

## **Stress Resistance of Personality in the Conditions of Organizational Culture in Ukraine. Specific Dependent Phenomena**

**Roman KHAVULA**<sup>1</sup>

**Oksana CHUYKO**<sup>2</sup>

**Nataliia RODINA**<sup>3</sup>

**Inokentii KORNIENKO**<sup>4</sup>

**Zhanna BOGDAN**<sup>5</sup>

**Antonina KICHUK**<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Candidate of Psychological Sciences, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, romankhavula@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> Candidate of Psychological Sciences, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Department of Social Psychology, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, oksana.chuyko@pnu.edu.ua

<sup>3</sup> Doctor of Science in Psychology, Full Professor, the Chairperson of the Department of the Differential and Special Psychology, Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University, nvrodinaod@gmail.com

<sup>4</sup> Doctor of Science in Psychology, Full Professor, Professor of the Department of Psychology, Mukachevo State University, innokasha@gmail.com

<sup>5</sup> Phd in Psychology, Associate Professor, Head of Department of Psychology and Sociology, Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics, bogdan.zhanna053@gmail.com

<sup>6</sup> Doctor of Psychological Sciences, Associate Professor, Izmail State University for the Humanities, tonya82kichuk@gmail.com

**Abstract:** *So far, the focus of safety psychology, coping strategies, and occupational safety has been predominantly on physical factors and self-regulation tools. However, this article outlines the poorly researched neuro-dependent phenomena of Ukrainian organizational culture, where parallel new proactive and old reactive tendencies are observed.*

*The purpose of this article is to identify the main neurodependent destructive tools of deceptive psychological self-protection in the context of contemporary organizational culture. These phenomena proved to be dependent on both general and personal culture, through which the instincts of psychological self-preservation and primitive unconscious defenses such as shame, guilt, excessive responsibility, competition avoidance, mythological attitudes, rituals, etc. are refracted. Methods of sociological survey by means of posing provocative questions with short answer time, intervisional and independent observations of production teams (with the subsequent neurointerpretative analysis) allowed to make a number of important conclusions. The main ones are the objectification and explanation of two intensions of Ukrainian organization culture, the determination of neuro-markers of destructive manifestations of personal deontological culture and the conclusion of a systematizing table of the stages of development of organization culture with procedural-attributive and neurodestructive explication. Also in the conclusions by psychological and pedagogical modeling and expedient selection of tools the authors concluded a set of recommendations for the acquisition of stress resistance in the context of the culture of the organization.*

*The article can become a theoretical basis for the development of effective training programs and non-invasive neuropsychological tools for the correction of neurocultural deviations.*

**Keywords:** *coping strategies; relic neuro-mechanisms of protection; subjectocentric threats; myths and rituals; method of provocative questions; neurosociology.*

**How to cite:** Khavula, R., Chuyko, O., Rodina, N., Korniienko, I., Bogdan, Z., & Kichuk, A. (2024). Stress resistance of personality in the conditions of organizational culture in Ukraine. Specific dependent phenomena. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 15(2), 175-190. <https://doi.org/10.18662/brain/15.2/571>

## Introduction

Man is equipped with a number of natural mechanisms for adapting and transforming the world. This world is already organized for her, so he must learn, accept and change it according to her own ideas of self-realization and self-organization. In sociocultural development the individual realizes certain values and learns to be successful and effective, but constantly comes into conflict with external restrictive or conversely uncertain conditions, which cause neuropsychological or physical hazards. In this article we will examine stress resilience as a component of organizational culture based on the interpretation of current trends in neuroscientific light.

The study of the phenomenon of culture in the integrative paradigm implies integrity and indivisibility, so traditional types of analysis of the problem can no longer be valid. This in micro-imaging correlates fully with the workings of the brain as a system in which there may be less or more excited zones, but none outside of any ongoing process. This is not just a metaphor, but one of the universal laws of holography, where the small components of large systems are isomorphic and repeat at the macro level the mother laws. This inspires scientists to increasingly resort to intuitive methods of investigation (Marshall et al., 2022; Nerubasska & Maksymchuk, 2020; Nerubasska et al., 2020). We now have genuine evidence that intuition is not a quasi-scientific concept, but one of the natural unknowable and holistic ways of knowing.

**Relevance of the article.** There was already a stage in psychology when it seemed that the role of the individual in the team had been studied and defined. However, advances in neuroscience and the integrated application of biological, psychological, and social theories allowed the development of new models of performance, team effectiveness, and synergy. External stimuli of work, retention and team effectiveness are no longer considered to be determinative factors. J. Moreno concluded that the invariant goal of any human activity is the psychological well-being of the individual. *It is determined by its place in the system of interpersonal relations developed in the group on emotional attitudes, sympathies and atypathies* (Moreno, 1951).

Organizational culture should now be seen as a process of resource production, alignment, and individual acceptability-reflexivity, where both technological, value-based, and psychological, bioethical, and neurophysiological drivers are involved. Their synergy produces the connections necessary for sociocultural symbiosis.

In anthropomorphic systems, we can postulate the above isomorphism and assume that in human formations (any real groups) every

internal pattern and external action, interaction, has a natural neurobasis and a corresponding processuality, instinctivity or other correlate.

Scientists have long studied the culture of an organization by its individual components. For example, proponents of psychonetics prefer communication culture (Bakhtiyarov, 1997); adherents of qualimetric approach produce ways to determine the level of organization culture (holistic, metaphorical, quantitative). Foreign scholars fill in various epistemological niches of organizational culture: the structure of framework competition (Cameron & Quinn, 2011), patterns of organizational members' behavior in abnormal and stressful situations, Thomas (1971), develop models of deontological style and leadership in organizational management (Blake et al., 1962). Industrial-organizational psychologists and even engineering technologists, Jewell (1985) deal with organizational culture issues.

In Ukraine, more relevant and poorly researched are not so much progressive trends in the development of organizational culture and personal safety in this culture, as residual destructive factors that create the illusion of primitive protection, but in fact carry significant neurosubjective, psychological and even economic harm.

In our country similar studies have recently intensified, where anukovs explain the role of myth in periods of social tension, Bevzenko (2015) or consider multimodal components of organizational culture and personality security (Dreval, 2020). However, so far there are no works that would describe the destructive neuromarkers of personal security characteristic of Ukraine in the context of organizational culture, where junior (subcultural) and senior (traditional) generations compete and coexist.

Therefore the aim of our research is: a) to study neuroscientific context of personal psychological safety problems in the organizational culture environment; b) to identify neuromarkers and main destructive tools of deceptive psychological self-protection of individuals with rigid neuroculture; c) to provide appropriate advice for independent and interactive exit from existential neurosocial crisis. The intermediate goal was to collect theoretical and sociological material by organizing extrinsic observation (the authors), interventions (peers to peers in the team) and the authors' method of provocative questions to identify hidden feelings (shame, guilt, anger, envy, etc.).

It was possible to disclose the goal to a relatively full extent through the use of methods of collection, analysis and interpretation of real socio-cultural and psychological factors relevant for neuroscientific consideration; methods of analysis, generalization, neuroscientific extrapolation and

interpretation, as well as psychological and pedagogical modeling of expedient advice at the end of the study.

**The presupposition** of our study is in the assumption that in the culture of Ukrainian organizations symbiotic or opportunistic coexist young progressive cultural generation and retrograde generation, which more than the former reveals markers of relic neurocultural avoidance of psychological security. These would obviously include the collective (myths, rituals, stereotypes) and the individual (shame, guilt, perfectionism, reductionism). However, we must verify this in further discourse.

A fundamental work relevant to our article is the book *Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life* (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). It describes for the first time the extreme subjective (prejudice, doubt, ritual) and objective (inordinate demands, when "the honor of the campaign is at stake") factors of psychological tension that were relevant at the time. Now we acknowledge that these factors are again relevant for the Ukrainian culture of organizations due to the sociopolitical situation and residual post-Soviet stereotypes. However, in the next chapter we will take a closer look at the scientific background for the subject of our study.

**Ethics of the article.** The authors of the article observed personal and corporate ethics particularly carefully, since they were dealing not just with personal, but with personally significant and even intimate data. Everyone who participated in the sociological survey (the method of provocative troubleshooting) was warned about the specifics of the study, gave personal consent and received guarantees of non-disclosure.

**The international significance of the article** lies in the fact that for the first time the authors have comprehensively outlined previously unexplored sociocultural neuro-dependent relic phenomena of shame, hyper-responsibility, ritualistic-mythological thinking and behavior, unwholesome competition, etc. These phenomena are related to non-physical aspects of human subjective security in the context of organizational culture.

## **Unscientific horizons of organizational security and its culture today. A review and reflection on the sources**

In the early 2000s, the neuro-analytic direction of research on individual and group mental processes became popular. In order to supplement the already existing picture of psychological phenomena, scientists at first resorted to studying social intuition. They were guided by 2 types of data: neuroscientific (descriptive neuropsychological and visualized neurophysiological) and nonverbal, implicit (personal and social intuition)

(Solms et al., 2018; Sarancha et al., 2021). The presupposition of such theories has been the thesis that intuition of cognition and expression is a nonverbal cognitive substratum that exists but is not expressed materially. The structural achievement of this approach was the understanding of three levels of intuition: social, cognitive and neural. Each of them can be represented by material markers of a certain level.

However, the study of most classical works in this field has shown: neurophysiologists have not yet given an answer to the question as to which brain mechanisms implement the reflexive lowering of production efficiency, excessive responsibility (perfectionism), or vice versa. The neuropsychology of responsibility/unresponsibility for actions and the maintenance/disruption of neurophysiological homeostasis has been found to be clearly observed in pathology (psychiatric disorders) or in criminals when committing misdemeanors, Van Sliedregt (2012). Such mechanisms are poorly investigated in the normal production mode of organizations.

Like Lansisalmi et al. (2000), we find it appropriate to use sociometric methods, such as critical incident interviews, to describe collective culture neuropsychologically. This allows us to identify sources of collective stress and collective well-being. This to some extent corresponds to the neuroscientific tradition of studying psychological phenomena in aggravated or pathological manifestation, where they are more clearly manifested.

We are more interested in this article in the neuroculture of subject-centered rather than physical threats, which provoke reflexive but culturalized manifestations. The culturalization of human stress at its low to moderate intensity prevents neuroscientists from studying psychological and physiological responses directly. Therefore, scientists are forced to resort to subjective descriptions of stressors and predictors (Thompson et al., 1996) or their intuitive cognition, as we wrote about above.

Since stress is a natural response to changing conditions, it is important to maintain work stress in organizational activities (Hafidhah & Marton, 2019). Group use of the significance test, assumption, correlativity, and multiple regression tests with interpretations of their results showed that low or work stress levels in a team are facilitated by an established organizational culture, and an individual sense- anticipation of organizational support. The latter factor reduces the syndrome of expected failure. It allows keeping the plateau phase of work stress from turning into hyperic forms.

Given the accumulation of a critical mass of needs to solve managerial, deontological, and subcultural problems through recent neuroscientific research about a decade ago, scientists announced the

creation of a new praxeological discipline, organizational neuroscience (Becker et al., 2011). Its mode of development so far is dialogic. It is contoured and works around three issues: the accumulation of new relevant theory within neuroscience, the search for new directions, and discussions around current and metatheoretical problems. The basic idea is to take more account of the natural than the acquired social when developing effective collective interaction.

Most of the available research goes around neurophysiological measurements of stress in a collective culture, with such measurements being more valid and evident in educational and industrial organizations with a priori high overall hazard levels (military, firefighters, rescue workers, pilots, etc.). For example, Chancellor & Yoshimura (2004) suggest in such cases to measure adaptability as the ability to survive or the speed/measure of acquiring such competence; resistance to stressors, their avoidance and even escape.

In teams where psychological dangers directly correlate with physical threats, a special type of mutual support, friendship of collective culture like a subculture with its hermetic rules, language and ethics is developed. We have found a similarity between the neuropsychological profile of firefighter-rescuers and extreme sports, about which S. Tukaiev and his colleagues wrote: *They are characterized by an associated high psychological variability and adaptability to external conditions of low neuroticism, high stability and lability. Increased self-esteem of athletes increases the level of stress resistance* (Tukaiev et al., 2020). As for the profile portrait of the neuroclimate of such organizations, we noticed: they are characterized by verbal minimalism, conventionalism in the use of signals, gaze, strict protocol of staff actions and instantaneous intuitively determined behavior change in the biggest moment of threat. At the same time, the level of responsibility is high, but the fear of this responsibility is almost absent. However, it is no longer too relevant to study neurorelevant phenomena in hyper or pathological detection. Such neurorelevant findings appear most clearly, but we believe that human safety in high-stress or physically threatening organizations (military, divers, lifeguards, etc.) should be a separate area. More important for most organizations is a psychological culture of stability and factors and counteracting fluctuations that provoke deviation from such stability.

Our colleagues recently wrote that for the Ukrainian culture of organizations and personal neurorelevant values of employees are important conditions of *unstable social situation, job loss, long-term deprivation of social needs on the background of emotional-phobic experience of pandemics, the problem of stress resistance and preservation of psychosomatic health* (Chystovska et al., 2022, 146).

However, during the propaedeutic study of the problem of our research we noticed: there is an area and tradition of silence, avoiding the study of such neuro-sensitive problems of cultural organization as subjective discomfort, the problem of error, abuse of duties, normal/insufficient responsibility, destructive relativity on the influence and dominance of the leadership and the organization. For working Ukrainians in this regard are very symptomatic feelings of shame, guilt, projectivity, idealization in relation to the superiors. We can safely assert that this is not only a Soviet tradition, but even a mental trait of Ukrainians, caused by centuries-long absence of democratic society, healthy competition and market relations in the sphere of employment and labor.

Consequently, the problem of personal safety in conditions of organizational culture should not be considered only in the context of such traditional for Ukraine engineering-oriented sciences as "Safety of Life", "Labor Hygiene", "Scientific Organization of Labor". The last term in general comes from the Soviet Union. It looked at planning, ergonomics, and communication solely to increase productivity, and the individual worker was considered a "cog in the machine".

Biological and neurophysiological ways of solving behavioral problems in the structure of organizations scientists were prompted by studies on animals, which in primitive teams show significant efficiency and coherence, and brain neuro-studies have confirmed that both humans and animals have the same mechanisms of stress, life-saving and optimal use of physiological resources (Liu et al., 2018). This greatly simplifies the technique of invasive interventions in certain parts of the brain, but neuroethical and legal issues are an obstacle to this.

As a result of this section, we agree that the most obvious goal of neuroscientific intervention in the field of organizational culture is to develop techniques and technologies to avoid both unnecessary neuro-euphoria and neuro-phobia. This obviousness stems from the fact that the human body and brain's bio-neurohomeostasis works most effectively under average stresses: energy expenditure, neurotransmitter levels, optimal task, and uncertainty of the object of corporate transformation. Here it is important that neuroscientific technologies do not become another tool for excessive stimulation or motivation of workers by unscrupulous managers who constantly want to increase efficiency. However, we see from the current discourse that neuroscience is interpreted differently by the economic-production establishment: we have both ironic, reductionist views and overly hopeful and capricious ones. In addition, we believe that first we need to conduct neurodiagnostic studies in organizations of different types,

including the regional, ethnic or socio-political specifics that we have in Ukraine.

**Danger avoidance in the context of Ukrainian organizational culture. Feeling of guilt, shame, increased obligation and "survivability" of relic neuromechanisms of protection**

Ukrainian organizational culture can be divided into four types, applying two vectors - workflow control and employees. The advantage of the counter over the workers of the organization indicates a low level of culture, the team of which consists of workers who have close family relationships, acquaintances. When this organization is no longer satisfied with the dictatorial, excessively controlling means of settling the organizational order - control the workers. Now the style of team responsibility is rapidly replacing the style of control. For the command style of organizational culture is characterized by control of the work process. In this case, the subjective sovereignty and psychological boundaries of the individual remain intact - and team members experience indirect, soft influence for the sake of changing or correcting deontological behavior. We noticed that in Ukraine young workers (up to 45 years old) predominantly confess about active-creative command deontological style, contemplating expectations of personal dangers. The fearful generation brought up in the Soviet Union exhibits its centrist anxieties and negative expectations of an organizational culture that they often find hierarchical, directive, and ultimative.

We conducted an oral survey of 96 members of two types of organizations (humanitarian and workplace) on the recognition of neuropsychological reflexive markers of subjective safety and sincerity. We applied the method of provocative questions with a short reflection time. We identified destructive neuro-cultural markers of shame, abuse of position, freeloading, hidden responsibility avoidance, silence, and reluctance to respond as undifferentiated markers. We found a correlation with the patterns and stereotypes of the Soviet model, when the collective culture was based on diktat, and personal success did not depend on the initiative, proactivity and productivity of individual members of the team.

Interviews with mature workers (45+) showed that they raise relic and primitive (immature) neuro-instruments of stress avoidance: expectations of failure, fear of competition from young proactive colleagues. However, outside observation and intra-team inter-observation showed the low and deceptive effectiveness of such tools. Rather the opposite: 26 out of 40 mature workers noted frequent or persistent threats to their subjective



identities and perceived psychological boundaries. "Liveness" of the above destructive tools of stress avoidance we explain not by their effectiveness, but by their unconsciousness and compulsiveness, which are difficult to eradicate without psychotherapeutic, training and self-regulatory intervention.

We followed: the fear of healthy competition from a younger and often more competent colleague generates numerous rational and irrational reflexes, patterns and attitudes in the minds of older workers. Their study allows us to describe the psychological portrait of the rival in his destructive attributions. Among such attributions, however, there are objective attributes as well. We summarized all the attributions of the image of the rival:

He is objectively or deceptively self-assertive by humiliating individuals with low self-esteem and depression, aggressive individuals (occupying the role of attacker, attacker,) individuals with pronounced hostility toward others.

It is manifested in all forms of aggression (gossiping, ridiculing another, irritation, anger, guilt and accusation), egocentrism (individuals with unresolved adolescent problems, self-asserting themselves in status and in asserting their own opinion, it is important for them to win), snobbery (individuals endure with a high attitude towards others and treat people negatively), neuroticism (intra-conscious individuals identifying with the work results, with status or social mask - role).

Demonstrated in excessive self-control and responsibility: workaholics (show that they are better than others because they work most, do not enjoy labor, so they often dump their negativity on people), persons with pronounced perfectionism (believe that they do everything perfectly and do not make a mistake

Conflicts of individuals who perceive the world non-dialogically (authoritarian in communication) through a "winner-loser" prism (directive dictators in management).

Anxieties of individuals with strong feelings of guilt and anxiety, who devalue others (self-assertion by humiliating another, distrust of others, low self-esteem because of despondency at their own inability to change something for the better, with maladaptive Ego-concept and low self-esteem).

It is clear that there is a positive sense in the emotional factors of rivalry. In an atmosphere of rivalry, the personality is subjected to stress and humiliation. According to C. Fopel, when respectable people find themselves in a situation where there is no competition, they become

uncomfortable; workaholics often work for the sake of competition, and when they do not achieve an advantage over someone, it annoys them. However, people with high self-esteem are not subject to competition; they do what appeals to them; they are mature and independent; they act and create freely.

Next, let's talk about sensualistic-being neuro-markers. The degree and ability to realize personal meaning is one of the key conditions for maintaining personal neuro-subjectivity in the collective culture. Personal meaning is the most important factor of professional self-improvement in modern social and informational space. Values are the basic conditions for the formation of meanings of personal being. Meanings are the answer to the question "why?" and "for the sake of what?" (why to live, why to do it, why to act, etc.) they contribute to personal motivation. According to Franklin (1994), meanings can be revealed to a person because of the situation they are experiencing. Exploring the problem of being a noetic dimension, the researcher concluded that noogenic neuroses arise from remorse and from value conflicts. Meaning can be measured and visualized neuro-physiologically if that meaning is hypertrophied and objectified by significant arousal zones in the cerebral cortex. Lack of meaning indicates unrecognizability of interests, and lack of a sense of satisfaction with life, labor indicate a pragmatic-oriented position of the person, where the need to "mother" prevails over "to be." "The need of the situation" is always addressed to a specific person. The individual either applies his opportunity to realize meaning or not. Under such conditions, freedom is above necessity, in relation to consequence, and factors and circumstances of the external environment.

However, we noticed during the sociological conversation that under the conditions of an adequately unconscious culture of organization in some respondents (predominantly mature women) the future-oriented sense of proactivity is replaced by retrograde and primitive mythological-ritual meanings. This confirms the traditional dependence of Ukrainians on collective self-realization and involvement and individualism as a symptom-complex of the national character. Here there is a contradiction: obsolete mythological tools work ineffectively today, inhibiting information exchange and social progress as a whole. A paradoxical situation arises: on the one hand, times of demassification and individual communications are coming, while, on the other hand, the resources of remythologization that have not yet been used are being renewed. In today's world of communication, the tendencies of microtargeting, individualization, demassification, and the desire for universalization of influences, the creation of new virtual communities, and

macro-identity are operating simultaneously. An effective counter to the destructive power of outdated myths of self-preservation and binary distribution can be not only the development of critical individual thinking, but also the use of mythological potential - the formation of a powerful linking monomyth of the national idea, ethnic traditional values of culture and production of goods.

To get rid of the habit to exploit obsolete consumer myths of "stability", the toolkit of mythological repetition and bricolage devastation means to really assess the situation in the country and to start working not on artificial maintenance of binary myths of disengagement, egalitarian, local or myths, formation of a unified, powerfully collected mentality of Ukrainians on the value basis of an authentic monolithic mythological tradition.

After the conducted dispute and made generalizations we offer our classification of the development of cultural organization on the basis of observations of the Ukrainian neuro-social context (Tab. 1).

**Table 1:** *Stages of cultural organization development with procedural attributive and neuro-destructive explication*

<b>The stage of development of the organization's culture</b>	<b>Basic attribution</b>	<b>Procedural manifestation</b>	<b>Neuromarkers of destructiveness</b>
The stage of acquiring knowledge and following generally accepted rules, forming a value-oriented unity, the search for common values	Discipline	Acquisition of knowledge and compliance with generally accepted rules, value-oriented unity is formed, the search for common values	Doubt, guilt, ritualism
Cooperation orientation stage	Competitiveness	Development of groupthink, competitive employees, developing a team work style, creating a positive climate	Envy, excessive responsibility, simulation
Developmental stage through the search for meaning, meaningful self-organization, orientation to the	Existence	Development of a noetic dimension of the personality, personal growth, development of freedom, leadership	Cognitive dissonance, expectation tension, awareness of uncertainty and entropy

quality of performance		and responsibility	
Stage of orientation to generation of new ideas, search for opportunities to develop and implement innovations	Prosperity and progress	Proactivity in activity and reflection, creativity of personal realization, development and way of solving production problems	Inability to participate equally because of different mental, intellectual, creative, and neuropsychological profiles

The table was compiled by the authors themselves

Of course, each stage has its own positive neuro-markers of subjectivity and security within the culture of organizations. Thus, with each higher level such positive markers as trust, partnership, freedom, responsibility, creativity, capacity for innovative solutions, culture-related dialogue, quality of relations in the process of team activity grow.

In the early years after formally overcoming the colonial world order, scholars immediately turned their attention to the category of duty in the performance of professional duties. It was considered that the duty in the individual picture of the world of personality includes importance and referentiality, which can now be interpreted as super-value (paranoia) and trans-identity (assertion of self and its subjectivity through others', fake pretensions, achievements and development). For Ukrainian workers of middle and older generations these reductionist tendencies proved to be valid even now.

## Conclusions

A detailed study of the current neuroscientific discourse has shown: the discipline of *neuro-organization of culture* is now rapidly developing, which now examines the emotional and rational determinants and consequences of behavior in the collective. This allows a holistic theory to consider norm and deviation, subjective and objective, conscious and unconscious "under one umbrella," Reisyán (2015). At the same time, such a theory does not need multihierarchical methods and approaches: it examines the socio-cultural problems of the group by identifying and modulating simple mechanisms - stereotypes, patterns, templates and models.

The use of primitive relic neuro-cultural tools (myths, rituals) inhibits the development of an organizational culture that becomes akin to cultural heritage rather than the spearhead of progress. Reflecting on this, we agree

with M. Abdelkader that the resource of organizational culture development is in the formation of its strategic foresight and instrumental maturity (Abdelkader, 2016). In our study using sociological diagnostics and neuroscientific description of cultural and communication problems in organizations, we confirmed the thesis about the importance of interactionist, instrumentalist and interpretativist approaches in defining the neuroscientific model of cultural organization (Connolly, 2012). We also note the vitality and effectiveness of prejudices, myths, rituals, taboos and other neuro-cultural relic mechanisms in Ukrainian professional teams. This contributes to the primitive avoidance or delegation of neuro-subjective danger and inhibits the mechanisms of flexibility, proactivity, and subject-centrism induced by the latest times.

At the same time we observe a unique synergy of workers of younger generation (showing spontaneity, proactivity and awareness of the right to make a mistake to avoid production stresses) and workers of older generation (despite significant destructive neuro-markers they show deliberateness, caution, perfectionism and relic stereotypes of ritualism). Such ambivalence in general contributes to sufficient effectiveness of collective culture and labor productivity.

The main result of the study was the formation of recommendations on the way out of situations of neuro-subjective pseudo-adaptation. Consequently, such an exit consists of:

1. In acquiring constructive coping-strategies: observing the role of a "bystander", because the above-mentioned individuals manipulate others and have themselves been victims or remain victims of such individuals in the past, playing the roles from S. Karpman's (1973) "Tyrant - Victim - Savior" triangle.

2. Development of self-awareness in a situation of conflict or stress (acquisition of important psychological information).

3. Spiritual development, indicating the search for heuristic knowledge (ways out of a situation: how to make sure it doesn't happen again), and not just figuring out the cause of the situation (why is it so? Why do I need it?).

4. Processing the "shadow parts of the personality," painfully reacting to colleagues with great success and a pronounced sense of rivalry;

5. Filling oneself with "positive energy" (cognitive-behavioral psychotherapy, mediation, quantum psychology and neurotransformation techniques).

6. Gaining resourcefulness (vitality) to survive in a competitive environment with the support of friends, relatives).

7. Awareness and change of negative contacts and positive contacts (by means of body psychotherapy).

8. Acquisition of skills of dialogic communication (ability to coordinate the interests of the interlocutor, acquire skills of partner communication). Development of the sense of empathy, internal locus of control; formation of adaptive Ego-concept. Development of stress resistance (searching activity of getting out of stress, propensity to change internal and external situation plan; combination of active coping-strategies and positive Ego-concept).

### **Acknowledgement**

We thank the administrations of humanitarian (social and educational) and economic (industrial and service) organizations in Ukraine, which allowed us to collect factual material in their enterprises. We also express special gratitude to the members of the teams, who provided valuable personal neuropsychological material during the survey while respecting ethics and non-disclosure of personal data.

Study limitation. We predict that a similar pattern of neuro-subjective and psychological danger awaits workers in many countries that are developing after overcoming totalitarian regimes. This requires additional and broader neuro-social research.

---

### **References**

---

- Abdelkader, M. E. (2016). Only human: Towards a neuroscience-based understanding of future-facing organizational culture. <http://openresearch.ocadu.ca/id/eprint/745>
- Bakhtiyarov, O. G. (1997). Postinformatsionnyye tekhnologii: vvedeniye v psikhonetiku [Postinformation technologies: an introduction to psychonetics]. Monograph. Kiev. Post.
- Becker, W. J., Cropanzano, R., Sanfey, A. G. (2011). Organizational neuroscience: Taking organizational theory inside the neural black box. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 933–961. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311398955>
- Bevzenko, L. (2015). Ponyattya mifu ta hry v kryzovomu dyskursi suchasnykh sotsiokul'turnykh protsesiv – sotsiosamoorhanizatsiynny pidkhid [The concept of myth and play in the crisis discourse of present-day sociocultural processes - social self-organization approach]. *Sociology: Theory, Methods, and Marketing*, 2, 112-129
- Blake, R. R., Mouton, J. S., & Bidwell, A. C. (1962). Managerial grid. *Advanced Management - Office Executive*, 1(9), 12–15.

- Cameron, K. S., Quinn, R. E. (2011). Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework. John Wiley & Sons.
- Chancellor, M. B., & Yoshimura, N. (2004). Neurophysiology of stress urinary incontinence. *Reviews in Urology*, 6(3), S19-S28.  
[https://www.hdgo.hr/userFiles/upload/documents/ginekologija/uroginekologija/mehanizmi/2a\\_Neurophysiology-SUI.pdf](https://www.hdgo.hr/userFiles/upload/documents/ginekologija/uroginekologija/mehanizmi/2a_Neurophysiology-SUI.pdf)
- Chystovska, Y., Bratanich, O., Zhurakovskiy, I., Akopian, A., & Izvekova, O. (2022). Neuropsychological Correction of Psychosomatic Disorders. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 13(1), 145-157. <https://doi.org/10.18662/brain/13.1/273>
- Connolly, T. H. (2012). Neurological model of organizational culture. a companion to organizational anthropology. In D., Caulkins, A. T., Jordan (eds.). *A Companion to Organizational Anthropology*, 122-145.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118325513.ch5>
- Deal, T. E., Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: the rites and rituals of corporate life*. Addison Wesley Publishing Company, Reading.
- Dreval, Yu. D. (2020). Upravlins'ka (orhanizatsiyna) kul'tura i bezpeka vyrobnytstva [Managerial (organizational) culture and production safety]. *Bulletin of the National University of Civil Defense of Ukraine. Collection of scientific works. Series "Public administration".1(12)*, 38-44.  
<http://repositsc.nuczu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/11744>
- Franklin, G. (1994). Dual therapy: Personality change in the therapist while working with patients. *The Israel Journal of Psychiatry and Related Sciences*, 31(2), 86-93. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7928297/>
- Hafidhah, R., Martono, S. (2019). The effect of perceived organizational support, job stress, and organizational culture on job performance. *MAJ*. 8(2):177-8.  
<https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/maj/article/view/25979>
- Jewell, L. N. (1985). *Contemporary industrial/organizational psychology*. West Publishing Company.
- Karpman, S. B. (1973). 1972 Eric Berne memorial scientific award lecture. *Transactional Analysis Bulletin*, 3(1), 73-77.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/036215377300300118>
- Lansialmi, H., Peiro, J. M., & Kivimaki IV, M. (2000). Collective stress and coping in the context of organizational culture. *European journal of work and organizational psychology*, 9(4), 527-559.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320050203120>
- Liu, H., Zhang, C., Ji, Y., & Yang, L. (2018). Biological and psychological perspectives of resilience: is it possible to improve stress resistance?. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 12, 326  
<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2018.00326/full>

- Marshall, J., Gollwitzer, A., Mermin-Bunnell, K., Shinomiya, M., Retelsdorf, J., & Bloom, P. (2022). How development and culture shape intuitions about prosocial obligations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 151(8), 1866–1882. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0001136>
- Moreno, J. L. (1951). *Sociometry, experimental method and the science of society*. Beacon House, Inc.
- Nerubasska, A., Maksymchuk, B. (2020). The demarkation of creativity, talent and genius in humans: a systemic aspect. *Postmodern Openings*, 11 (2), 240-255.  
<https://www.lumenpublishing.com/journals/index.php/po/article/view/2625>
- Nerubasska, A., Palshkov, K., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020). A Systemic Philosophical analysis of the contemporary society and the human: new potential. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(4), 275-292.  
<https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.4/235>
- Reisyan, G. D. (2015). *Neuro-organizational culture: A new approach to understanding human behavior and interaction in the workplace*. Springer.
- Sarancha, I., Maksymchuk, B., Gordiichuk, G., Berbets, T., Berbets, V., Chepurna, L., Golub, V., Chernichenko, L., Behas, L., Roienko, S., Bezliudna, N., Rasskazova, O., & Maksymchuk, I. (2021). Neuroscientific principles in labour adaptation of people with musculoskeletal disorders. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 12(4), 206–223.  
<https://doi.org/10.18662/brain/12.4/245>
- Solms, M., Turnbull, O., & Sacks, O. (2018). *The brain and the inner world: An introduction to the neuroscience of subjective experience*. Routledge.
- Thomas, K. W. (1971). *Conflict-handling modes in interdepartmental relations*. Purdue University
- Thompson, N., Stradling, S., Murphy, M., & O'Neill, P. (1996). Stress and organizational culture. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 26(5), 647-665.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjsw.a011139>
- Tukaiev, S., Dolgova, O., Van Den Tol, A. J. M., Ruzhenkova, A., Lysenko, O., Fedorchuk, S., & Voronova, V. (2020). Individual psychological determinants of stress resistance in rock climbers. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport*, 20(Suppl1). DOI:10.7752/jpes.2020.s1069
- Van Sliedregt, E. (2012). *Individual criminal responsibility in international law*. OUP Oxford.