

**DOI: 10.52363/passa-2026.1-2**

**UDC: 005.73:005.21**

**Chubina A.**, PhD in Public Administration, Cherkasy City Council, Cherkasy  
ORCID: 0000-0001-6812-231X

**Чубіна А.**, доктор філософії, Черкаська міська рада, Черкаси

## **TRANSFORMATION OF CORPORATE CULTURE AS A STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IMPERATIVE IN A POST-INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY**

## **ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ КОРПОРАТИВНОЇ КУЛЬТУРИ ЯК СТРАТЕГІЧНИЙ ІМПЕРАТИВ МЕНЕДЖМЕНТУ В ПОСТІНДУСТРІАЛЬНОМУ СУСПІЛЬСТВІ**

*The article aims to substantiate the transition of corporate culture from a secondary administrative tool to a strategic management imperative in post-industrial society. The author seeks to reveal the methodological foundations of transforming managerial paradigms from modern instrumental rationality to postmodern pluralism and communicative openness.*

*The research is based on an interdisciplinary approach combining the critical theory of the Frankfurt School (T. Adorno, M. Horkheimer, H. Marcuse), J. Habermas's theory of communicative action, and Z. Bauman's concept of liquid modernity. Methods of dialectical analysis of the technogenic matrix, deconstruction of postmodern socio-cultural contexts, and a systems approach were used to study anthropological risks in business digital transformation.*

*It was revealed that the dominance of instrumental rationality leads to "anthropological reduction" and the formation of the one-dimensional man within corporate structures. It is proved that postmodern liberalization without an ethical center causes a shift toward mimetic rationality and the creation of hyper reality. The concept of the Communicative Turn is substantiated as a strategic mechanism for transitioning from manipulative management to*

*dialogic interaction, ensuring the legitimation of the "Other" and the development of employees' critical thinking.*

*The transformation of corporate culture into a strategic imperative is a necessary condition for institutional resilience. It is established that a leader in modern organizations must evolve from a technician of souls to a facilitator of meaning, integrating social pedagogy and self-discipline principles (Wu Wei) into the workflow. True organizational resilience in the era of global crises is achieved through human-centric development and a refusal to perceive culture as a secondary administrative expense.*

**Keywords:** *corporate culture, strategic imperative, post-industrial society, technogenic matrix, anthropological reduction, communicative turn, instrumental rationality, one-dimensional man, institutional resilience, digital transformation, dialogic interaction, facilitator of meaning, liquid modernity, socio-cultural transformation.*

*Стаття спрямована на обґрунтування переходу корпоративної культури від статусу допоміжного адміністративного інструменту до стратегічного імперативу менеджменту в умовах постіндустріального суспільства. Автор ставить за мету розкрити методологічні засади трансформації управлінських парадигм від модерної інструментальної раціональності до постмодерного плюралізму та комунікативної відкритості.*

*Дослідження ґрунтується на міждисциплінарному підході, що поєднує критичну теорію Франкфуртської школи (Т. Адорно, М. Горкгаймер, Г. Маркузе), теорію комунікативної дії Ю. Габермаса та концепцію «плинної сучасності» З. Баумана. Використано методи діалектичного аналізу техногенної матриці, деконструкції постмодерних соціокультурних контекстів та системного підходу для вивчення антропологічних ризиків у цифровій трансформації бізнесу.*

*Виявлено, що засилля інструментальної раціональності призводить до «антропологічного звуження» та формування «одновимірної людини» в межах корпоративних структур. Доведено, що постмодерна лібералізація без етичного центру спричиняє сповзання до*

*міметичної раціональності та створення гіперреальності. Обґрунтовано концепцію «комунікативного повороту» як стратегічного механізму переходу від маніпулятивного управління до діалогічної взаємодії, що забезпечує легітимацію та розвиток критичного мислення працівників.*

*Трансформація корпоративної культури в стратегічний імператив є необхідною умовою інституційної стійкості. Встановлено, що лідер у сучасних організаціях має еволюціонувати від «технолога душ» до «фасилітатора сенсів», інтегруючи соціальну педагогіку та принципи самодисципліни у робочий процес. Справжня стійкість організації в епоху глобальних криз досягається через людиноцентричний розвиток та відмову від сприйняття культури як вторинних витрат.*

**Ключові слова:** *корпоративна культура, стратегічний імператив, постіндустріальне суспільство, техногенна матриця, антропологічне звуження, комунікативний поворот, інструментальна раціональність, одновимірна людина, інституційна стійкість, цифрова трансформація, діалогічна взаємодія, фасилітатор сенсів, плинна сучасність, соціокультурна трансформація.*

Problem statement. Despite the rapid transition to a post-industrial economy, many contemporary management systems remain anchored in the instrumental rationality of the industrial era. This reliance on top-down, hierarchical control creates a fundamental misalignment with the values of the modern workforce, such as autonomy, self-realization, and ethical engagement.

The core problem lies in the ossification of corporate culture, which often acts as a barrier rather than a catalyst for strategic change. In the context of global social transformations – characterized by the communicative turn and the pluralization of lifestyles – traditional managerial tools fail to address the growing risks of anthropological reduction and organizational alienation.

Without a deliberate transformation of corporate culture from a secondary administrative function into a strategic management imperative, organizations face a double crisis:

1. **Systemic Inefficiency:** The inability to adapt to the fluid, high-speed requirements of a knowledge-based society.

2. **Human Degradation:** The loss of creative potential and psychological resilience among employees, leading to what Marcuse described as the one-dimensional existence.

Therefore, there is a critical need to redefine the methodological framework of corporate culture, shifting it from a mechanism of mimetic styling to a foundational driver of institutional sustainability and human-centric development.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The study of corporate culture as a multifaceted socio-cultural phenomenon rests on a rich foundation of interdisciplinary research. The methodological basis for analyzing the crises of the modern era was established by the representatives of the Frankfurt School, notably T. Adorno and M. Horkheimer [4]. Their work on the Dialectic of Enlightenment remains crucial for understanding how instrumental rationality can lead to the subordination of human individuality to technical systems. H. Marcuse, whose theories explain the mechanisms of social alienation within corporate structures, provided further critical insights into the one-dimensional nature of industrial civilization [10].

The works by J. Habermas, specifically his theory of communicative action, heavily influence the transition toward a postmodern understanding of organizational life [8]. Habermas' communicative turn serves as the primary alternative to the repressive technocratic management models of the past. Additionally, the philosophical reflections of X. Ortega y Gasset and K. Jaspers provide a vital lens for examining the massification of society and its impact on the spiritual substance of corporate environments [11, 9].

In the realm of contemporary management and sociology, Z. Bauman, who introduced the concept of liquid modernity, has explored the problem of social transformations in the post-industrial era [6]. His analysis of the fragility of human bonds is particularly relevant for understanding the sporadic and atomized nature of modern corporate communications. Theoretical contributions regarding the hyper reality and symbolic coding of culture by J.

Baudrillard help explain how modern organizations construct corporate identities that often replace reality with simulated images [5].

Recent Ukrainian scholarship has also made significant strides in adapting these global theories to the local context. Researchers such as V. Voronkova [1], V. Melnyk, Z. Skrynnyk, A. Karas [3] etc. have focused on the challenges of preserving human identity amidst technical expansion and the necessity of ethical anchoring in public administration and management.

However, despite this extensive body of work, the specific role of corporate culture as a strategic management imperative – rather than a mere tool – remains under-researched, particularly in the context of balancing global postmodern trends with the need for national institutional resilience.

Research objectives. The primary objective of this study is to substantiate the transition of corporate culture from a functional tool to a strategic management imperative within post-industrial society. To achieve this, the following specific objectives are addressed:

1. To analyze the methodological transition from modern instrumental rationality to postmodern pluralism, identifying how this shift redefines the philosophical foundations of organizational management.
2. To evaluate the systemic risks of anthropological reduction and social alienation caused by the technogenic matrix, contrasting these with the potential of a human-centric corporate environment.
3. To conceptualize the Communicative Turn as a strategic mechanism for institutional transformation, fostering dialogic interaction as a foundation for organizational resilience and sustainability.

Presentation of the main material. The conceptualization of corporate culture has reached a critical juncture, necessitated by the exhaustion of the modernist paradigm. Since the late 18th century, management has been dominated by an instrumental rationality that views the organization as a technical machine. Within this framework, corporate culture was often reduced to a set of regulatory mechanisms designed to ensure linear progress and hierarchical compliance. This will to power, as identified by Adorno and Horkheimer, positioned the human element as a passive object for systematic transformation and redesign.

In contrast, the postmodern perspective introduces a liberalization of the organizational lifeworld. It replaces rigid, universalist structures with a mosaic-like pluralism, legitimizing the Other and fostering a group consciousness capable of self-criticism. However, this transition is fraught with a specific paradox: without a strategic anchor, postmodern openness often devolves into mimetic rationality. In such cases, corporate culture becomes a symbolic superstructure – a hyper reality where values are merely styled or imitated to fit external market trends. This leads to a situation of all-inclusiveness where the lack of an ethical center results in a loss of authentic organizational identity.

A fundamental challenge in contemporary management is the encroaching influence of the technogenic matrix. As science and technical efficiency become the measure of all things, the organization risks losing its heart – the moral and emotional substance that sustains human commitment. This process leads to anthropological reduction, where the employee's biosocial structure is narrowed to fit purely functional, economic requirements. While the technogenic matrix accelerates scientific progress, the management of AI within business digital transformation must prioritize human-centric values to avoid the total automation of organizational consciousness [2].

Following the critique of H. Marcuse, the individual in such a technocratic system becomes one-dimensional. In the pursuit of total rationalization, the modern workplace often fosters an environment of atomization and isolation. Digital connectivity, while expanding the reach of communication, frequently fails to provide deep social integration. Consequently, corporate culture in the industrial tradition acts merely as a compensatory mechanism – a standardized identity that helps the individual adapt to high-speed environments but fails to provoke genuine spiritual or creative self-development. The result is a heartless technical culture that, while efficient in the short term, undermines long-term institutional resilience.

To reclaim corporate culture as a strategic imperative, management must initiate a Communicative Turn. This shift involves moving beyond top-down indoctrination and the dictatorship of laboratories toward a model of dialogic interaction.

- From Mimetic Styling to Authentic Life-Creation: Strategic management must transition from simply following external best practices (mimesis) to fostering an authentic organizational environment that reflects the unique cultural and ethical values of its members.

- The Power of Habermasian Dialogue: Communication must be redefined not as a tool for manipulation but as a space for genuine communicative action. In this space, organizational values are not imposed but are negotiated and internalized through transparent discourse, allowing for the legitimation of diversity and critical thought.

- Building Institutional Resilience: In an era of liquid modernity (Z. Bauman), where social bonds are sporadic and fragile, a strong, ethically anchored corporate culture becomes the primary defense against systemic crises. For societies undergoing rapid transformation, such as Ukraine, this culture serves as a stabilizing force that protects the human personality from the pressures of economics and utilitarianism.

The transformation of corporate culture into a strategic imperative requires a reassessment of the leader's role. The leader is no longer a technician of souls who manipulates behavior through incentives, but a facilitator of meaning. This involves:

- Integrating social pedagogy back into the workplace to counter the separation of culture and education.

- Prioritizing internalized self-discipline (the Chinese principle of Wu Wei) over external coercive control.

- Developing a culture of presence that counters the atomization of remote and digital work by emphasizing shared ethical goals and social responsibility.

By aligning organizational goals with the human-centric development of the individual, management transforms corporate culture from a secondary administrative expense into the core driver of institutional sustainability.

Conclusions and Prospects for Further Research. The investigation into the transformation of corporate culture in the post-industrial era leads to several critical conclusions. First, the modernist paradigm of instrumental rationality, while effective during the industrial age, has become a source of

organizational entropy in the 21st century. The will to power and hierarchical control mechanisms are increasingly incompatible with the fluid, knowledge-based nature of contemporary society.

Second, the study confirms that without a deliberate methodological shift, corporate culture remains a mere compensatory tool – a standardized identity that masks the underlying alienation of the workforce. The transition to a postmodern perspective offers the necessary pluralism and critical group consciousness to counter the one-dimensional existence of the employee. However, this transition must be anchored in an ethical center to avoid the trap of mimetic rationality, where culture is reduced to a hollow, simulated hyper reality.

Finally, the article substantiates that the Communicative Turn is the primary mechanism for establishing corporate culture as a strategic management imperative. By fostering authentic dialogue and moving away from anthropological reduction, management can align organizational goals with the self-realization of the individual. In this light, corporate culture is no longer a secondary administrative expense but the core foundation of institutional resilience and social sustainability.

The findings of this study open several avenues for future investigation:

- **The Role of Artificial Intelligence:** Future research should explore how the integration of AI-driven management tools influences the "technogenic matrix" and whether they exacerbate or mitigate the risks of anthropological reduction.

- **Cross-Sectoral Analysis:** A comparative study between corporate cultures in the private sector and those in Higher Education or Security Structures (such as Civil Protection) would provide deeper insights into how strategic imperatives vary across different institutional environments.

- **The Impact of Global Crises:** Investigating how organizational cultures adapt to extreme social turbulence – such as the ongoing transformations in Ukraine – could offer a new model for resilience management that prioritizes human-centric values over technical efficiency.

- **Digital Leadership Ethics:** Further exploration is needed into the ethical responsibilities of leaders in a liquid modernity context, focusing on how

they can facilitate meaning and authentic community in increasingly remote and atomized work environments.

### References:

1. Voronkova, V. H. (2012). *Filosofiya rozvytku suchasnoho suspil'stva: teoretyko-metodolohichnyy kontekst* (Monohrafiya) [Philosophy of development of modern society: theoretical and methodological context]. Zaporizhzhya: RVV ZDIA.
2. Kuklin, O. V., Ivanova, I. V., & Borovyk, T. M. (2025). Shtuchnyi intelekt u menedzhmenti tsyfrovoy transformatsii biznesu [Artificial intelligence in the management of business digital transformation]. *Marketynh i tsyfrovi tekhnolohii*, 9(3). URL: <https://surl.lt/xhfwah>
3. Melnyk, V. Skrynnyk, Z., & Karas, A. (Eds.). (2024). *Peretvorennia buttia liudyny i sotsiumu v konteksti suchasnoho tsyvilizatsiinoho rozvytku* [Transformation of human being and society in the context of modern civilizational development: A monograph]. Lviv. LNU.
4. Adorno, T. W., & Horkheimer, M. (1997). *Dialectic of enlightenment* (J. Cumming, Trans.). Verso. (Original work published 1944).
5. Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation* (S. F. Glaser, Trans.). University of Michigan Press. (Original work published 1981).
6. Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Polity Press.
7. Benjamin, W. (2008). *The work of art in the age of its technological reproducibility, and other writings on media*. Harvard University Press.
8. Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action: Reason and the rationalization of society* (Vol. 1). Beacon Press.
9. Jaspers, K. (1951). *Man in the modern age*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
10. Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-dimensional man: Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. Beacon Press.
11. Ortega y Gasset, J. (1932). *The revolt of the masses*. W. W. Norton & Company. (Original work published 1930).
12. Pascal, B. (1995). *Pensées* (A. J. Krailsheimer, Trans.). Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1670).

13. Schopenhauer, A. (2014). *The wisdom of life*. Renaissance Classics. (Original work published 1851).

Funding. This research received no external funding.

Use of AI. AI was not used in the preparation of this manuscript. The author bears full responsibility for the content of the article.

Acknowledgments. The author declares no acknowledgments.

Received: 23.04.26

Accepted: 27.05.26

Published: 26.06.26