity therefore concerns the relationship among these forms of clarity rather than their isolated presence.

Based on the reviewed literature, Organizational Culture Clarity (OCC) is conceptualized as the degree of transparency, alignment, and coherence that enables organizational members to understand and enact the organization's mission, values, roles, relationships, processes, and leadership expectations. Within this definition, transparency concerns the visibility and accessibility of relevant cultural signals; alignment concerns the correspondence among formal expectations, leadership behavior, and organizational practices; and coherence concerns the extent to which these signals can be interpreted together as a sufficiently intelligible pattern. The proposed model consists of three

interdependent domains: *Organizational Clarity*, concerning the formal and strategic reference points that structure organizational activity; *Leadership Clarity*, concerning the translation of direction and values into credible communication, decisions, and behavior; and *Relational Clarity*, concerning the tacit norms through which organizational members understand how trust, voice, disagreement, collaboration, and interdependent action operate.

These domains correspond broadly, although not exclusively, to Schein's (2010) levels of culture. Organizational Clarity is most visible in artifacts and espoused values through roles, processes, communication systems, objectives, mission, and strategic priorities. Leadership Clarity operates particularly at the interface between espoused values and organizational practice, as leaders interpret, communicate, model, and reinforce what the organization claims to value. Relational Clarity reaches more deeply into underlying assumptions concerning authority, trust, interpersonal risk, conflict, responsibility, and collaboration. The model should therefore not be understood as three isolated layers, but as an interconnected cultural system in which signals originating in one domain affect the interpretation of the others.

The concept of cultural capability is used here to emphasize both the integrative and strategic relevance of Organizational Culture Clarity. The term *capability* is used here in a descriptive organizational sense, referring to the capacity to generate sufficiently intelligible and mutually reinforcing cultural signals, rather than as a claim that OCC constitutes a dynamic capability in the established strategic-management sense. OCC does not describe the substantive content of a particular organizational culture or prescribe a preferred cultural type. Rather, it concerns the organization's capacity to make its cultural reference points sufficiently intelligible and mutually reinforcing for members to orient and coordinate their actions. In this sense, two organizations with very different cultural values could both exhibit relatively high cultural clarity if organizational structures, leadership behavior, and relational norms consistently communicate how those values are expected to be enacted.

OCC is therefore conceptually distinct from the normative desirability of cultural content. A cultural system may be highly intelligible and internally coherent while reinforcing practices that are restrictive, exclusionary, or otherwise detrimental to employees. Cultural clarity should therefore not be assumed to produce positive outcomes on its own; its effects are likely to depend on the substantive values, practices, and relational norms that are made clear.

Importantly, cultural clarity should not be equated with cultural uniformity or complete consensus. Organizations contain subcultures, competing interests, professional identities, and irreducible ambiguity. Excessive convergence may itself constrain learning, dissent, and adaptation. OCC therefore concerns sufficient interpretive coherence, not identical interpretation. Its theoretical

relevance lies in distinguishing productive ambiguity from ambiguity generated by contradictory or unintelligible organizational signals.

This distinction also separates OCC from managerial control. Clarifying purpose, responsibilities, decision boundaries, and relational expectations does not necessarily prescribe how every action must be performed. On the contrary, sufficiently clear cultural reference points may enable greater distributed judgment by reducing the need for continuous managerial intervention and by providing employees with the contextual understanding required for meaningful autonomy and psychological empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995). From this perspective, clarity and autonomy are not inherently opposing conditions: clarity without autonomy may become control, whereas autonomy without sufficient clarity may contribute to fragmentation.

The proposed model is therefore preliminary rather than psychometrically established. The three-domain architecture represents a theoretically derived synthesis of the reviewed literatures and provides a basis for subsequent construct refinement and empirical validation. Whether Organizational Clarity, Leadership Clarity, and Relational Clarity operate empirically as distinguishable dimensions of a broader OCC construct remains a question for future research.

6. DISCUSSION AND THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

The proposed model contributes to organizational culture research by reframing clarity as a cultural rather than merely local or managerial phenomenon. Existing scholarship provides substantial insight into role ambiguity, communication, goal clarity, leadership consistency, psychological safety, voice, and coordination, but these constructs are usually examined within separate theoretical traditions. The present synthesis suggests that their interdependence is theoretically consequential. Organizational members do not experience roles, leadership, communication, values, and relationships as isolated systems; they interpret them simultaneously as signals about how the organization functions and what forms of action are expected.

This perspective extends organizational culture theory by foregrounding interpretability as a relevant property of the cultural system. Schein's (2010) framework explains how artifacts, espoused values, and underlying assumptions together shape organizational meaning. The OCC model develops this logic by asking whether these levels provide sufficiently coherent signals for members to understand and enact organizational expectations. In this sense, cultural clarity does not describe the content or strength of a culture, but the degree to which its different manifestations can be interpreted in relation to one another.

The model is therefore distinguishable from several adjacent concepts. OCC is broader than role or goal clarity because it includes leadership and relational norms; broader than communication clarity because explicit communication cannot resolve contradictions embedded in structures or

behavior; and broader than strategic alignment because relational assumptions about voice, trust, conflict, and collaboration also shape cultural intelligibility. It is likewise not equivalent to a strong culture or high cultural consensus. A culture may be strongly reinforced yet communicate expectations that remain contradictory across organizational levels, while high consensus may reflect conformity rather than meaningful clarity. The distinction between coherence and uniformity is therefore central to the proposed framework.

A second implication concerns the relationship between clarity and organizational adaptability. A possible objection to the proposed framework is that clarity may be conflated with formalization, control, and stability, thereby appearing incompatible with flexibility and innovation. The OCC perspective suggests a more nuanced relationship. Employees require sufficient understanding of responsibilities, priorities, decision criteria, and relational expectations in order to exercise autonomy effectively. At the same time, excessive prescription may constrain adaptation and employee agency. OCC therefore occupies an intermediate theoretical position: it concerns the cultural conditions that make distributed judgment possible without requiring either complete standardization or continuous managerial intervention.

This logic is particularly relevant in periods of organizational transformation. Change frequently modifies structures, priorities, roles, leadership expectations, and patterns of collaboration simultaneously. When these signals evolve at different speeds or communicate incompatible expectations, employees may face increased interpretive burden even when each individual change initiative is formally explained. From an OCC perspective, transformation becomes not only a problem of change communication or employee resistance, but also a problem of maintaining sufficient cultural coherence while organizational assumptions and practices are being renegotiated.

The model also has implications for people management. HR and organizational development interventions often address clarity through separate mechanisms such as role design, performance management, leadership development, communication initiatives, employee voice, or team effectiveness. The proposed framework suggests that these interventions may be less effective when implemented independently of one another. Clarifying roles may have limited value if leaders enact competing expectations; strengthening employee voice may have limited impact if strategic priorities remain ambiguous; and communicating values may have limited credibility when organizational systems reward contradictory behavior. OCC therefore provides a conceptual basis for examining whether people-management practices reinforce or undermine one another as cultural signals.

The contribution of the model is therefore integrative rather than substitutive. It does not seek to replace established constructs, but to organize

them within a broader explanation of how culture becomes intelligible and actionable for organizational members. By positioning Organizational Culture Clarity as an integrative cultural capability, the framework provides a theoretical foundation for investigating the relationship between cultural coherence, coordinated action, employee experience, and organizational adaptation. These relationships, however, remain propositions requiring empirical examination rather than established effects.

7. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The study has several limitations consistent with its exploratory and theory-building purpose. First, the resulting corpus is dependent on the terminology used in the search strategy. Although the search areas were theoretically derived from Schein's cultural framework and relevant organizational literatures, studies using alternative conceptual vocabularies may not have been captured. Second, the review was restricted to Scopus and Web of Science and therefore does not exhaust potentially relevant books, edited volumes, or other academic and professional sources. Third, the initial classification of the large corpus relied substantially on title and abstract screening; consequently, the conceptual relevance of priority sources requires continued verification through full-text analysis. Finally, the review did not systematically appraise the methodological quality of every identified study, as its principal objective was conceptual mapping and theoretical integration rather than aggregation of empirical effects.

A further limitation concerns levels of analysis. The literatures integrated in the model include constructs developed at individual, team, and organizational levels. The present conceptual synthesis does not assume that these levels are interchangeable or that individual perceptions can automatically be aggregated into an organizational property. Future construct development must therefore establish the appropriate referent, aggregation criteria, and multilevel relationships through which OCC can be empirically represented.

These limitations also define the next stages of research. The proposed three-domain structure should be regarded as a theoretical architecture rather than an empirically established factor structure. Further work should refine the boundaries and component constructs of Organizational, Leadership, and Relational Clarity, examine their conceptual distinctiveness from adjacent constructs, and translate the resulting framework into a valid and reliable measurement instrument. Subsequent empirical research should then assess whether the proposed domains can be distinguished empirically and investigate their relationships with theoretically relevant organizational outcomes, including organizational coherence, performance, and employee experience. Cross-organizational and cross-contextual research will ultimately be necessary to determine the generalizability and practical relevance of Organizational Culture Clarity.

8. CONCLUSION

This article addresses a recurring but fragmented problem in organizational research: clarity is extensively studied through constructs such as role clarity, communication, goal clarity, leadership consistency, psychological safety, employee voice, and relational coordination, yet these literatures are rarely integrated within a common cultural framework. Drawing on a systematized scoping review and Schein's model of organizational culture, the study proposes Organizational Culture Clarity (OCC) as an integrative cultural capability concerned with the intelligibility, coherence, and enactability of organizational life.

The resulting framework identifies three interdependent domains: *Organizational Clarity, Leadership Clarity,* and *Relational Clarity*. Together, these domains capture how formal structures and strategic reference points, leadership behavior, and relational norms combine to shape employees' understanding of what matters, what is expected, and how coordinated action should occur. OCC therefore does not imply complete consensus, the elimination of ambiguity, or increased managerial control; rather, it concerns the presence of sufficiently coherent cultural signals to support interpretation, coordination, and responsible agency.

The proposed framework remains theoretical and requires further refinement and empirical validation. Nevertheless, it offers a foundation for integrating previously fragmented clarity-related constructs and for examining cultural clarity as a potentially relevant condition for organizational coherence, performance, and employee experience.

References

1) Claxton, B.L. and Dolan, C.L. (2022) *A Step-by-Step Guide to Writing a Literature Review for Doctoral Research.* Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing Company.
2) Edmondson, A.C. (1999) 'Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), pp. 350–383.
3) Gittell, J.H. (2002) 'Coordinating mechanisms in care provider groups: Relational coordination as a mediator and input uncertainty as a moderator of performance effects', *Management Science*, 48(11), pp. 1408–1426.
4) Gittell, J.H. (2006) 'Relational coordination: Coordinating work through relationships of shared goals, shared knowledge and mutual respect', in Kyriakidou, O. and Özbilgin, M.F. (eds.) *Relational Perspectives in Organizational Studies: A Research Companion*. Edward Elgar, pp. 74–94.
5) Guzley, R.M. (1992) 'Organizational climate and communication climate: Predictors of commitment to the organization', *Management Communication Quarterly*, 5(4), pp. 379–402.
6) Herold, D.M., Fedor, D.B., Caldwell, S. and Liu, Y. (2008) 'The effects of transformational and change leadership on employees' commitment to a change: A multilevel study', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), pp. 346–357.

7) Kammeyer-Mueller, J.D. and Wanberg, C.R. (2003) 'Unwrapping the organizational entry process: Disentangling multiple antecedents and their pathways to adjustment', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), pp. 779–794.
8) Leroy, H., Palanski, M.E. and Simons, T. (2012) 'Authentic leadership and behavioral integrity as drivers of follower commitment and performance', *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107(3), pp. 255–264.
9) Morrison, E.W. and Milliken, F.J. (2000) 'Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world', *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), pp. 706–725.
10) Morrison, E.W., Wheeler-Smith, S.L. and Kamdar, D. (2011) 'Speaking up in groups: A cross-level study of group voice climate and voice', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), pp. 183–191.
11) Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S.S.K. and Cha, S.E. (2007) 'Embracing transformational leadership: Team values and the impact of leader behavior on team performance', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), pp. 1020–1030.
12) Schein, E.H. (2010) *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. 4th edn. Jossey-Bass.
13) Schmiedel, T., vom Brocke, J. and Recker, J. (2013) 'Which cultural values matter to business process management? Results from a global Delphi study', *Business Process Management Journal*, 19(2), pp. 292–317.
14) Schmiedel, T., vom Brocke, J. and Recker, J. (2014) 'Development and validation of an instrument to measure organizational cultures' support of business process management', *Information & Management*, 51(1), pp. 43–56.
15) Schneider, B. and Barbera, K.M. (eds.) (2014) *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Climate and Culture*. Oxford University Press.
16) Semler, S.W. (1997) 'Systematic agreement: A theory of organizational alignment', *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 8(1), pp. 23–40.
17) Söling, S., Pfaff, H., Karbach, U., Ansmann, L., Köberlein-Neu, J., Kellermann-Mühlhoff, P., Düvel, L., Beckmann, T., Hammerschmidt, R., Jachmich, J., Leicher, E., Brandt, B., Richard, J., Meyer, F., Flume, M., Müller, T., Gerlach, F.M., Muth, C., Gonzalez-Gonzalez, A.I. et al. (2022) 'How is leadership behavior associated with organization-related variables? Translation and psychometric evaluation of the implementation leadership scale in German primary healthcare', *BMC Health Services Research*, 22, Article 1204.
18) Spreitzer, G.M. (1995) 'An empirical test of a comprehensive model of intrapersonal empowerment in the workplace', *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23(5), pp. 601–629.
19) Taormina, R.J. (2008) 'Interrelating leadership behaviors, organizational socialization, and organizational culture', *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(1), pp. 85–102.
20) Tricco, A.C. et al. (2018) 'PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation', *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 169(7), pp. 467–473.
21) Tsui, A.S., Zhang, Z.-X., Wang, H., Xin, K.R. and Wu, J.B. (2006) 'Unpacking the relationship between CEO leadership behavior and organizational culture', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(2), pp. 113–137.

22) Wanberg, C.R. and Kammeyer-Mueller, J.D. (2000) ‘Predictors and outcomes of proactivity in the socialization process’, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), pp. 373–385.
23) Westrum, R. (2004) ‘A typology of organisational cultures’, *Quality and Safety in Health Care*, 13(Suppl. 2), pp. ii22–ii27.
24) Yanow, D. and Ybema, S. (2011) ‘Introduction’, in Ybema, S.B., Yanow, D. and Sabelis, I.H.J. (eds.) *Organizational Culture: Volume 1*. Edward Elgar, pp. xi–xxxii.