

HOLISM IN THE MANAGEMENT OF SOCIO-CULTURAL PROCESSES

Tetyana POPLAVSKA – PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Philosophical and Sociological Studies and Sociocultural Practices, State Institution «South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky», Odesa, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2492-8068>
<https://doi.org/10.35619/ucpmk.52.1186>
voronovavv18@gmail.com

Oksana PETINOVA – Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Professor of the Department of Philosophical and Sociological Studies and Sociocultural Practices, State Institution «South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky», Odesa, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1871-1201>
oksanapnp@gmail.com

Zoia ATAMANIUK – Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Professor of the Department of Philosophical and Sociological Studies and Sociocultural Practices, State Institution «South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky», Odesa, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7299-409X>

Kateryna TKACHENKO – PhD in Philosophy, Lecturer of the Department of Philosophical and Sociological Studies and Sociocultural Practices, State Institution «South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky», Odesa, Ukraine

Цитування:

Поплавська Т., Петінова О., Атаманчук З., Ткаченко К. Холізм в управлінні соціокультурними процесами. *Українська культура: минуле, сучасне, шляхи розвитку*. 2026. № 52. С. 509-519. <https://doi.org/10.35619/ucpmk.52.1186>

Traditional models of managing socio-cultural activity, which are focused primarily on economic efficiency and administrative control, prove to be insufficient for addressing the multidimensional nature of cultural processes. Therefore, turning to the reflection on fundamentally new approaches and methods for managing various processes becomes an increasingly urgent task of contemporary humanities scholarship. This article aims to examine existing promising models of socio-cultural management that have not yet gained widespread adoption, but have already demonstrated their effectiveness and viability in practice. *Purpose and methods.* The purpose of the article is to analyze and elucidate the conceptual foundations and practical possibilities of applying a holistic approach to the management of processes in the socio-cultural sphere. The aims and objectives of the article have determined the primary reliance on the holistic approach, as well as on holistic methods and principles, in order to reveal their practical potential in the management of socio-cultural activity. *Results.* The holistic approach to managing the socio-cultural sphere in Ukrainian is currently at a stage of development and of searching for unifying paradigms that facilitate mutual convergence. We argue that holistic management in the socio-cultural space represents a new type of cultural rationality, one that aspires not only to efficiency but also to viability, harmony, and, more broadly, to the evolution of the system as a whole. Holistic management in general can be understood as the art of managing energy, and in the socio-cultural sphere it becomes the management of cultural energy, where people, institutions, and environments interact as a single organism capable of self-reflection, self-knowledge, and self-development. In this context, problems are becoming increasingly relevant whose solution requires going beyond the boundaries of individual disciplines and engaging external experts equipped with fundamentally different types of knowledge and specialized socio-humanitarian technologies, or alternatively, the innovative training of managers of the future themselves. We assume that integrators of the holistic approach constitute a new profession of the near future, and that their training should begin today.

Key words: socio-cultural sphere, holism, holistic approach, socio-cultural management, marketing, manager-integrator, cultural ecosystem, self-organization, synergy, sociocultural processes.

Relevance of the problem. In contemporary society, the socio-cultural sphere plays a key role in shaping value systems, developing cultural identity, and ensuring dialogue among diverse social groups. Under conditions of globalization, information saturation, and growing cultural diversity, there is a pressing need for renewed approaches to the management of cultural organizations, projects, and institutions. Traditional management models, focused primarily on economic efficiency and administrative control, prove insufficient for addressing the multidimensional nature of cultural processes. At the same time, knowledge and methods of managing art and culture are recognized as a necessary condition for progress and a prerequisite for the very survival of cultural and artistic institutions. They are essential for achieving higher quality in cultural programs, increasing their effectiveness, and ensuring sustainable professional careers for individual artists and producers. Therefore, turning to the conceptualization of fundamentally new approaches and methods for managing any kind of processes

constitutes an increasingly relevant task of contemporary humanities scholarship.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The transition to a harmonious type of human development directly depends on the improvement of governance mechanisms, a significant portion of which are currently in a state of systemic crisis. This crisis is caused by a complex of interrelated factors. First, there is a decline in the level of governability within the global economy and financial relations, indicating the erosion of coherent regulatory mechanisms. Second, growing unfairness in international economic exchange intensifies, leading to increasing asymmetries between the centers and peripheries of the world system. Third, international conflicts are escalating, as a result of which governance resources are redirected toward maintaining a balance of power rather than fostering a culture of cooperation. Fourth, social stratification of humanity is deepening, with polarization occurring between rich and poor countries, communities, and even individuals. Fifth, governance actors across all spheres of activity are increasingly oriented toward private interests, while public goals remain outside their field of attention.

Moreover, contemporary managerial thinking is dominated by economic reductionism, which reduces complex socio-cultural processes to purely market indicators, fostering the widespread consolidation of egocentric attitudes and undermining the moral and value foundations of collective development. As a result, a state of subjectlessness in the civilizational process emerges, in which humanity loses its internal mechanisms of self-regulation and spiritual integration, potentially threatening the degradation of modern civilization. Naturally, all the problems mentioned above—as well as many others—have become the subject of scholarly attention in both Europe and Asia. This has led to the emergence of several alternative approaches to their resolution. In this context, particular interest is drawn to those concepts that, in one form or another, address a holistic approach to the governance of social systems and socio-cultural processes that is, management models grounded in the principles of integrity, self-organization, adaptability, and value-based interaction.

In general, the idea of holism in management emerged at the intersection of two major cultural traditions – the Western tradition of analytical rationality and the Eastern tradition of intuitive, harmony-oriented wisdom. Although these traditions developed independently, in the era of globalization they have begun to converge, opening new horizons for understanding the social whole. The European tradition developed holism through the science of complex systems, the philosophy of organicism, and contemporary integral methodology. Already Aristotle emphasized that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, yet this intuition received its full development in the twentieth century, particularly in the works of J. Smuts, who introduced the very term holism [20], and later in the philosophy of E. Morin, who elaborated the concept of complex thinking [16]. It was Morin who demonstrated that the governance of social systems should be based not on the principle of control, but on the dialogue between parts and the whole, where contradictions are not eliminated but integrated into a living structure. He understands culture as an open ecosystem in which various forms of energy—economic, informational, and spiritual—circulate, while at the same time viewing it as a component of a broader system encompassing nature, society, and civilization. E. Morin's vision of culture as an ecosystem proved to be closely aligned with the ideas of the physicist F. Capra, well known for his influential publications. In his works (*The Web of Life*, 1996; *The Hidden Connections*, 2002; *The Systems View of Life*, 2014), F. Capra interprets culture and social systems as ecosystems of interconnected networks organized according to the same principles as natural ecosystems. He proposes viewing sustainable human communities as «human ecosystems» designed in accordance with the fundamental principles of the organization of life. Notably, he characterizes contemporary global culture—marked by neoliberal capitalism and technocentrism as a pathological ecosystem that undermines its own foundations of existence [10].

This line of thought was further developed by K. Wilber, to whom the idea of understanding any system as a holon belongs—a part/whole that must exist in harmonious unity with a larger whole, otherwise it is destined for disintegration and nonexistence. In this way, K. Wilber emphasizes that the organization of any social phenomenon or process, such as culture, constitutes a holon within a broader holarchy of social life. In his integral theory (the AQAL model), the scholar described a universal map of development of the individual, organizations, and civilization, based on the interpenetration of four dimensions: the interior and the exterior, the individual and the collective [23].

This idea was applied to management by F. Laloux in his theory of «teal organizations». In this framework, the individual interior dimension includes motivation, values, and consciousness; the individual exterior encompasses behavior and professional skills; the collective interior involves culture, trust, and the spiritual atmosphere; and the collective exterior comprises structure, economics, and politics. F. Laloux argues that «organizations have their own soul, their own calling, and the task of leadership is to listen to it» [14; 55]. Elsewhere he adds: «When we stop managing an organization and begin listening to where it

wants to go, a new type of leadership is born – leadership based on trust» [14; 137]. Among the scholars who further develop K. Wilber's integral theory in the fields of management, business, leadership, and social transformation is the Australian researcher M. Edwards, PhD (University of Western Australia), a lecturer in organizational design and systems thinking. He conceptualizes management as a multidimensional activity in which four levels of reality must be harmonized: the material, the psychological, the cultural, and the spiritual [11].

This represents a continuation of Wilber's AQAL model (All Quadrants, All Levels, All Lines, All States, All Types), which M. Edwards applies to managerial systems. According to his interpretation, effective management is possible only when both the leader and the organization develop simultaneously across all these dimensions: the material (objective) dimension – economic resources, technologies, infrastructure, and productivity; the psychological (interior-individual) dimension-consciousness, motivation, values, and the leader's competence; the cultural (interior-collective) dimension-shared meanings, ethics, communication style, and organizational culture; and finally the spiritual (transcendent) dimension-purpose, meaning, mission, and the evolutionary direction of organizational development. If even one of these levels remains underdeveloped, the system loses its harmony, and various crises emerge-economic, moral, psychological, or cultural. This is precisely what M. Edwards refers to as the «harmonization of the interior and exterior dimensions of managerial reality» [11; 42]. Here it should be noted that over the past two decades, a whole «peripheral intellectual continent» has formed around the ideas of Morin, Edwards, and Wilber – that is, a community of scholars who think in holistic, ethical, and evolutionary terms, yet operate outside rigid academic frameworks. One can identify several groups of Western thinkers working within the same intellectual field as Morin and M. Edwards, although they represent different disciplines, including philosophy, systems thinking, management, psychology, anthropology, and related areas.

Thus, P. Senge, the author of the seminal work «The Fifth Discipline: The Art & Practice of the Learning Organization» (1990), argues that contemporary organizations can survive only if they think and act as living, learning systems. He emphasizes the role of systems thinking, shared vision, personal mastery, and team learning, thereby effectively constructing a practical model of holistic management. His concept of the «learning organization» is, in essence, a socio-cultural organism that evolves itself [19]. A follower of Senge and the founder of Theory U (MIT, 2009), O. Scharmer speaks of «leadership from the emerging future» – a form of leadership that arises not from past models but from the future potential of the system itself. His ideas are closely aligned with Wilber's integral philosophy and even resonate with the Eastern intuition of «action without forcing» (wu wei). O. Scharmer thinks holistically insofar as he views the organization as a field of consciousness capable of sensing, opening itself, and renewing itself from within [18]. A brilliant attempt to rethink management through the lens of quantum physics, chaos, and interconnectedness was made by M. Wheatley, the author of «Leadership and the New Science» (1992). In this work, she argues that effective management is not about control but about attentiveness and trust in the natural processes unfolding within collectives. M. Wheatley views the organization as a «living universe», an approach that strongly resonates with the ideas of E. Morin and M. Edwards [22]. D. Beck and Ch. Cowan are the creators of Spiral Dynamics, a model of the development of collective consciousness that can be regarded as a social analogue of Wilber's integral theory. In their view, management must adapt to the level of value development present in a society. This constitutes a spiritual – cultural form of holism: the harmonization of power structures with the evolutionary stage of consciousness [9].

The theorist of complex responsive processes, R. Stacey (University of Hertfordshire), criticizes the classical «systems» metaphor of management, yet he also thinks holistically. In his view, an organization is a continuous process of interaction in which order and chaos coexist. His paradigm of complex responsiveness resonates strongly with Morin's perspective, which conceives management as a social dialogue rather than as control over structure [21]. Developmental psychologist R. Kegan (Harvard University), the author of «In Over Our Heads» (1994) and a co-author with F. Laloux, also works within a K. Wilber – M. Edwards framework. He argues that organizational development is possible only through the development of the thinking patterns and value structures of those who lead organizations. His ideas on the evolutionary stages of consciousness have become a psychological foundation of integral management [13]. Thus, as it turns out, the common denominator uniting all the authors discussed above is the conviction that effectiveness and harmony are possible only through the development of consciousness-individual, organizational, and collective. Accordingly, Western holism has evolved from a focus on structural system city toward an integral conception of consciousness, in which management is understood as a process of sustaining a dynamic balance between the material, social, and spiritual dimensions of reality. As for Ukrainian researchers of alternative management models, it is important to note the work of V. Pekar, an entrepreneur and lecturer at the Kyiv –Mohyla Business School and the Lviv Business School. He is the author of

Colorful Management: The Evolution of Thinking, Leadership, and Governance, in which he develops a model of integral dynamics in management. V. Pekar argues that the «interconnectedness of all things in our world-economics, politics, culture, religion, and language» constitutes the foundational premise from which management thinking should proceed [3]. The author of the article «A Holistic Approach to the Management of Business Communication», H. Monastyrskyi, demonstrates an example of applying a holistic approach within the managerial sphere-specifically in business communication, in Ukraine [2]. A similar line of reasoning is developed by A. Shtanhert, the author of the publication «A Holistic Approach to Enterprise Management: Security Aspects», who considers the economic security of an enterprise as part of an integral management system in which risks, resources, and cultural factors interact in a complex and interdependent manner [7].

The authors of the article «The Concept of Holistic Marketing», Yu. Fisun and V. Marchuk, argue that the philosophy of holistic marketing is based on a shared goal, coordinated activity, and integrated actions. They identify four core elements of this concept: internal marketing, integrated marketing, relationship marketing, and socially responsible marketing [4]. A conceptual study outlining the methodological principles of holistic management-namely systemic integrity, adaptability, and self-organization within a socio-cultural context – was conducted by S. Chura. In examining the theoretical foundations of the holistic approach, he emphasizes the interconnection and interdependence of different elements of a system as a prerequisite for achieving a synergistic effect [6]. The dominance of holistic paradigms in contemporary science is addressed by a group of authors led by E. Khodakivskyi. In their article, they seek to interpret analytical studies on the prevalence of the holistic paradigm as a systemically integrated characteristic of the Universe and to apply the tools of syntellectics, Gestalt theory, logical-structural abstractions, the concept of Providence within the akmosphere, noospheric education, economics, and primary governance structures [5].

The author of the teaching and methodological complex «The Contemporary Paradigm of Marketing in the Conditions of an Innovative Economy» (2021), L. Shulhina, promotes the concept of socio-ethical marketing and substantiates the need to move from traditional marketing to holistic marketing, which integrates the concepts of relationship marketing and partnership marketing [8]. Thus, the holistic approach to enterprise management – whether in business communication, enterprise security, or contemporary marketing is actively discussed in Ukrainian professional journals and in several monographs by representatives of economic science. However, there is still a notable lack of research devoted to the implementation of holistic methodology in the management of the socio-cultural sphere.

The purpose of the article is to analyze and elucidate the conceptual foundations and practical possibilities of applying a holistic approach to the management of processes in the socio-cultural sphere. To achieve this aim, the following tasks are addressed:

- to analyze the theoretical and methodological foundations of the holistic approach within the context of management concepts;
- to identify the specific features of socio-cultural activity as an object of management;
- to outline the possibilities for integrating the principles of holism into contemporary management models.

Methodology and Methods. In the course of this study, the authors employed theoretical methods such as analysis, synthesis, comparison, and generalization of contemporary scholars' concepts concerning the application of methodological holism in the socio-cultural sphere. The aims and objectives of the article determined the primary use of the holistic approach, along with holistic methods and principles, in order to reveal their practical potential in the management of socio-cultural activity. A distinctive feature of the holistic approach is the broad application of the principles of integrity (wholeness), adaptability, synergy, and homeostasis as core principles, as well as the principles of openness, interdependence, sustainability, and evolutionarily as auxiliary ones.

The principle of integrity views any association of people not as a system but as an organism that possesses the capacity to exchange matter, energy, and information with its external environment. Adaptability manifests itself as the ability to take adequate measures in response to changes in internal and external conditions. Homeostasis is understood as the organization's striving for harmony between its internal and external dimensions. Synergy refers to the effect that arises from the joint and harmonious functioning of the members of any organization. One of the effective methods of the holistic approach that facilitates the attainment of integral knowledge is the subjective method, which takes into account the nature and degree of the influence of the subjective on the objective. By focusing on individual perception and interpretation of reality, this method is actively employed by a number of contemporary philosophers and scholars in the fields of philosophy of consciousness, psychology, and epistemology. This does not, however, preclude its application in the management of the socio-cultural sphere.

Presentation of the main material. The traditional understanding of management was formed within the framework of classical science and was limited by the subject–object paradigm. Within this type of scientific rationality and the paradigm mentioned above, both simple and large-scale systems were considered the basic objects of analysis. In the study of management problems within classical scientific rationality, a monodisciplinary approach became established. In effect, almost all issues of management were subsumed under a single field of knowledge–cybernetics, which was interpreted as the science of the general laws governing processes of control and information transmission in machines, living organisms, and society. Within this paradigm, a variety of approaches were employed to model management processes, including functional, functional–structural, axiomatic, informational approaches, operations research, and classical game theory, among others. It should be noted that all these approaches were organically integrated into first-order cybernetics, which, as a monodiscipline, encompassed all aspects of management. The non-classical type of scientific rationality takes into account the relationships between knowledge about an object and the nature of the means and operations of activity. The explication of these relationships is regarded as a condition for an objectively true description and explanation of the world. However, the connections between intra-scientific and social values and goals still do not constitute an explicit subject of scientific reflection, even though it is precisely these connections that implicitly determine the character of knowledge – what exactly we single out in the world and how we interpret it. As a result, scientific findings are accompanied by reflection on the correlation between the characteristics of the object being explained and the specificity of the means and operations of scientific activity. In this context, the development of ideas about management has largely been associated with overcoming a number of limitations inherent in the subject–object paradigm. In the philosophical dimension, such studies also facilitated a shift from the dominance of positivism toward philosophical constructivism, which has become one of the leading currents within non-classical rationality.

According to the philosophical position of constructivism, what humans deal with in the process of knowing and mastering the world is not some reality that exists independently and is merely apprehended, but rather, to a certain extent, a product of their own activity. Constructivists maintain that in processes of perception and thinking, human beings do not simply reflect the surrounding world; instead, they actively create and construct it. Under such a formulation, the opposition between the object and the researcher proved to be valid only with respect to objects that are «not endowed with psyche». In cases where the researcher confronts an object «endowed with psyche» the relationship between researcher and object is transformed into a relationship between two researchers, each of whom becomes an object in relation to the other. Within such relations, the researcher becomes merely one of the actors in a specific system of reflexive interactions. Objects thus become comparable to the researcher in terms of their level of organization and complexity.

In Western scholarship, similar approaches emerged within the framework of general systems theory and second-order cybernetics, marked by a shift from the consideration of «passive systems» to the study of «observing systems». These studies laid the groundwork for a transition in management from the subject–object paradigm to the subject–subject paradigm. As a result, new conceptions of the basic types, mechanisms, and models of management emerged. Within this type of scientific rationality and the foundational subject–subject management paradigm, the most important property of the objects of management under consideration, in our view, is their activity. In this case, causality with respect to such objects can no longer be reduced to Laplacian determinism and must be supplemented by the ideas of teleological causality (goal-oriented determination). Objects of this kind can be classified as active systems, while the most complex and fundamental objects should be regarded as large-scale active systems.

The foundational role of the subject–subject paradigm and the emergence of active systems as the principal type of objects of management determined the key direction in the development of cybernetics as second-order cybernetics, and also brought to the forefront of management studies knowledge from a wide range of disciplines, including biology, psychology, sociology, political science, and others. The interdisciplinary approach thus became the basic scientific framework. The founders of cybernetics were well aware of the limitations of the subject–object paradigm for addressing management problems that extend beyond technical systems; however, the urgency of practical tasks led to the postponement of the further development of this paradigm to a later period. The idea of the active object (the object-as-researcher) was placed by Heinz von Foerster at the foundation of the new second-order cybernetics. First-order cybernetics is the cybernetics of observed systems. Second-order cybernetics is the cybernetics of observing systems. The subjectivity of the observer determines their model of observation and their theory, for which persuasive facts are subsequently selected. Whereas first-order cybernetics emphasizes «hard control» (within a subject–object context), second-order cybernetics must be oriented toward subject–subject forms of

management-toward «soft» models that place processes of self-organization at the center of attention.

H. Foerster reasons as follows: first-order cybernetics separates the subject and the object; it points to a supposedly independent world «out there, beyond us». Second-order cybernetics, by contrast, is cyclical: the human being begins to understand themselves as part of the world – the very same world they intend to observe. The entire situation of description shifts to a different plane, in which the human suddenly becomes compelled to assume responsibility for their own observations [12]. In biology, the ideas of second-order cybernetics found their embodiment in the concept of autopoiesis developed by H. Maturana and F. Varela, in which the focus shifted to the selfhood and self-production of developing systems. In psychology and psychotherapy, the ideas of second-order cybernetics found their foremost proponents in G. Bateson and P. Watzlawick, whose views are closely aligned with constructivism. In essence, second-order cybernetics represents a transition from positivism to constructivism. The emergence of second-order cybernetics fundamentally influenced the development of management theory, leading to changes in mechanisms and models of management, as well as to the emergence of new types of governance. The transition in management from the subject–object paradigm to the subject–subject paradigm resulted in the formation of new conceptions of management types, including reflexive management, information management, management of active systems, and related approaches.

Moreover, new scientific and applied fields began to emerge, such as management psychology, NLP, and related approaches (psychology–cybernetics); the theory of autopoiesis and related developments (biology–cybernetics); economic cybernetics (economics–cybernetics); the philosophy of management (philosophy–cybernetics); the sociology of management (sociology–cybernetics); as well as concepts and models of rational human choice (economics–psychology–cybernetics). All of this testified to the formation of a new, interdisciplinary approach to the study of management problems. In turn, this approach contributed to the rapid development of science and to the successful solution of pressing practical tasks. However, at present all the aforementioned fields are subject to sharp criticism for their fragmentation, the loss of holistic vision in management, and the insufficient consideration of the influence of culture on managerial actors, among other shortcomings. It is time to revise scientific paradigms and to search for new forms of interaction among different fields of knowledge within the broader problematics of management in general, and of managing processes in the socio-cultural sphere in particular. Socio-cultural activity, understood as a set of actions aimed at the creation, preservation, transmission, and development of cultural values within the social environment, encompasses not only art or leisure but the entire sphere of the society's spiritual and practical activity. This includes education, culture, communication, traditions, ethics, and symbolic practices.

Its specificity lies in the fact that it is simultaneously oriented toward the development of the individual both as a personality and as a member of a community, while the outcome of this activity is purely meaningful, symbolic, and communicative. In this domain, process and result coincide: the very act of cultural interaction already constitutes the result (for example, a festival, concert, exhibition, or ritual). In this regard, the object of management in the socio-cultural sphere comprises several interrelated levels:

- individual – the personality, its spiritual experience, creativity, and values;
- institutional – organizations of culture, education, and media;
- societal – cultural policy, social norms, and symbolic systems;
- civilizational – the historical and mental code of the nation, traditions, and archetypes.

Thus, the management of socio-cultural activity must itself be **holistic**: it simultaneously works with people, organizations, information flows, and spiritual phenomena – that is, both horizontally and vertically. It is an inherently **dynamic and adaptive** form of management that takes into account unpredictability, variability, and the multivector nature of influences. In this context, effectiveness is achieved not through rigid directives but through **soft forms of governance** such as moderation, facilitation, networked communication, and cross-sectoral interaction. Unlike production systems, where people often function as a «resource», in socio-cultural activity the individual is a **co-creator of meaning**. Therefore, management in this sphere must be not instrumental but **anthropocentric**, since the cultural manager works not *over* people but *with* people, creating spaces for participation, co-creation, and self-realization.

Given that cultural processes are always contextual – that is, dependent on historical memory, traditions, and social dynamics – socio-cultural management cannot be standardized. It must always be situational and environment-sensitive. Thus, the holistic paradigm of managing processes in the socio-cultural sphere presupposes precisely such a mode of governance that integrates material (infrastructure, resources), social (human relations, communication), symbolic (values, norms, traditions), and spiritual (meanings, creativity, self-knowledge) levels. It encompasses not only organizational processes but also the development of cultural consciousness, ethical motivation, and communicative relationships.

According to Ken Wilber, a system – whether a personality, an organization, or a society – can

develop harmoniously only if its various levels grow integrally, from the material to the spiritual [24]. The holistic paradigm of management overcomes the reductionist approach that previously reduced management to a technology of control. In the context of socio-cultural management, this entails a shift from the model of the «organization as a mechanism» to that of the «organization as a living organism», where the primary focus becomes the vital process of culture itself – that is, the exchange of meanings, energy, and creativity. In this regard, Edgar Morin noted in his work [16] that thinking in terms of the whole is not an addition to analytical reason, but its correction. Turning to the issue of implementing holistic management in the socio-cultural sphere, it is appropriate to distinguish three management models that currently exist and, to varying degrees, correspond to the holistic paradigm: «the organization as a living organism», «the cultural ecosystem», and «the integral management model».

The model of the «organization as a living organism» received its scientific grounding in the field of synergetics developed by I. Prigogine and H. Haken. They demonstrated that complex, open systems maintain order through self-organization and nonlinear dynamics. A cultural organization is precisely such an open system, living in a constant exchange of energy and meanings with its social environment. In the 1980-s, organizational theorists D. Nadler and M. Tushman, working within the field of organizational design, proposed an approach that later came to be known as the Congruence Model. Its idea is simple yet profound: an organization is not a mechanism in which one can replace a single cog and obtain a predictable result. Rather, an organization is an adaptive system, much like a living organism, in which all elements are interconnected [17]. It should be noted here that the authors of this model themselves – D. Nadler and M. Tushman – did not describe it through a biological metaphor. However, managers and organizational psychologists quickly identified the core principles underlying its operation: the organization continuously adapts to its environment; it possesses feedback mechanisms and internal self-regulation; it has «needs» (such as resources, information, and an optimal structure); it exhibits homeostasis, that is, a natural tendency toward maintaining stability; and it displays emergent properties, meaning that it cannot be reduced to the sum of the individuals who constitute it. For this reason, the model began to be interpreted as an «organization-as-a-living-organism» model, especially in the literature on organizational development, systems management, and the social psychology of groups. At present, there are cases in Ukraine where the model of the «organization as a living organism» operates de facto. An international marketing group, on its website, describes six companies operating in Ukraine as «teal» or «living organizations» and explicitly notes a shift from the metaphor of the «machine» to that of the «living organism»: «In the third millennium, classical organizations with traditional structures, hierarchical value systems, and subordination have been replaced by innovative ones with alternative approaches to leadership and work in general. They are called teal or living organizations, the so-called «organizations of the future». Teal companies represent a new trend in global business, and mastering the principles of their operation and the secrets of their management requires sustained learning and practice» [15].

Among the six Ukrainian «teal» companies examined by the authors of the article are the following: IPLAND – a Ukrainian service provider of IT solutions for sales management. The company has implemented holacracy, meaning that authority and decision-making are distributed among self-organizing teams. 4IRE Labs – a Swedish-Ukrainian company operating in the fields of DeFi, FinTech, and Green Finance, which consciously transitioned to a teal model in 2017 by introducing holacracy. Management reports reduced administrative costs, faster decision-making, and greater team engagement – classic markers of a «living organism» that responds rapidly to its environment. In addition, a group of companies (Beetroot, Uptech, Triggmine, Yoctocode) demonstrates very similar principles: openness of information (including financial transparency); freedom to choose projects, roles, and levels of compensation; an emphasis on values and the «whole person» (the absence of a requirement to «put on a business mask»); cultivation of a friendly atmosphere; and the deliberate selection of clients who share the organization's values.

Unfortunately, teal companies in Ukraine remain a relatively rare phenomenon, though a real one rather than a theoretical ideal. Nevertheless, it is precisely within such organizations that a company truly «transforms into a living organism», characterized by a high degree of self-organization and integrity. The model of the «organization as a living organism» can also be extended to volunteer movements and civic initiatives. Examples include the «Support Movement for Transcarpathian Military Personnel» or the Kyiv-based volunteer movement «Zhraia», which articulates a direct, non-metaphorical – indeed, existentially sincere – formulation rather than a managerial one: «We are a living organism that functions exactly as required at this moment» [1]. From the perspective of the holistic paradigm, this is an almost textbook example. Zhraia represents an adaptive, emergent organization that grows out of practices of mutual aid; its structure is not «designed» but has evolved organically; governance here is not command-based but consists in tuning the flow of resources, information, and people. As we can see, the most «living» organizations in

contemporary Ukrainian realities are not only progressive IT companies, but above all volunteer and civic networks, which literally behave as complex adaptive organisms. From the perspective of the holistic management paradigm, it is precisely within these contexts that the model is currently being tested and refined in practice – one that can later be theoretically conceptualized in lectures and monographs.

The second model that also corresponds to the basic principles of holism is that of the «cultural ecosystem». For decades, Europe has operated within the paradigm of cultural ecosystems in both research and cultural policy, grounded in the concepts developed by Gregory Bateson and Edgar Morin. Here, the focus is not on cultural institutions as organizations, but on a mode of thinking in which culture is understood as a living, self-regulating, non-rigid, and interpenetrating system of meanings, actions, symbols, environments, and human practices. In the concepts developed by these thinkers, culture appears as a networked, self-organizing, and emergent system of meanings and practices, within which meanings are produced, symbols circulate, norms are reproduced, innovations arise, different levels of consciousness coexist, and an internal dynamic equilibrium is maintained. Thus, Morin and Bateson effectively introduced a philosophy of culture understood as an ecology of meanings. Ukraine already has individual institutions that operate in an ecosystemic manner; however, a fully formed cultural ecosystem as a holistic phenomenon is still in the process of emergence. At present, there are several key nodes moving in this direction, including the Ukrainian Institute, Jam Factory Art Center (Lviv), Mystetskyi Arsenal (Kyiv), networks of independent theaters and cultural spaces (such as Smena, PostPlay, Teatr na Zhukakh), and music communities (Polyphony Project, Hudprom, Shpytal Records). Paradoxically, the war has accelerated ecosystemic dynamics by intensifying self-organization, strengthening horizontal connections, and enabling the rapid circulation of cultural meanings. The final model we would like to consider here is the Integral Management Model, developed by Ken Wilber, according to which an organization is not merely a system of processes or a set of cultural values, but a holistic «holographic» organism. In such an organism, it is necessary to take into account both the external and the internal dimensions, as well as individual and collective aspects simultaneously. In the business context, this approach is often referred to as Integral Business, Integral Organization, Integral Leadership, or Integral Organizational Development.

At present, very few organizations formally declare themselves as «integral». However, there are some that explicitly or implicitly state that they employ Wilber's approach or an integral form of management. Several examples and domains may be noted. These include the Integral Institute and its affiliated organizations and consultants – a center established by Wilber's own followers, which promotes Integral Theory in business coaching, management, education, and organizational development. There are also consulting and transformation-oriented companies that position themselves as practicing integral / holistic organizational development (for example, firms offering integral organizational development services). Such organizations propose approaches that simultaneously take into account processes and structures, organizational culture, people's mental models, values, and systemic influences – that is, they work with the organization as an entire field. Thus, the integral model of management currently exists primarily as a set of practices, programs, consulting approaches, and individual business models rather than as a widespread organizational type. Yet it is precisely this circumstance that makes the topic especially fertile for philosophical and methodological elaboration.

Conclusions. As we can see, the holistic approach to managing the socio-cultural sphere is currently at a stage of development and of searching for unifying paradigms that could facilitate their mutual convergence. The high methodological complexity involved in coordinating and integrating different approaches provides grounds to argue that significant results are unlikely to be achieved within the frameworks traditionally associated with interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary communication. In our view, holistic management in the socio-cultural space represents a new type of cultural rationality, one that aspires not only to efficiency but also to viability, harmony, and, more broadly, to the evolution of the system itself. Holistic management in general can be understood as the art of managing energy, while in the socio-cultural sphere it becomes the management of cultural energy, in which people, institutions, and environments interact as a single organism – one that is capable of self-reflection, self-knowledge, and self-development. Increasingly relevant are problems whose resolution requires going beyond the boundaries of individual disciplines and engaging external experts equipped with fundamentally different types of knowledge and specialized socio-humanitarian technologies. The most important functions of such external experts should include the following: communicative, ensuring effective communication among subjects; representational, facilitating the reflection of subjects; ontological, establishing a connection between the knowing subject and the realities of being, as well as the subjective realities of other subjects; and, finally, integrative, enabling the integration of the knowledge space. Traditionally, such integrators have been represented by manager-methodologists and manager-philosophers. At the same time, it should be noted that culture acquires

particular significance in the realization of these functions, as it establishes the common space within which all scientific fields of knowledge are represented. It can therefore be assumed that integrators of the holistic approach constitute a new profession of the near future, and that their training should begin today.

Список використаної літератури

1. Безрученко Д., Павлов Д. Ми вже звиклі до всього, просто зараз війна перемістилася ближче до нас. *The Ukrainians*, 28 квіт. 2022 р. URL: <https://theukrainians.org/zgraya/>.
2. Монастирський Г., Шушпанов Д. Холістичний підхід до управління бізнес-комунікацією. *Економічний аналіз*. 2024. Т. 34. № 2. С. 259–271. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35774/econa2024.02.259>.
3. Пекар В. О. *Різнобарвний менеджмент: Еволюція мислення, лідерства та керування*. Харків : Фоліо, 2016. 190 с.
4. Фісун Ю., Марчук В. Концепція холістичного маркетингу: теоретичні аспекти та особливості практичного застосування. *Socio-Economic Relations in the Digital Society*. 2023. Т. 1. № 47. С. 61–69. DOI: 10.55643/ser.1.47.2023.480.
5. Ходаківський Є. І., Якобчук В. П., Іванюк О. В., Присяжнюк О. Ф., Плотнікова М. Ф. Домінування парадигм холістичності в сучасній науці. *Наукові горизонти*. 2018. № 11. С. 3–12. URL: [https://sciencehorizon.com.ua/web/uploads/pdf/%E2%84%9611\(72\)_3-12.pdf](https://sciencehorizon.com.ua/web/uploads/pdf/%E2%84%9611(72)_3-12.pdf)
6. Чура С. Холістичне управління економічною безпекою підприємства. *Науковий погляд: економіка та управління*, 2021, № 1 (71). С. 46–49. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32836/2521-666X/2021-71-8>.
7. Штангрет А. М., Соколовська А. М. Холістичний підхід в управлінні економічною безпекою підприємства. *Цифрова економіка та економічна безпека*. 2023. Вип. 8 (08). С. 237–243. DOI: 10.32782/dees.8-39.
8. Шульгіна Л. Сучасна парадигма маркетингу в умовах інноваційної економіки: навчально-методичний комплекс. Київ : КПП ім. І. Сікорського, 2021. 83 с.
9. Beck D., Cowan C. *Spiral Dynamics: Mastering Values, Leadership and Change*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1996. 331 p.
10. Capra F. *The Tao of Physics: an exploration of the parallels between modern physics and eastern mysticism*. Boulder: Shambhala, 1975. 330 p.
11. Edwards M. *Organizational Transformation for Sustainability: An Integral Metatheory*. Routledge, 2010. 288 p.
12. Heinz von Foerster. *Ethics and Second-Order Cybernetics*. *Cybernetics & Human Knowing*, 1991. Vol. 1. No. 1. P. 9–19.
13. Kegan R. *In Over Our Heads: The Mental Demands of Modern Life*. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press, 1994. 336 p.
14. Laloux F. *Reinventing Organizations: A Guide to Creating Organizations Inspired by the Next Stage of Human Consciousness*. Nelson Parker, 2014. 382 p.
15. Laloux F. *Reinventing Organizations: A Guide to Creating Organizations Inspired by the Next Stage of Human Consciousness*. Belgium: Nelson parker, 2014. 379 p. <https://www.socialskills4you.com/wp-content/Reinventingorganization.pdf>
16. Morin E. *La Méthode*. Т. 1. *La Nature de la nature*. Paris : Seuil, 1977. 416 p.
17. Nadler D., Tushman M. Model for Diagnosing Organizational Behavior. *Organizational Dynamics*, 1980. Vol. 9. No. 2. P. 35–51.
18. Scharmer O., Kaufer K. *Leading from the Emerging Future: From Ego system to Eco system Economies*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2013. 304 p.
19. Senge P. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art & Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York : Doubleday / Currency, 1990. 464 p.
20. Smuts J. *Holism and Evolution*. Creative Media Partners, 2022. 362 p.
21. Stacey R. *Complex Responsive Processes in Organizations: Learning and Knowledge Creation*. London : Routledge, 2001. 256 p.
22. Wheatley M. *Leadership and the New Science: Discovering Order in a Chaotic World*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 1992. 164 p.
23. Wilber K. *A Theory of Everything: An Integral Vision for Business, Politics, Science, and Spirituality*. Boulder, CO : Shambhala Publications, 2001. 189 p.
24. Wilber K. *Integral Psychology: Consciousness, Spirit, Psychology, Therapy*. Shambhala Publications, 2001. 453 p.

References

1. Bezruchenko D., Pavlov D. My vzhe zvykli do vsogo, prosto zaraz viina peremistylasia blyzhche do nas. *The Ukrainians*, 28 kvit. 2022 r. URL: <https://theukrainians.org/zgraya/>.
2. Monastyrskiy H., Shushpanov D. Kholistychnyi pidkhid do upravlinnia biznes-komunikatsiiei. *Ekonomichnyi analiz*. 2024. Т. 34. № 2. С. 259–271. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35774/econa2024.02.259>.
3. Pekar V. O. *Riznobarvnyi menedzhment: Evoliutsiia myslennia, liderstva ta keruvannia*. Kharkiv : Folio, 2016. 190 s.
4. Fisun Yu., Marchuk V. Kontsepsiia kholistychnoho marketynhu: teoretychni aspekty ta osoblyvosti praktychnoho zastosuvannia. *Socio-Economic Relations in the Digital Society*. 2023. Т. 1. № 47. С. 61–69. DOI: 10.55643/ser.1.47.2023.480.

5. Khodakivskiy Ye. I., Yakobchuk V. P., Ivaniuk O. V., Prysiazhniuk O. F., Plotnikova M. F. Dominuvannia paradyhm kholistychnosti v suchasni nautsi. Naukovi horyzonty. 2018. № 11. S. 3–12. URL: [https://sciencehorizon.com.ua/web/uploads/pdf/%E2%84%9611\(72\)_3-12.pdf](https://sciencehorizon.com.ua/web/uploads/pdf/%E2%84%9611(72)_3-12.pdf)
6. Chura S. Kholistyчне upravlinnia ekonomichnoiu bezpekoiu pidprijemstva. Naukovyi pohliad: ekonomika ta upravlinnia, 2021, № 1 (71). S. 46–49. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32836/2521-666X/2021-71-8>.
7. Shtanhret A. M., Sokolovska A. M. Kholistychnyi pidkhid v upravlinni ekonomichnoiu bezpekoiu pidprijemstva. Tsyfrova ekonomika ta ekonomichna bezpeka. 2023. Vyp. 8 (08). S. 237–243. DOI: 10.32782/dees.8-39.
8. Shulhina L. Suchasna paradyhma marketynhu v umovakh innovatsiynoi ekonomiky: navchalno-metodychnyy kompleks. Kyiv : KPI im. I. Sikorskoho, 2021. 83 s.
9. Beck D., Cowan C. Spiral Dynamics: Mastering Values, Leadership and Change. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1996. 331 r.
10. Capra F. The Tao of Physics: an exploration of the parallels between modern physics and eastern mysticism. Boulder: Shambhala, 1975. 330 p.
11. Edwards M. Organizational Transformation for Sustainability: An Integral Metatheory. Routledge, 2010. 288 r.
12. Heinz von Foerster. Ethics and Second-Order Cybernetics. Cybernetics & Human Knowing, 1991. Vol. 1. No. 1. R. 9–19.
13. Kegan R. In Over Our Heads: The Mental Demands of Modern Life. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press, 1994. 336 r.
14. Laloux F. Reinventing Organizations: A Guide to Creating Organizations Inspired by the Next Stage of Human Consciousness. Nelson Parker, 2014. 382 r.
15. Laloux F. Reinventing Organizations: A Guide to Creating Organizations Inspired by the Next Stage of Human Consciousness. Belgium: Nelson parker, 2014. 379 p. URL: <https://www.socialskills4you.com/wp-content/Reinventingorganization.pdf>
16. Morin E. La Méthode. T. 1. La Nature de la nature. Paris : Seuil, 1977. 416 r.
17. Nadler D., Tushman M. Model for Diagnosing Organizational Behavior. Organizational Dynamics, 1980. Vol. 9. No. 2. R. 35–51.
18. Scharmer O., Kaufer K. Leading from the Emerging Future: From Ego system to Eco system Economies. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2013. 304 r.
19. Senge P. The Fifth Discipline: The Art & Practice of the Learning Organization. New York : Doubleday / Currency, 1990. 464 r.
20. Smuts J. Holism and Evolution. Creative Media Partners, 2022. 362 r.
21. Stacey R. Complex Responsive Processes in Organizations: Learning and Knowledge Creation. London : Routledge, 2001. 256 r.
22. Wheatley M. Leadership and the New Science: Discovering Order in a Chaotic World. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 1992. 164 r.
23. Wilber K. A Theory of Everything: An Integral Vision for Business, Politics, Science, and Spirituality. Boulder, CO : Shambhala Publications, 2001. 189 r.
24. Wilber K. Integral Psychology: Consciousness, Spirit, Psychology, Therapy. Shambhala Publications, 2001. 453 r.

UDC316.42:130.2

ХОЛІЗМ В УПРАВЛІННІ СОЦІОКУЛЬТУРНИМИ ПРОЦЕСАМИ

Тетяна ПОПЛАВСЬКА – кандидат філософських наук, доцент, доцент кафедри філософських і соціологічних студій та соціокультурних практик, Державний заклад «Південноукраїнський національний педагогічний університет ім. К. УШИНСЬКОГО», м. Одеса, Україна

Оксана ПЕТІНОВА – доктор філософських наук, професор, професор кафедри філософських і соціологічних студій та соціокультурних практик, Державний заклад «Південноукраїнський національний педагогічний університет ім. К. УШИНСЬКОГО», м. Одеса, Україна

Зоя АТАМАНЮК – доктор філософських наук, професор, професор кафедри філософських і соціологічних студій та соціокультурних практик, Державний заклад «Південноукраїнський національний педагогічний університет ім. К. УШИНСЬКОГО», м. Одеса, Україна

Катерина ТКАЧЕНКО – кандидат філософських наук, викладачка кафедри філософських і соціологічних студій та соціокультурних практик, Державний заклад «Південноукраїнський національний педагогічний університет ім. К. УШИНСЬКОГО», м. Одеса, Україна

Традиційні моделі управління соціокультурною діяльністю, орієнтовані переважно на економічну ефективність та адміністративний контроль, виявляються недостатніми для адекватного врахування багатоглибини природи культурних процесів. Тому дослідження та впровадження принципово нових підходів і методів управління різними процесами стає дедалі актуальнішим завданням сучасної гуманітарної науки.

Здійснюється аналіз перспективних моделей соціокультурного управління, які поки що не отримали широкого поширення, проте вже продемонстрували свою ефективність та практичну життєздатність.

Метою статті є з'ясування концептуальних засад і виявлення практичних можливостей застосування холістичного підходу в управлінні процесами соціокультурної сфери.

Методологія дослідження. У дослідженні застосовано теоретичні методи аналізу, синтезу, порівняння та узагальнення концепцій сучасних науковців щодо використання методологічного холізму в соціокультурній сфері. Основу дослідження становить холістичний підхід разом із відповідними методами та принципами, що дозволяють виявити його практичний потенціал у менеджменті соціокультурної діяльності. До ключових принципів холістичного підходу віднесено цілісність, адаптивність, синергію та гомеостаз, а допоміжними – відкритість, взаємозалежність, стійкість та еволюційність. Важливим методом досягнення інтегрального знання є суб'єктивний метод, що враховує вплив індивідуального сприйняття та інтерпретації реальності, застосовуваний у філософії свідомості, психології, епістемології та практично – у менеджменті соціокультурної сфери.

Результати. У ході дослідження обґрунтовано еволюцію управлінської думки від класичної суб'єкт-об'єктної парадигми, зорієнтованої на жорсткі моделі контролю та монодисциплінарну кібернетику першого порядку, до неklasичної й постнеklasичної раціональності, в межах якої формується суб'єкт-суб'єктна логіка управління. Показано, що перехід до кібернетики другого порядку, конструктивізму та міждисциплінарних підходів зумовив трактування об'єктів управління як активних і рефлексивних систем, для яких визначальною стає не лінійна причинність, а телеологічна, цілеспрямована детермінація та процеси самоорганізації. Доведено, що в соціокультурній сфері управління не може зводитися до інструментальної технології, оскільки його об'єктами є багаторівневі символічні, ціннісні та комунікативні процеси, у яких індивід постає співтворцем смислів. На цій основі сформульовано концептуальні засади холістичного управління соціокультурною діяльністю як інтегративної моделі, що поєднує матеріальні, соціальні, символічні та духовні виміри й охоплює як горизонтальні, так і вертикальні рівні взаємодії. Виокремлено та проаналізовано три управлінські моделі, релевантні холістичній парадигмі, – «організація як живий організм», «культурна екосистема» та «інтегральна модель управління», – а також показано особливості їх практичної реалізації на прикладі сучасних українських культурних, бізнесових і волонтерських ініціатив. Зроблено висновок, що саме холістичний підхід створює методологічні передумови для подолання фрагментарності сучасних управлінських теорій і забезпечує адекватне управління складними, динамічними та контекстуально зумовленими соціокультурними процесами. Водночас встановлено, що холістичне управління соціокультурною сферою нині перебуває на стадії становлення та пошуку об'єднаних парадигм, здатних забезпечити конвергенцію різних теоретичних і практичних підходів. Висока методологічна складність їх узгодження дає підстави стверджувати, що досягнення системних результатів є малоімовірним у межах традиційних форматів міждисциплінарної чи трансдисциплінарної комунікації. У цьому контексті холістичне управління постає як новий тип культурної раціональності, орієнтований не лише на ефективність, а й на життєздатність, гармонійність і еволюцію соціокультурних систем. Холістичне управління загалом осмислюється як мистецтво управління енергією, а в соціокультурному вимірі – як управління культурною енергією, в межах якої люди, інституції та середовища функціонують як єдиний організм, здатний до саморефлексії, самопізнання та саморозвитку. У зв'язку з цим зростає потреба у залученні зовнішніх експертів, що володіють принципово різними типами знання та спеціалізованими соціогуманітарними технологіями.

Наукова новизна дослідження полягає в системному обґрунтуванні холістичного підходу до управління соціокультурними процесами, що інтегрує матеріальний, соціальний, символічний та духовний рівні діяльності; обґрунтовано перехід від парадигми суб'єкт-об'єкт до парадигми суб'єкт-суб'єктного управління активними системами. Розкрито міждисциплінарний характер соціокультурного менеджменту та підкреслено антропоцентричний підхід, де індивід є співтворцем значень і цінностей.

Практична значущість дослідження полягає у розробці методологічного підґрунтя для впровадження холістичного управління у соціокультурних організаціях, що підвищує адаптивність, самоорганізацію та інтеграцію різних рівнів діяльності – індивідуального, організаційного та суспільного. Запропонована методологія може використовуватися для розвитку культурних, освітніх та волонтерських ініціатив, забезпечуючи ефективну взаємодію учасників, формування ціннісно-символічного середовища, сприяючи саморозвитку, креативності та соціальній відповідальності.

Ключові слова: соціокультурна сфера; холізм; цілісний підхід; соціокультурний менеджмент та маркетинг, менеджер-інтегратор, культурна екосистема, самоорганізація, синергія, соціокультурні процеси.

Стаття отримана 18.01.2026

Стаття прийнята 03.03.2026

Стаття опублікована 28.05.2026