

MODERN REALITIES OF CORPORATE CULTURE FORMATION IN THE YOUTH ENVIRONMENT: INTERACTION OF LAW AND IDEOLOGY**

Nikita V. Grishanin^{1,2}, Yakov V. Minevich^{1,3}, Tatiana D. Sokolova⁴, Vlada V. Tovstiy²

¹ State Academic University for the Humanities, Moscow, Russia

² North-West Institute of Management – branch of RANEP, St. Petersburg, Russia

³ Moscow State Institute of Culture, Khimki, Russia

⁴ HSE University, Moscow, Russia

Article info

Received –

2022 October 01

Accepted –

2023 January 10

Available online –

2023 March 20

Keywords

Law, ideology, values of youth, corporate culture, factors of pentabasis, youth culture, sociological survey of youth audience, employer company, indicators of culture, patriotism

Corporate culture as it exists today is a cast of the Western European matrix, in which patriotic ideology is replaced by the values of the corporation and personal result. But modern realities form a new demand of society, moral principles and traditions develop modern legal relations. The human right to patriotic behavior is largely shaped by the system of religious and moral values that influenced Russian legislation long before the emergence of modern Russia.

The purpose of the article (in the form of confirmation or refutation of a scientific hypothesis) is to analyze the value system of youth, legal realities and ideological features of the formation of the Russian state around the factors of Russian identity: family, society, country, state, person, to describe the possibility of their inclusion in the corporate culture (employer) as the basic principles of corporate governance.

The method of group interview, the method of content analysis was chosen as the research method. The method of group interview or classroom analysis allows each of the participants of the discussion to speak freely on a particular problem, and during the discussion in the polemic to form a unified representation of the group on the problem.

The respondents were students of universities in Moscow and St. Petersburg, aged 18 to 23 years, technical and humanitarian areas of training - a total of 150 people (110 humanities and 40 technical areas of training). During the survey, they were divided into groups of 7 to 10 people and the groups were asked to form an opinion on how they understand value, the group discussed the idea of value and recorded the definition and their understanding of this value.

As part of the study, young people aged 18 to 23 years were consistently considered about their values, how these values form the factors of pentabasis, contribute to the formation of relationships with companies. Then, which factors of pentabasis most influence the formation of the value field of youth and which indicators can be identified as markers of the formed value. Further, in order to determine how the company forms the pentabasis factors, taking into account values and indicators, young people write down which indicators and values are characteristic of the cross-influence of pentabasis factors on each other.

Thus, after we have considered the principles of the formation of legal awareness, it becomes transparently clear that when developing the principles of corporate culture, it is necessary to transfer to the factors of Russian identity. Patriotism in corporate communications, until they form a clear system of values for Russians, will be a superstructure that will not be fully realized in any corporation, since it is built on different values, which became clear to us when studying the history of legal awareness. Consequently, after the conducted research, we have described some conclusions on the principles of the formation of the ideology of corporate culture, which are based on the factors of Russian identity.

** The article was prepared at the State Academic University for the Humanities in the framework of the state assignment of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation (project no. FZNF-2022-0001 – Opportunities and features of the formation of a worldview in the digital environment).

1. Introduction.

Patriotic behavior has always been a valuable asset for the state. Establishing love for the motherland and trust in the state in Russian culture has been discussed at various political, social, and creative levels. Today, we are ready to face a new challenge: the confrontation of corporate cultures and their values with the state ideology and law, exacerbated by both of them following completely different patterns of audience interaction.

Can company-internal values align with state values, and can a state have other values except global ones? How do corporate governance and global trends change the values of young people? Research in sociology focuses on how value orientations are transformed among young people. Prominent Russian scholars, such as A.E. Geger [1], M.K. Gorshkov [2,3], F.E. Sheregi [4], E.K. Kazarina-Volshebnyaya [5] et al., have contributed to the development of this knowledge area.

The labor values of the Russian youth are shaped by the specific socio-cultural and economic context of the new legal reality, therefore reflecting dominant trends in labor relations of the modern Russia. Indispensable for a detailed study of this topic are works of O.V. Aksenova [6,7], Z.T. Golenkova [8,9], Zh.T. Toshchenko [10,11,12], and A.A. Shamin [13].

Globalization also influences the nature of modern youth labor values globally, including in Russia, making papers on globalization theory by I.F. Devyatko [14], V.A. Koretsky [15], M.O. Mnatsakanyan [16, 17] and others indispensable for understanding the issue in question.

This article aims to analyze the value system of young people and legal realities, and describe the possibility of their inclusion in the corporate culture of an employer as the main principles of corporate governance by confirming or refuting a scientifically formulated hypothesis.

2. Corporate Culture as a Set of Systematized Company Values. Corporate culture is most commonly understood as a system of company-specific material and spiritual values, rules of behaviors and interaction that reflect the company's unique character [18]. This aligns with

the notion of a national culture which can be seen as a system of material and spiritual values, rules of behavior and interaction. Norms of behavior, however, vary from one corporate culture to another and are completely different from the norms adopted at state level. At the same time, an employee is a citizen of the state and adheres to national, not company-internal laws, as well as all moral principles established or generally accepted in the state.

Corporate culture is based on the Western European value matrix [19], shaping a corporate mindset which is unlikely to be combined with a patriotic mindset. A corporation always has corporate interests first, not the state ideology. Legal consciousness, as professor A.P. Gerasimenko puts it in his "Philosophy of Law: Between Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism", can be divided into two types: cosmopolitan and patriotic. The cosmopolitan type is dominated by Catholic and Protestant religions, whereas the patriotic legal consciousness aligns with Buddhism and Orthodox Christianity. Gerasimenko also introduces two forms of the legal framework, ideological and judicial: ideology-based framework has morality prevail over the law, while judicial-based framework sees the law prevail. "In ideology-based legal frameworks of a multi-party state, the legal consciousness can be both patriotic and cosmopolitan, just as a judicial-based framework does not necessarily presume cosmopolitan-type legal consciousness— moreover, it is the patriotic legal consciousness that most often dominates here" [20, p. 22]. These concepts were further detailed in other Gerasimenko's works. As Gerasimenko puts it, "the legal ideology of Catholics, Protestants and Muslims is similar to conservative, liberal and socialist ideologies, and can be considered pro-judicial. The legal ideology of Buddhists and Orthodox Christians corresponds to the anti-judicial attitudes of anarchists and communists, as the former equate law with morality while the latter give preference to morality and reduce law to an insignificant factor." [20, p. 24] Similar concepts were presented in other works of the author [21, 22]. This point is further corroborated by Ovchinnikov: "Today, we should be constructing a legal space of education that finally embraces

peacefully coexisting spiritual, moral and formal-judicial values from various cultural and legal traditions that are currently accepted as generally Russian.” [23, p. 43] It can be said therefore that, in the Russian context, law is rooted in Orthodox Christianity and will contribute to maintaining patriotic attitudes in society.

Over the past twenty years, the government has made decisions aimed at establishing traditional Russian spiritual and moral values, thus restoring historical justice. The most important principles were reflected in the 2020 amendments to the Constitution of the Russian Federation. The National Security Strategy, as approved by Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of July 2, 2021 No. 400, further aligned with the policy to strengthen traditional Russian spiritual and moral values while preservation of cultural and historical heritage of the people of Russia was identified as national priority [Decree, 2021]” [23, p. 44].

On the other hand, legislative patriotism can also play an opposite role, as exemplified by the “PATRIOT Act”, signed into law in the United States after September 9, 2001. The landmark PATRIOT Act provided access to personal information of US citizens and derived its name from the fact that the country decided to live by new rules. According to Romanovskaya, a government's powers must correspond to actual threats to the rights and freedoms of citizens, the state or society, so that these threats can be countered—and, most importantly, prevented. On the other hand, society must consent to a certain level of intrusion into personal freedom that enables the state to use its powers to protect citizens rather than putting them under total police control [24, p. 12].

3. Ideology of corporate culture

Describing the adaptation of corporate culture to the Russian culture, as a specific employee activity type for global corporations, Persikova states: “After many years of following communist values and a subsequent abrupt changes to the socio-political system, our country has found itself in a value vacuum both in terms of the society culture in general and the culture of a

particular organization” [25, p. 12]. This means that civilizational gaps cannot make up for the problems that have arisen due to the introduction of a new ethics of corporate relations.

Is it at all possible to regard corporate culture as a part of the culture of the state or as one of the manifestation forms of the society culture? What should the corporate culture be based on in order to provide value and help the state development of the culture? In order to assess the place and importance of a modern company for the culture, we surveyed students of different Russian universities, asking them to characterize the key factors in the formation of Russian culture.

To discuss the importance of the employer in a corporate culture, system-forming factors must be identified. For this purpose, pentabasis factors were used, as described in “Perception of Basic Values, Factors and Structures of the Socio-Historical Development of Russia (Based on Research and Testing)” by A.D. Kharichev, A.Yu. Shutov, A.V. Polosin and Ye. N. Sokolova: “These are factors and structures such as “person”, “family”, “society”, “state”, “country”, which are interconnected as follows: a “person” is the key subject of social life, a “family” is the primary form of social organization, “society” is a civilization-conditioned form of social organization or “family of families” while a “state” is an “organized society” [26, p. 14]. These factors will be referred to as “pentabasis factors”.

4. Research of the ideological basis of corporate culture in the youth environment

For the purpose of this study, an in-class survey was proposed. Respondents were students of Moscow and St. Petersburg universities, aged 18 to 23, studying technical and humanitarian subjects, a total of 150 people (110 in humanities, 40 in sciences). During the survey, they were divided into groups of 7 to 10 people. Groups were then asked to form an opinion on how they understand a specific value. Having discussed the idea of a value, group members wrote down the definition and their understanding of this value. The list of values proposed in the survey was derived from the monograph “Value Orientations of Russian Youth and the Implementation of State Youth Policy: Research Results” by S.V. Chuev. The purpose of this

study was to determine where young people place employers (companies) in their value system among all other factors that form patriotic feelings (i.e., the pentabasis) [26, p. 9-19].

As part of the study, young people aged 18 to 23 analyzed values one-by-one by specifying the values shape pentabasis factors and contribute to establishing relationships with companies. Next, they also identified pentabasis factors that have the most leverage in respondents' value field, and indicators that can serve as markers of an established value. In order to determine how companies contribute to pentabasis factors, participants wrote down indicators and values that are characteristic for a situation where pentabasis factors cross-influence each other.

In the first step, the students specified what a value means for them. "Real Assets", defined as money and real estate, were the most frequently mentioned, followed by "Things You Can Buy" (i.e. wealth, brand merchandise, etc.)

"Love / Relationships, Friendship / Social Interaction / Communication" was described using the concepts of trust, family education and support, as well as personal fulfillment, self-expression, self-affirmation, strongly emphasizing the "self" component.

When describing "Patriotism / Civic Participation" as a value, participants used phrases such as "for the country", "for the motherland" and frequently referred to the concept of "motherland". They expressed devotion towards the country along with a sense of belonging, and realized the importance of current developments. Respondents also mentioned a reverent attitude "to the motherland", their desire to protect it, their love and self-sacrifice.

"Culture / Cultural Identity" was interpreted through the concept of "tradition", sometimes combined with costume, food and music. This value was determined by feeling one whole with the country and self-identifying as a custodian of their ancestors' heritage, or interpreted through arts, i.e. theater, architecture, literature.

"Career" was defined using the concept of "development", less often so through

"achievements" and growth, accompanied by material rewards and money, "recognition" and "success". Less frequently mentioned were potential, opportunities, power, labor, progress, individuality, personal fulfillment and self-expression.

"Individualism" was defined using the concepts of "personality", possibly as self-respect, self-expression, personal fulfillment, uniqueness or being outstanding.

"Healthy lifestyle" is understood as "self-care", "self-love", proper nutrition and wholesome foods, sports and longevity. "Quality of life" acts as an important element and indicator of a healthy lifestyle.

Describing "personal fulfillment" as a value, respondents used possessive pronouns, such as "one's own", "oneself", referring to the desire of following one's own ambitions, pursuing new opportunities and enjoying hobbies. Success, respect, self-importance and career were also mentioned, referring to an accomplished personal fulfillment.

"Education\knowledge" was described as acquired knowledge, often accompanied by mentioning school or university as sources of this knowledge. "Development" was also mentioned, specified using "self-" concepts or pronouns "intellectual" or "constant". Relevant indicators were prestige, elitism and social status.

"Social Success / Social Status" was presented as depending on a person's achievements in society, most frequently by indicating the top management level (e.g. "director", "president", "professor").

"Family", as a value, was primarily associated with significant others and the care, warmth and comfort they provide. The feelings most often experienced by respondents were love, trust, support, affection and excitement.

"Pleasure" was predominantly associated with food, hobbies, sleep and love.

"Desire for change" was perceived as development, "desire for something new", "new stage", "new things", "new skills" and "new opportunities", manifesting respondents' desire for "independence".

After defining values and doing minor

adjustments to the surveying process, we started analyzing what factors of the pentabasis and the employing company have the most influence on the youth values. To achieve this, participating students were asked to rank pentabasis factors by their influence on the value formation.

According to the respondents, society plays a crucial role in establishing Real Assets as a value. Socialization affects material values while the society forms them. Society also creates the framework and guiding principles for its individual members.

Unlike society, the country is a less significant factor in the formation of this value, being mainly responsible for public resources, but to a lesser extent influencing the material standing of an individual.

Family is the primary institution that instills values and serves as the primary socialization agent. It is the family where the foundations of love and social relations are laid from childhood.

Country and company exert less influence because the company cannot develop values in a person while the country aims at more global things, leaving it for the individual and their family to develop feelings and personal relations. The personal network of an individual in the country does not depend on their location.

For the Patriotism/Civic Participation value, the state is the most important factor. State establishes the patriotic values of a person and demonstrates their importance through policies, however the family also helps shape patriotism. *Respondents believe that the person himself does not choose patriotism as a value but rather acquires it unconsciously.*

The employer, according to survey participants, has the least influence on establishing patriotism. Political views are not relevant for a company and it does not affect the civic participation.

Cultural Values/Cultural Identity is primarily understood as the country's heritage, but these are the family and society that are the primary agents of socialization, helping establish this value.

The employer influences cultural values to a lesser extent because they do not play a significant role for the company.

For the Career value, it is the family that establishes ambitions. The individual, specified as the second-important factor, independently chooses their direction in life and builds a career. The state provides equal opportunities for career growth through its policies but does not help build a career, since it is the individual person who chooses where to apply their skills.

The country does not influence career choices.

Individualism as a value is rooted in the family but the personality is shaped as a result of introspection by listening to the self.

A country acts as a community, equalizing everyone without affecting the formation of the individual's personality.

To maintain a Healthy Lifestyle, society and the person themselves are the main factors: despite being a conscious choice of an individual, healthy lifestyle has now become a cult.

The country is the least significant factor here since state policies do not promote a healthy lifestyle or provide any other support.

Personal Fulfillment is defined by the individual, according to the respondents, since everyone chooses their own path and development independently. The society also provides basic rules and opportunities for personal fulfillment, helping to establish this value.

As noted above, the country equalizes everyone and therefore contributes the least to personal fulfillment.

Respondents believe that Education/Knowledge as a value is predominantly influenced by the person and their family since the value of education is fostered in the family. The family is the primary social institution where elementary education begins.

The country does not play the leading role here as it has other values, caring more about the territory, while the state establishes the education system.

Social Success / Social Status were demonstrated to be most influenced by the society since it provides and consolidates social status, also setting the measure for success.

Once again, respondents said that the country does not affect this value in any way, since a

country is about resources, not status, while the territorial location does not affect your position in society.

Family as a value is seen by respondents as the primary defining environment for a person. Values nurtured in one's family are retained after a new family is created and influence relationships there.

The company has a smaller influence on the family since companies cannot really influence internal family relations and mostly focus on corporate values.

For Pleasure as a value, mixed responses were received. Survey participants tend to believe that the individual themselves decides what pleasure is, depending on their character. This makes the individual a factor in establishing the value.

Primarily being an apparatus of power and preoccupied with tax- and defense-related questions, the state defines pleasure to a lesser extent.

The main factor in the Desire for Change, according to the respondents, is the individual themselves thanks to their personal ambition.

The country and the state influence this value the least because they pursue quite the opposite, namely stability.

The third survey mirrored the initial instructions: respondents had to list values that influence the formation of pentabasis factors.

INDIVIDUAL

According to respondents, two values play a fundamental role in the formation of a person: family (37.5%) and personal fulfillment (37.5%). Young people consider the atmosphere of comfort, mutual understanding and support within the family, as well as basic education that ensures initial socialization to be the key to a successful formation of the Family value. Achieving Personal Fulfillment is understood as achieving career success, correctly setting and attaining goals, and following the desire to become better.

Respondents also mentioned Individualism (12.5%) and Love, Relationships, Friendship (12.5%), which, in fact, also relate to the two values discussed above.

As a second priority, respondents

mentioned values such as Personal Fulfillment, Family, Love, Career, Real Assets, Social Interaction. Here, the opinions were extremely divergent with hardly any repeated answers. Those who gave the leading role to Family did not necessarily put Personal Fulfillment in second place.

As a third-priority influencing factor, respondents specified social and spiritual values, such as Success, Search for Own Identity, Cultural Values, Freedom, Pleasure and Social Interactions. Only one group who put the Individualism in the first place mentioned Family as a value.

FAMILY

Most of the young people surveyed interpret Family as something relying on mutual understanding, care and support, as well as love and relationships, which clearly suggests that family promotes these values. 62.5% of respondents chose Love as the dominant value in the formation of a family. Only 12.5% noted the importance of Cultural Values that are passed down from generation to generation.

As a second priority, Family was described through a variety of values, such as Education, Knowledge, Communication, Respect, Social Status and Civic Participation. These are the foundations which the family as an institution relies on for its growth, development and prosperity.

37.5% of young people noted Cultural Values, i.e. family traditions and habits, while 12.5% noted the value of a Healthy Lifestyle. Other answers included Love, Care and Understanding.

SOCIETY

The majority of young respondents interpret the concept of society as Cultural Values and Social Interactions (37.5%). For them, this is reflected as a position in society or a contribution to the future culture of society.

Second most frequent reply was the social status of a person (37.5%), demonstrating the importance of self-expression and finding the right place in society.

Social Success (25%) was the third most frequent answer, implying that having a good education, a good job, and, consequently, success and social recognition is crucial for the young people.

12% of respondents chose Patriotism as the main value shaping the society.

COUNTRY

Young people prioritize Cultural Values (75%), which are understood through preservation and maintenance of traditions, transfer of knowledge, customs and holidays from generation to generation. Young people believe that the country is primarily characterized by this cultural component, which forms people's mentality and identity. Other answers given were: People, i.e. their involvement in the life of the country, in politics and their active civic participation (12.5%), and Patriotism, perceived as readiness to "stand up for the motherland" (12.5%).

Second-priority values were very different: Patriotism (25%), Civic Participation (25%), Freedom, Communication, Power, Real Assets.

Third-priority replies provided a variety of opinions: mentioned were Social Interactions, Communication, Education, Independence, Family and National Values. 25% of the answers focused on the fact that the cohesion of society is important for the country, the other 25% noted a high level of education is important, which can be achieved only after reaching a high standard of living.

This means that young people regard social cohesion, preservation of culture and its transfer as key values for the state, because this will ensure a good standard of living. Patriotism has not been a very frequent answer, although it is the ultimate guarantee of preserving the cultural characteristics and character of the people.

STATE

Most of the young people surveyed (87.5%) interpret and define the state as something that relies on citizenship, patriotism and the desire for change, as well as love for the motherland and improving the standard of living. In doing this, they use words and expressions proving that the state relies on these values and shapes essential processes that contribute to its development and prosperity. Compliance with laws was only noted in 12.5% replies.

Second-priority definitions were very different: the state was described through economy (12.5%), social interaction (12.5%), family and unity (25%), and civic participation (12.5%), which are no less important for a well-functioning state with a high standard of living.

Third priority replies were diverse as well: respondents mentioned standard of living and life expectancy, military equipment, education and economy, suggesting that all of these factors are important for a full-fledged state.

COMPANY/EMPLOYER

Career is the most frequent topic (50%) used to define this aspect. Having a good career for the respondents means to acquire influence and reach prosperity. Career is one of the most important values for young people because it helps to find a suitable place in the social system.

It is remarkable that social status and position in society were the second most frequent answers (37.5%).

They were followed by socialization and individualism (25%). For the youth, professional personal achievements are important. Good working conditions attract new employees.

The final study was aimed at determining cross influence of pentabasis factors.

Influence of the individual on the family. First, a person creates their family, protects it, gives offspring, continues the race, creates new members of society, provides materially, spiritually and physically for his relatives, raises and educates new members of society.

According to the respondents, the family influences the individual. It establishes one's personality, helps the individual to create their own self, instilling the norms and rules of behavior in society. It is in the family where the development of a person begins with the support of relatives. Healthy relationships in the family give a sense of security and form a healthy personality. The family is the first prototype of society for the child.

The influence of society on the individual. Society provides opportunities to develop communication skills and behaviors acquired in the family, and to fulfill oneself in various fields. A person cannot exist without society since it not only socializes individuals, but also influences the formation of the personality, instilling norms and rules of behavior. However, society can help develop but also suppress the individual.

The influence of country on the individual. The country is a place of social cohesion. Identifying oneself with a certain mentality provides a feeling of

belonging to something greater: being within their nation, a person can feel motivated by acting together with fellow countrypeople.

The influence of the state on the individual. Individuals take a civic stance and gain independence in determining their attitude to the political life of society. Through this, a person also influences the state by transforming and amending laws or participating in law-making processes, maintains a certain level of patriotism and informs citizens about the situation in the country and the world.

The influence of the employer on the individual. The company primarily provides jobs for the population, making it possible to earn money for existence but also creating a competitive environment for further personal growth. Being in a team, individuals feel themselves a part of this community as employees. Employers provide for a career growth and establish a sense of importance in the team.

The influence of society on the family. The society establishes economic prerequisites for creating a family, pursues a demographic policy aimed at increasing or limiting birth rates and determines living standards for families. The family must align with the society in which it exists, however the society, in turn, is itself is a collection of individual families.

The influence of the country on the family. The country informs the family, provides places of rest and leisure, ensures unity through "propaganda" of family values. The family establishes its rules and norms of behavior based on the national mentality and its historical heritage.

The influence of the state on the family. The family serves as the basis of the state. Being a miniature of the state foundation, it provides insights into the guiding principles of the state. Any fluctuation of the state is reflected in the family. Main principles of demographic policy (on the example of Russia):

- 1) Assisting families with children in order to increase the birth rate.

- 2) Ensuring parenthood can be combined with an active career.

- 3) Improving healthcare
Promoting patriotism.

The influence of the employer on the family. The family begins to understand the value of earnings. Employer of a family member provides social assistance, such as maternity leave, if necessary.

Influence of the individual on the society. Not every person can have an impact on society as this requires specific leadership skills. Only a strong-willed and self-confident person can change the world around them. In a society, individuals can make choices (with whom to be friends, with whom to live, with whom to start a family, where to study, etc.) Individuals can convey their information to other people and, to some extent, influence events in society.

Influence of the family on the society. For the society, the main purpose of families is the reproduction of the population. A family distributes roles, forming a person's identity, helps construct the family as an institution and nurtures family values, which form the society.

Influence of the country on the society. The country supports the interests of society, unites and motivates it, participates in the formation of the country and, to some extent, helps its formation and influences the culture. Together with the society, the country also shapes the national mentality.

Influence of the state on the society. The state influences all the processes taking place in society, performs managerial, regulatory, ideological and other functions, establishes legal and moral laws, protects citizens, organizes people and provides meaning to their activities. If the state does not meet the needs of society, the situation may result in a revolution.

Influence of the employer on the society. Companies create jobs, ensure a competitive environment for a stable operation and market development. Work also shapes the corporate culture, thereby systematizing the life of society.

Influence of the individual on the country. Individuals preserve the customs and mentality of their country, serve as a transmitter of cultural values and follow the national traditions, accumulate knowledge about the country and share it with the outside world, also defending the country's territory.

Pentabasis factors are indeed intertwined in the value field of the youth, however companies do

not pay enough attention to the formation of the value field, which led us to prepare some proposals to enhance the influence of the pentabasis factors. This model takes into account the values and factors along with the respondents' description of how future companies should influence social life through ideology into corporate culture. The summary below proceeds from the feedback given by the respondents of our study.

5. Conclusions. Principles of establishing a corporate culture based on the patriotic principles of pentabasis and the youth values.

Having analyzed how legal consciousness is established, we can adopt that principles of corporate culture must be based on factors of Russian identity. Until corporate communications evolve into a system of values that is clear to Russians, patriotism will remain a superstructure that will not be fully realized in any corporation since it builds on different values, as demonstrated during our analysis. This leads us to the following conclusions:

In terms of public policy, companies support the principles of fairness, aim at ensuring justice and establishing a community of people sharing a common goal. Companies support social lifts, promote staff training and social ratings, add value by providing help, mutual assistance, stimulate and support the policy of attention and good management.

At the country level, companies maintain the values of a common Russian identity in its corporate culture, ensure employees' understanding of the country's unity and establish transparent labor justice.

To form a strong country, internal corporate cultures follow the guiding principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs". Perception of the country as a just homeland. Reliability. Companies and their corporate cultures provide communication tools used to establish value in perceiving the homeland as a reliable and strong state.

At the society level. Social responsibility of businesses. Internal corporate cultures establish the value of being responsible to society and harmonizing the personal and the public.

Companies welcome initiatives aimed at strengthening the understanding of the company as socially responsible. Development. Companies promote the principle of development at all levels and appreciate that society consists of their employees, letting employees contribute to the development of society as a whole.

At the family level. Reproduction. Family as a value. Appreciating family as an important component of an employee's life. Establishing a feeling of close mutual interests between the company and employees, so that the employee understands the company's attention and care. Partnership. Paying attention not only to the relations between employee and company, but also to the relations between company and the employee's family.

- At the level of a person. Ensuring wellbeing by supporting healthy employees, providing knowledge for continuous professional development and lifelong learning, ensuring optimism to motivate workers into a brighter future.

REFERENCES

1. Ghegher A.E. Revealing individual and group values in youth groupings, relevant methodic solutions. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya = Sociological Studies*, 2010, no. 1 (309), pp. 132–141. (In Russ.).
2. Gorshkov M.K. Young People and the Future Economy. *Upravlenets = The Manager*, 2018, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 2–7. DOI: 10.29141/2218-5003-2018-9-3-1. (In Russ.).
3. Gorshkov M.K. Russian identity in the context of new challenges and risks. *Nauchnye trudy Vol'nogo ekonomicheskogo obshchestva Rossii = Scientific Works of the Free Economic Society of Russia*, 2015, Vol. 195, no. 6, pp. 274–290. (In Russ.).
4. Gorshkov M.K., Sheregi F.E. Youth of Russia: demographic trends historical consciousness. *Monitoring obshchestvennogo mneniya: ekonomicheskie i sotsial'nye peremeny = Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes*, 2009, no. 6 (94), pp. 5–36. (In Russ.).
5. Kazarina-Volshebnaia E.K., Komissarova I.G., Turchenko V.N. Paradoxes of transformation of value orientations of Russian youth. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya = Sociological Studies*, 2012, no. 6 (338), pp. 121–126. (In Russ.).
6. Aksenova O.V. Traditional values of Russian professionals under the modernization. *Vestnik Rossiiskogo universiteta družby narodov. Seriya: Sotsiologiya = RUDN Journal of Sociology*, 2016, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 799–807. (In Russ.).
7. Aksenova O.V. A lost city: media constructs and reality. *Vestnik Instituta sotsiologii = Bulletin of the Institute of Sociology*, 2013, no. 7, pp. 062–074. (In Russ.).
8. Golenkova Z.T., Igithanjan E.D. Self-identification in socio-structural processes. *Vestnik Rossiiskogo universiteta družby narodov. Seriya: Sotsiologiya = RUDN Journal of Sociology*, 2002, no. 1, pp. 20–26. (In Russ.).
9. Golenkova Z.T., Khagurov T.A. Regional youth in a nonlinear global-local society: New forms of social tension. *Vestnik Rossiiskogo universiteta družby narodov. Seriya: Sotsiologiya = RUDN Journal of Sociology*, 2022, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 291–305. DOI: 10.22363/2313-2272-2022-22-2-291-305. (In Russ.).
10. Toschenko Zh.T. New in the social structure of society: precariat. *Vestnik Rossiiskogo fonda fundamentalnykh issledovaniy. Gumanitarnye i obshchestvennye nauki = Russian Foundation for Basic Research Journal. Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2017, no. 2 (87), pp. 100–108. (In Russ.).
11. Toshchenko Zh.T. Life world and its meanings. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya = Sociological Studies*, 2016, no. 1 (381), pp. 5–17. (In Russ.).
12. Toshchenko Zh.T. Centaur-idea as a deformation of social consciousness. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya = Sociological Studies*, 2011, no. 12 (332), pp. 3–12. (In Russ.).
13. Shamin A.A. Increase in labor activity of youth in the conditions of an unstable economy. *Nauka i shkola = Science and School*, 2013, no. 2, pp. 157–160. (In Russ.).
14. Devyatko I.F. The Concept of Value in Sociological Theory: The Influence and (Underestimated) Possibilities of Its Interpretation from the Standpoint of Gestalt Psychology. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya = Sociological Studies*, 2020, no. 10, pp. 3–12. DOI: 10.31857/S013216250011945-2. (In Russ.).
15. Khalikov M.S., Koretsky V.A. Modeling trends of the globalizing world. *Sotsiologiya vlasti = Sociology of Power*, 2011, no. 5, pp. 59–65. (In Russ.).
16. Mnatsakanyan M.O. Globalization and the national state: three myths. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya = Sociological Studies*, 2004, no. 5 (241), pp. 137–142. (In Russ.).

17. Mnatsakanyan M.O. In search of a new theory. [Rev.] *Sociology of life: Theoretical foundations and social practices*. Ed. by Z.T. Toshchenko. Moscow: Russian State Humanitarian University, 2016. *Sotsiologicheskii zhurnal = Sociological Journal*, 2016, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 166–172. DOI: 10.19181/socjour.2016.22.4.4814. (In Russ.).
18. Persikova T.N. *The phenomenon of corporate culture in modern Russia (comparative analysis of corporate cultures in Russian and foreign organizations)*, Cand. Diss. Thesis. Moscow, 2007. 20 p. (In Russ.).
19. Danova N.Yu. Culture of business as the prevailing doctrine in economy of modern Russia. *Sot-sial'no-ekonomicheskie yavleniya i protsessy = Social Economic Phenomena and Processes*, 2014, no. 2 (60), pp. 27–32. (In Russ.).
20. Gerasimenko A.P. *Philosophy of law: between patriotism and cosmopolitanism*. Blagoveshchensk, Amur State University Publ., 2021. 93 p. DOI: 10.22250/FP. (In Russ.).
21. Gerasimenko A.P. Orthodox Legal Ideology by I.A. Ilyin. *Religiovedenie = Study of Religion*, 2019, no. 2, pp. 114–121. DOI: 10.22250/2072-8662.2019.2.114-121. (In Russ.).
22. Gerasimenko A.P. B.P. Vycheslavzeff on religious roots of law. *Religiovedenie = Study of Religion*, 2020, no. 1, pp. 101–113. DOI: 10.22250/2072-8662.2020.1.101-113. (In Russ.).
23. Ovchinnikov A.V. Traditions of public education law as a factor in the formation of Russian youth patriotism (historical and pedagogical aspect). *Istoriko-pedagogicheskii zhurnal*, 2022, no. 4, pp. 42–51. (In Russ.).
24. Romanovskaya O.V. Act on patriotism: restrictions on the right to privacy in the USA in order to counter terrorism. *Nauka. Obshchestvo. Gosudarstvo = The science. Society. State*, 2017, vol. 5, no. 2 (18), available at: https://esj.pnzgu.ru/files/esj.pnzgu.ru/romanovskaya_ov_17_2_02.pdf. (In Russ.).
25. Kalenchuk E. Corporate culture in the context ideological processes. *Nauchnye trudy Respublikanskogo instituta vysshei shkoly. Filosofsko-gumanitarnye nauki*, 2015, no. 14, pp. 191–197. (In Russ.).
26. Harichev A.D., Shutov A.Yu., Polosin A.V., Sokolova E.N. Perception of basic values, factors and structures socio-historical development of Russia (based on research and testing materials). *Zhurnal politicheskikh issledovaniy = Journal of Political Research*, 2022, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 9–19. DOI: 10.12737/2587-6295-2022-6-3-9-19. (In Russ.).
27. Chuev S.V. (ed.). *Value orientations of Russian youth and the implementation of state youth policy: research results*, Monograph, under the general editorship of S.V. Chuev. Moscow, State University of Management Publ., 2017. 131 p. (In Russ.).

INFORMATION ABOUT AUTHORS

Nikita V. Grishanin – PhD in Cultural Studies; ¹Senior Researcher; ²Head, Master's program “Consulting and Reputation Management in Advertising and Public Relations”

¹ State Academic University for the Humanities

² North-West Institute of Management – branch of RANEPA

¹ 26, Maronovskii per., Moscow, 119049, Russia

² 57/43, Srednii pr. V.O., St. Petersburg, 199178, Russia

E-mail: grishanin-nv@ranepa.ru

ORCID: 0000-0001-8872-633X

RSCI AuthorID: 633945

Yakov V. Minevich – PhD in Sociology; ¹Senior Researcher; ²Head, Department of Advertising and Public Relations

¹ State Academic University for the Humanities

² Moscow State Institute of Culture

¹ 26, Maronovskii per., Moscow, 119049, Russia

² 7, Bibliotekhnaya ul., Khimki, 141406, Russia E-mail: minevich@rim-pn.ru

Tatiana D. Sokolova – PhD in Politics, Associate Professor, School of Communications, Faculty of Creative Industries
HSE University
20, Myasnitskaya ul., Moscow, 101000, Russia E-mail: tdsokolova@hse.ru

Vlada V. Tovstiy – master's student
North-West Institute of Management – branch of RANEPA
57/43, Srednii pr. V.O., St. Petersburg, 199178, Russia
E-mail: vvtovstiy-21@edu.ranepa.ru

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION

Grishanin N.V., Minevich Ya.V., Sokolova T.D., Tovstiy V.V. Modern realities of corporate culture formation in the youth environment: interaction of law and ideology. *Pravoprimerenie = Law Enforcement Review*, 2023, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 15–24. DOI: 10.52468/2542-1514.2023.7(1).15-24. (In Russ.).