Section Two
NATURE AND CIVILIZATION

The World of Corporate Culture:
Ontological, Anthropological
and Organizational Models

Leonid Hubersky

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
(Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: dphs@ukr.net
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4391-4385

Yevheniia Levcheniuk

Ph.D. in Philosophy, Associate Professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
(Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: levchenyuk@knu.ua
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0361-6455

The article examines the peculiarities of corporate culture formation and development in the modern stage of societal development, which is characterized by high levels of dynamism and conflict. It has been said that culture is something created by Man just as Man is the creation of culture, because culture influences behavior in a person from the beginning of their socialization through the assimilation of norms, values, models of behavior, etc. A person implements all of these in various types of relationships which, in turn, develop structures, organizations, and all individuals, in particular. Corporate culture becomes the basis for the development of organizations at various levels through the application of management

theory, especially when considering the current state of international, intercultural relations caused by globalization and migration processes. Corporate culture plays a particularly important role in ensuring the progressive development of science and education, and in preserving the intellectual potential of the state in conditions of social contradiction and military conflict. The development of corporate culture is based on such principles as tolerance, equality and partnership, which are embodied in the relations of any organization, corporation, etc. It has been shown that culture always involves some kind of change, and through such change, corporate culture can act as the criterion that will ensure a group's integrity under the pressure of external challenges and act as the measure of the internal stability of any team that has determined its goals, tasks and the purpose of its development and the effective implementation of its values and beliefs.

Keywords: culture, corporate culture, organization, tolerance, social partnership, globalization processes, migration processes.

Introduction

The modern dynamic conditions of world development caused by the accelerated pace of globalization and the entry into the new development phase of post-globalization necessarily require the introduction of new methodologies, techniques, management technologies and the harmonization of newly created relations and structures. It especially applies to the sphere of education, the training of specialists in the field of management and the regulation of the migration processes, which have significantly intensified. This is because management processes permeate all spheres of human activity. Moreover, it is management that makes it possible to organize the coexistence of people because modern society is a complex system where everyone has their own needs and interests. Therefore, management appears to form a kind of methodological basis, building ways of coordinating individual actions in a single direction to develop the community.

For a long time, the concepts of "governance" and "management" have been identified in the scientific literature. In their scientific research, the authors have repeatedly proved the incorrectness of this approach. In our opinion, these concepts reveal different management strategies. Namely, management is a technique that, first of all, focuses on the management practices and standardization of approaches to solving specific problems that describe a part of reality without taking into account the organization's development cycle. It is based on a single function, that of management: the training of a professional manager who can solve the management tasks set before them.

Management theory serves as a *methodological basis* for revealing patterns in the development of management processes and covering both the global and local levels of the development of organizations, focusing on the peculiarities of the development of culture, traditions, values, national guidelines, etc. This factor is important in modern management theory since different people with different cultural and religious traditions, peculiarities of national character, etc., work together in single organizations.

That is why we strongly believe *corporate culture* should be the basis in the training of modern managers who will not only perform the management function but, above all, will be part of the team that can function as a whole while taking into account the characteristics of each team member, as well as the specifics of the whole.

The approaches of both domestic and foreign modern researchers to the understanding of corporate culture in various spheres of social life is the methodological basis of this study, particularly the work of Adizes, Bogatyr, Braun, Kramer, Coyle, Rudenko, Utiuzh, Vlasenko, Turenko, Vedernikov, Sandyga, Gorton Gary, Grennan, Zentefis, Tian, Wan, and Chen. Through their work, it has been established that corporate culture has a significant positive impact on the development of organizations at any level.

The anthropological and organizational dimensions of corporate culture

Corporate culture is a branch of knowledge that studies the organizational basis of the culture of interaction between people within an organization, as well as between representatives of different social structures. According to Huntington, culture today is a criterion, an identifier that is rooted in the essence of man and, on the one hand, distinguishes, as well as on the other hand, serves as a factor in the interaction between individuals. It should also be noted that although the problems of development and interaction of cultures are as ancient as mankind's existence, globalization processes are updating them and taking them to a higher level. Previously, anthropologists focused on the peculiarities of a particular civilization's or nation's development but today the interaction and interpenetration of cultures are in the foreground. As Brown and Kramer point out, "Today, anthropological concepts are applied to anything from marketing and design to medicine and entertainment. <…> Corporate anthropology demonstrates the internal hidden dynamics of the organization. It shows the difference between the formal organizational structure and informal authorities" (Braun & Kramer, 2018). Namely, they allow you to identify behavioral models and relationship peculiarities between people in the structure of an organization. According to Bogatyr, "business and media see anthropology as a discipline that has tools for deep penetration into consumption culture and an anthropologist as an ideal mediator who is able to connect the manufacturer and the consumer and make their interaction controlled" (Bogatyr, 2012). It is only one of the various aspects of organizational anthropology. Anthropologists perform another important function: they become an integral part of the corporate world.

Since the beginning of the 21st century, corporations, instead of creating focus groups, have been involving anthropologists in "branding" their products. Anthropological studies are enhanced by the use of the latest technologies, including webcams, blogs, social networks and more. In other words, anthropology has changed the vision of manufacturer-consumer interaction. Today, companies produce not only a product but, above all, a brand that becomes an integral part of modern life. Consequently, the function of the consumer has changed; the consumer is now regarded as a cultural and social actor. Emphasizing the importance of learning about these processes, we can not only describe the peculiarities of such relationships but we are also able to produce new solutions for the strategy of an organization's further development. It is especially important in crises and transitional periods in the development of any organization, as well as in the wider society. For example, inviting foreigners to work in the government has recently become a fashionable trend in public administration. However, such actors appear to have been ineffective. A specialist in the field of the international economy, Garbaruk, thinks that, concerning employment in the government, it is worth inviting people who permanently reside in the context of the Ukrainian culture and traditions and who are familiar with how to build relationships and what strategic goals to achieve rather than people who are only or who have recently received citizenship. In this regard, Adizes emphasizes that special attention should be paid to cycles of an organization's development since managers need

to constantly change their management methods and approaches. For the effective development of organizations, it is necessary to perform four main functions: the first function is productivity (determining the value aspect of the company's existence, i.e., the production of the results); the second function is administration (this is the ability of the company management to find effective management models); the third is entrepreneurship (as our lives consist of changes, the skillful leader can manage these changes, taking into account such a triad as 'changes–problem/opportunity–solution', which, in turn, again stipulates change); the fourth function is integration (this involves forming the manager's ability to combine elements into a single whole to ensure the life and efficiency of the organization) (Adizes, 2018). As a result, taking into account these functions, it is possible not only to plan or to develop a strategy for the development of the company or organization but also to provide its successful functioning. There is a significant difference between an organization that exists only as a plan ("a project on paper" in which the organization's development strategy is embedded as effectiveness indicators and numbers) and a real organization that manifests itself in the stories, relationships and emotions of people who create and implement the strategy of its development. In such circumstances, the main task of a corporate anthropologist, at any stage of a corporation's development, is to study the language (culture) of each of the worlds (the world of management and the world of the lower level/average employee; the world of the client and the world of the organization; the world of training and the world of everyday work) and to be a translator between them. That is, to mediate between the different cultures. This will create appropriate relationships in the organization and will relieve the tension existing between representatives of different cultures and levels. For example, this may occur when there is a merger of companies, the introduction of reorganization processes, changes in the work schedule, etc. All of these procedures necessarily cause changes in corporate culture. Does it cause anxiety and fear? The answer is undoubtedly: "Yes!" However, you should not be afraid of change, because cultures are constantly changing, and each generation acts according to these changes and transformations. And in this context, thanks to its openness, corporate culture acts as an effective strategy for harmonizing relations not only in a specific corporation but also in society as a whole since the current stage of the development of societies has an accelerated dynamic character (crises, wars and migration processes). All this requires creating appropriate types of relationships that will develop each specific person, organization, society, culture and humanity.

It is our opinion that management is a methodology with clearly defined goals and standardized management methods that do not consider accelerated dynamic changes. Modern management theory, based on corporate culture, gives priority to the task that enables the creation of a mutually complementary team, taking into account the characteristics of each member of the team, as well as the sphere of the organization's activities and the limits of its existence at both the local and global levels of development. After all, if you look at the organization from the point of view of a corporate anthropologist, then it is a group of people who are connected by culture. As the Dutch anthropologists Braun and Kramer claim, "We work with 'spaces' or 'invisible lines' between people, that is, assumptions, beliefs, rules and norms that they share, and which make the group act as a collective and guarantee that each member of the group knows about the group's intentions and how to behave in it" (Braun & Kramer, 2018). So, from the point of view of anthropology, there is no void between people. This space is filled with culture, which, in turn, not only determines people's way of life and behavior but also causes change. That is, culture does not simply exist by itself; it is a product of people, just as it is what forms people. In other words, culture shapes people, and people also shape culture. Based on the content of this thesis, it can be argued that culture is never innate,

it is always in the process of creating. That is, "With the help of culture, people create order out of chaos" (Braun & Kramer, 2018).

Thus, culture becomes an important tool that people, acting together, can use to find answers to existential questions, to create relationships of any type (economic, political, family, etc.), to structure their lives accordingly, and to, together, try to create and embody in their lives social norms and values. Thus, corporate anthropologists claim that "we are not born with culture; we are born in culture and create it together with the people around us" (Braun & Kramer, 2018).

At the personal level, a person is involved in culture from childhood; they are taught how to behave, how to look, how to perceive the surrounding world, and how to communicate and interact with other people. All these skills are acquired by people as a matter of course since most cultural values and attitudes are so deeply rooted in human consciousness that they are transmitted from generation to generation at an unconscious level. For example, in the attitude toward children of different sexes, boys are more often told that they should be strong, steady, and not cry, while girls are told that they are beautiful, elegant, attractive, etc.

At the same time, humanity has developed a large number of forms of cultural transmission: for example, through language, gestures, stories, rites, rituals, symbols, behaviors, etc. Culture becomes an identifier for a separate group of people because one or the other collectively shares the same thoughts which create appropriate forms and patterns of behavior. In this context, we can talk about both national cultures and corporate cultures. People create a culture in an organization and the elements of this culture are passed on to the next generations (in society), as well as to new employees (in organizations, corporations, and enterprises).

For example, if an employee of a corporation resigns and another takes his place, the replacement is expected, after an adaptation period, to take on the corporate norms of behavior as a matter of course and to adapt to the new team. So, the team member changes but not the culture. However, it is worth noting that if culture can be learned, it can also be changed. "Changes in culture are, in fact, a modification of existing relations, behavior, and understanding of the meaning of words" (Braun & Kramer, 2018). According to our example, a new employee must not only adapt to the existing norms and patterns of behavior in the team but also bring new ideas to the group. These may be able to change the balance of forces in their favor; that is, they may change the culture itself: "Culture is constantly changing, sometimes subtly, and sometimes quite radically. It changes with the appearance of new people in response to technological innovations, to events in the world, in accordance with the spirit of the times" (Braun & Kramer, 2018). However, most cultural changes, and this is their peculiarity, occur without any plan or script. That is, they occur naturally. Conversely, if you try to change the culture actively and purposefully, it is a complicated process.

This leads us to ask about the need for change in the difficult transitional periods of the existence and development of corporations and societies, given that it is necessary to consciously influence the unconscious process. Thus, how can people be encouraged to believe in the same idea and act in a new way? How can the organization be made efficient and profitable, so that employees act together to achieve future common goals, overcoming the habits of old? When creating a strategy for the development of a company, organization, or society, there is and cannot be a ready method for cultural transformations. For example, some leaders and managers deliberately avoid planned cultural transformations because the process is too time-consuming and is quite often doomed to failure.

Basic methods of understanding corporate culture

Then they direct their main efforts to change the planned indicators, operational activities, etc. The second way is to change the culture where leaders immediately face resistance from team members, an approach that can lead to chaos. In this approach, according to corporate anthropologists, it is necessary to find ways that appropriately structure relations between people and direct their activities in a single direction. Such approaches have been developed and we can single out three of them.

The first method is typologies. They exist to describe organizations and involve a set of basic characteristics, where the names used to refer to organizations can be symbolic or metaphorical. Examples of this include the use of a color scheme (red, blue), trademarks, emblems, etc. "The advantage of typologies is that they immediately gave a general picture, which makes it easier to discuss culture" (Braun & Kramer, 2018). However, there are several disadvantages to this approach. First, the peculiarities and exceptions of one or another culture, which are characteristic of the description of a specific group, are not considered. Second, the question of the history of the development of a culture may be excluded: when it was born, how it developed, and what factors significantly influenced its development. Third, it excludes the question of the functionality of culture, i.e., which cultural model has proven to be effective and stable.

The second method is measurement. This approach is based on the idea that all cultures have the same parameters but their indicators differ. For this approach, tools such as questionnaires are often employed. With their help, researchers can measure selected aspects of corporate culture on a scale (from 1 to 10). For example, Hofstede has proposed several measurements that are important in any culture but have different indicators in different cultures. One advantage of this approach is the possibility of measuring various aspects of culture or the development of one aspect over time. For example, it is possible to evaluate the development of a company or corporation from its institution to the present. The main disadvantage of using measurements is that quality is assessed in a quantitative form, which may give a false sense of control and management.

The third method is grounded theory. Using this approach, the anthropologist examines the real working environment of the organization. This is done to find out how people collectively structure and make sense of their world. The peculiarity of this approach lies in the fact that it is impossible to achieve this goal by relying on a previously proposed hypothesis or typology. Reality should reveal itself: the researcher observes and identifies feelings while testing all the intricacies of the functioning of corporate culture in any organization (a university, police station), etc. The result of this approach is the identification of regularities in the collected data and the creation of a theory that can be tested in real conditions. A major feature of this approach is that the complexity of the structure of culture is considered here. Meanwhile, the disadvantage is that the process takes time, and the reliability of the results depends on the skills and personal characteristics of the researcher. For example, corporate anthropologists Danielle Braun and Jitske Kramer use all three approaches in their research.

Although it is often said that the first two approaches are more attractive due to their simplicity and the possibility of quantification, something which is very often requested by customers, these approaches falter in that they take away the opportunity to consider the unique nature of an organization. Therefore, from this aspect, grounded theory is a preferable alternative. Thanks to this method, it is possible to investigate not only the role and significance of individual aspects of a culture that unite people into a collective but also how these aspects are connected within a single whole. This allows for a better understanding of the culture and,

with it, a solid foundation for intervention for change. "Culture can be neither good nor bad. She just is. It is a connected structure that provides answers to the two main questions of group survival: How do we – a group or an organization – survive in the outside world? And how do we organize ourselves from the middle?" (Braun & Kramer, 2018). That is, it is the corporate culture that acts as a factor not only in the survival and development of the collective (the group or organization) under the pressure of external factors and circumstances but is also an internal yardstick (invisible ontological space) that binds people together for the realization of set goals and is ready for any changes and challenges.

The ontological dimension of corporate culture

The current stage of world development is mostly characterized by conflict, which is caused by many factors, in particular economic pressures, political crises, military activity, intercultural, international and religious issues, and other contradictions, all of which require the quick identification and the implementation of an effective way of regulating social relations. In our opinion, the study and knowledge of culture will contribute to dialogue and the harmonization of relations between representatives of different cultures and worldviews because strength lies in the group or corporate culture: "Group culture is one of the most powerful forces on the planet" (Coyle, 2018). Her presence is felt in any successful organization (corporations, sports teams, happy families, etc.). For example, 200 companies took part in one Harvard University study, and it was found that a strong culture increased the company's profits by 756% over 11 years. As Coyle states, "We all want a strong culture in our company, community, or family. We all know it works. We just don't know how exactly" (Coyle, 2018).

Therefore, the question arises, what meaning do we attach to the term "culture"? Can it be defined as actual, that is, a set of skills, something constant and unchanging? This understanding of culture reduces it to inheritance and destiny, suggesting certain groups have a strong culture, while the rest do not. In this context, Coyle, who studied several successful groups, including the Marines, a professional basketball team, the film industry, a comedy troupe, etc., drew several interesting conclusions. In particular, he stated that "it turned out that their cultures are determined by a certain set of skills. These skills direct our social intelligence to create interactions" (Coyle, 2018).

Conclusions

Corporate culture is a complex and multidimensional system of values, norms, beliefs, and principles shared by each member of a team, which is implemented in their behavior and activities to promote the development of the organization or the corporation, as well as their personal development. The ontological dimension of corporate culture concerns the deep factors of both universal and national cultures (the peculiarities of worldview, value orientations and attitudes, which are supra-corporate elements). Culture is a space of human activity, one of the models of the world that describes the structure of relations in society. The organizational dimension involves the use of management theory as a methodological basis to reveal the developmental regularities of management processes at different levels of development of the corporation or the society. The anthropological dimension of corporate culture regards a person as the center of the organization and the purpose of all executed events, including scientific research. Corporate culture sees a person as the figure and the organization as the background: the person influences the development of the corporation, they are active and dynamic, and the organization itself is relatively static. In this way, human capital is the determinant both

for any successful company or any state and society as a whole. Therefore, in the context of intensified globalization transformations, in particular the world migration processes, corporate culture can be considered as one of the mechanisms to harmonize interactions between people to preserve the human capital of any state.

📖 References

Adizes, I. (2018) *Change management*. Kyiv: Book Chef.

Bogatyr, N.V. (2012) Anthropology of Organizations and Network Communities: History and the Present. *Ethnographic Review*. No 3, 4–12.

Braun, D., and Kramer, J. (2018) The Corporate Tribe Organizational lessons from anthropology. Publisher Routledge.

Coyle, D. (2018) The Culture Code: The Secrets of Highly Successful Groups. Random House Audio.

Utiuzh, I., Kovtun, N., Vlasenko, F. et al. (2023) The Evolutionary Mechanisms for Tolerance and Social Humanism Development in Education and Medicine: a Post-Capitalist Discourse. *Wisdom*. Vol. 25. Output. 1, 107-117. https://doi.org/10.24234/wisdom.v25i1.980

Rudenko, S., Turenko, V., Petrenko, I. et al. (2023) Philosophical and Anthropological Issues in Chinese Marxism: Key Ideas and Concepts. *Synesis*. Vol. 15. No.2, 278-289

Vedernikov, M., Sandyga, I., and Volianska-Savchuk, L. (2020) Specificity of Corporate Culture Modeling at Industrial Enterprises in Conditions of Digital Business Transformation. *International Conference on Advanced Computer Information Technologies*, 595-600.

Gorton, G.B., Grennan, J., and Zentefis, A. (2022) Corporate Culture. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, Vol. 14, 535-561. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-financial-092321-124541

Tian, J., Cao, W., and Cheng, Q. (2022) Corporate Competing Culture and Environmental Investment. *Frontiers in Psychology,* Vol. 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.774173

Wan, P., Chen, X., and Ke, Y. (2020) Does corporate integrity culture matter to corporate social responsibility? Evidence from China. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. Vol. 259. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120877