

# A Study on the Impact of Corporate Culture Innovation on Enterprise Management Innovation

Li Haobei

Taiyuan University, Taiyuan Shanxi, 030000;

**Abstract :** In the contemporary business landscape characterized by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA), innovation stands as the paramount imperative for enterprises seeking sustainable competitive advantage. While technological and product innovations receive significant attention, the profound influence of Corporate Culture Innovation (CCI) on Enterprise Management Innovation (EMI) remains a critical yet underexplored domain in theoretical discourse. This paper posits that CCI is not merely a supportive element but the fundamental precursor and deep-seated driver of substantive and sustainable EMI. Through a comprehensive theoretical analysis, this study constructs a holistic framework to elucidate the intrinsic relationship between these two constructs. It systematically investigates the core mechanisms—namely value system reshaping, innovation climate cultivation, organizational learning facilitation, and organizational change capability enhancement—through which deliberate changes in an organization’s core cultural assumptions enable and catalyze innovations in its management practices, structures, and processes. Furthermore, contextualized within the digital-intelligent era, the paper theorizes the evolutionary trajectories of corporate culture towards entrepreneurial, symbiotic, and socially spillover-oriented paradigms, analyzing their concomitant implications for expanding the scope and nature of EMI. The research concludes that the proactive, strategic, and systemic shaping of an innovation-oriented culture, meticulously aligned with organizational strategy, is a non-negotiable prerequisite for achieving transformative management renewal. This study contributes to organizational theory by providing an integrated theoretical model that links the “soft” power of culture with the “hard” outcomes of management systems, offering a robust framework for future research and actionable insights for strategic leadership in navigating complex organizational change.

**Keywords:** Corporate Culture Innovation; Enterprise Management Innovation; Impact Mechanism; Organizational Learning; Organizational Change; Digital-Intelligent Era

**DOI:** 10.69979/3041-0843.26.01.001

## 1 Introduction

The 21st-century global economic environment is in a state of perpetual flux, driven by accelerating technological disruption, shifting geopolitical forces, evolving stakeholder expectations, and the relentless pressure for adaptability. In this context, the ability to innovate has transcended its status as a competitive advantage to become a fundamental necessity for organizational survival and relevance. While innovation has traditionally been associated with technological breakthroughs and novel product development, scholars and practitioners increasingly recognize that the most significant and enduring sources of competitive differentiation may lie within the domain of management itself. Enterprise Management Innovation (EMI), defined as the invention and implementation of new management practices, processes, structures, or techniques that fundamentally alter how managerial work is performed, is thus critical for enhancing efficiency, strategic agility, and value creation (Hamel, 2006, pp.72-74). The significance of EMI lies in its potential to reconfigure an organization's fundamental operating logic, thereby creating new combinations of resources and capabilities that are difficult for competitors to replicate.

However, the path to successful EMI is fraught with challenges. A substantial body of evidence suggests that many management innovation initiatives fail to realize their intended benefits, often regressing to previous states or degenerating into superficial, symbolic gestures. A primary reason for this high failure rate is the neglect of the organization’s ingrained cultural context. Corporate culture, understood as the deep-seated pattern of shared assumptions, values, beliefs, and norms that govern behavior within an organization, acts as the organization’s “psychological immune system” and “operating software” (Schein, 2010, p.3). It creates an implicit framework that determines what is perceived as legitimate, desirable, and possible. Consequently, any management innovation that is incongruent with the prevailing cultural code risks being rejected, subverted, or rendered inert. This resistance stems not from ill will, but from a fundamental cognitive and behavioral misalignment; the new practices simply do not make sense within the existing cultural worldview.

This observation leads to the central thesis of this paper: Corporate Culture Innovation (CCI)—the purposeful transformation of an organization’s core cultural elements—is a critical antecedent and enabling force for effective and enduring Enterprise Management Innovation. EMI cannot be successfully grafted onto an unchanged cultural substrate; rather, it must be organically cultivated from within a reconfigured cultural ecology. The core research question addressed herein is: Through what theoretical mechanisms does CCI systematically influence and drive EMI? The objective is to develop a comprehensive, multi-layered theoretical framework that moves beyond descriptive correlation to propose a causal chain of influence. By dissecting these mechanisms and situating them within the transformative context of the digital-intelligent era, this study aims to enrich theoretical understanding of organizational innovation dynamics and provide a coherent conceptual map for leaders seeking to orchestrate holistic organizational transformation. This paper adopts a deductive, theory-building approach, synthesizing concepts from organizational behavior, strategic management, and innovation studies to construct its arguments.

## 2 Theoretical Foundations: Defining Core Constructs

### 2.1 The Multifaceted Nature of Corporate Culture and Its Innovation

Corporate culture is a complex, layered, and socially constructed phenomenon. Drawing on Schein’s (2010, pp.23-30) seminal model,

culture can be analytically decomposed into three interrelated levels: (1) Artifacts (visible, tangible structures, processes, and observed behaviors), (2) Espoused Values (stated strategies, goals, philosophies, and rationalizations), and (3) Basic Underlying Assumptions (unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs and perceptions about reality, human nature, activity, and relationships). The deepest level—basic assumptions—is the most resilient and influential, as it operates unconsciously to define an organization's view of itself and its environment, guiding thought and action automatically. These assumptions are often non-negotiable and treated as self-evident truths within the cultural group. For instance, a deeply held assumption might be that "the market is inherently adversarial" or that "seniority is the primary basis for authority."

Corporate Culture Innovation, therefore, is a profound, deliberate, and often disruptive process that targets these basic underlying assumptions. It is not about changing superficial artifacts like office layouts or corporate slogans, nor is it solely about proclaiming new values on a website. True CCI involves a challenging sociopsychological process of "unfreezing" deep-seated beliefs, critically examining their relevance in a changing context, and "refreezing" new, more adaptive assumptions through consistent leadership action and systemic reinforcement (Cameron & Quinn, 2011, pp.38-40). This might entail shifting from an assumption that stability and control are paramount to one that adaptability and empowerment are essential; from believing that success stems from internal competition and individual heroism to valuing collaboration, collective genius, and systemic thinking; or from a purely shareholder-centric worldview to a multi-stakeholder-inclusive perspective that balances financial, social, and environmental outcomes. Successful CCI realigns the deepest, often invisible, layers of organizational psychology with strategic imperatives, thereby unlocking new potential for action and enabling a fundamental shift in what the organization is capable of achieving. It is a process of collective sense-making and identity reformation.

## 2.2 The Scope and Essence of Enterprise Management Innovation

Enterprise Management Innovation refers to marked departures from traditional management principles and practices that significantly alter how managerial work is conceived, organized, and executed to advance organizational goals (Hamel, 2006, p.75). It is distinct from, though deeply complementary to, technological or product innovation. While the latter focuses on what is produced or how it functions, EMI focuses on the how of organizing, directing, coordinating, and motivating the human and material resources that enable production and value delivery. Its manifestations span several key dimensions of the management apparatus:

**Strategic and Business Model Innovation:** Novel approaches to strategy formulation, value proposition design, revenue model architecture, and competitive positioning logic.

**Organizational Architecture Innovation:** Fundamental changes in organizational structure (e.g., network, platform, holacratic, or ecosystem models), governance mechanisms, accountability systems, and the formal division of labor.

**Process and Operational Innovation:** Breakthroughs in core workflows, decision-making protocols, problem-solving methodologies (e.g., design thinking, agile sprints, lean management), and end-to-end value delivery processes.

**Human Resource and Leadership Innovation:** New paradigms in talent acquisition and development, performance evaluation, motivation and reward systems, and leadership styles (e.g., servant, distributive, empowering, or adaptive leadership).

**Administrative System Innovation:** Innovations in planning cycles, control mechanisms, performance measurement dashboards, and management information systems that underpin the managerial infrastructure.

The ultimate objective of EMI is to dismantle organizational path dependencies and core rigidities—the ingrained ways of working that become liabilities in a new environment. By doing so, EMI aims to construct and enhance dynamic capabilities that enable the enterprise to continuously sense market opportunities and threats, seize them through timely resource commitment, and reconfigure its asset base and routines to maintain evolutionary fitness (Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997, p.516). Thus, EMI is not just about efficiency; it is about building a capacity for strategic renewal.

## 3 The Core Theoretical Mechanisms: Linking Culture Innovation to Management Innovation

The relationship between CCI and EMI is not simple or direct but is mediated and moderated by several critical organizational processes and states. This section proposes an integrative theoretical framework centered on four core mechanisms that constitute the essential transmission belt through which cultural change enables and amplifies management innovation. These mechanisms operate at both individual and collective levels, bridging the gap between shared beliefs and concrete practices.

### 3.1 The Value Reshaping Mechanism: Establishing Legitimacy and Strategic Coherence

At its essence, culture is a system of values—enduring beliefs about what is good, right, and desirable. These values serve as a collective moral and strategic compass. CCI involves the intentional introduction, reinforcement, and eventual institutionalization of new core values—such as "radical customer centricity," "extreme ownership," "collaborative genius," "transparent experimentation," or "sustainable value creation." This process of value reshaping operates as a primary mechanism for EMI in two crucial, interrelated ways:

**Conferring Legitimacy and Reducing Resistance:** New management practices often disrupt established routines, challenge vested interests, and violate implicit rules of conduct, thereby encountering natural political and psychological resistance. When a proposed EMI (e.g., abolishing annual budgets for rolling forecasts, implementing a peer-review-based compensation system, or dissolving functional silos) is explicitly and authentically linked to a newly embraced, salient core value (e.g., "agility," "meritocracy and fairness," "collaboration"), it gains normative legitimacy. It transitions from being perceived as an arbitrary, top-down imposition or a politically motivated change to being understood as a necessary and logical enactment of "who we are now" and "what we collectively stand for." This legitimacy is vital for securing genuine buy-in, reducing defensive routines, and neutralizing political opposition, as individuals are more likely to accept changes that align with a collectively endorsed higher purpose (Yang & Ma, 2025, p.8).

**Guiding Strategic Alignment and Decision Filters:** Values act as heuristic decision filters for individuals at all levels. A deeply held and consistently rewarded value like "data-driven insight over hierarchical intuition" will naturally and automatically channel EMI efforts and

resource allocation. It will lead to investments in analytics infrastructure, training programs to foster data literacy, and the redesign of meeting cultures to privilege empirical evidence and reasoned debate over seniority and rhetoric. Thus, a consciously reshaped value system provides a coherent strategic compass, ensuring that various, potentially disparate management innovations do not pull the organization in contradictory directions but instead converge into a synergistic, self-reinforcing system aligned with the organization's renewed strategic intent and identity.

### 3.2 The Innovation Climate Cultivation Mechanism: Lowering Social-Psychological Barriers

Management innovation inherently involves experimentation, venturing into the unknown, challenging sacred cows, and proposing ideas that may initially seem heretical. All of these actions carry perceived personal and professional risks: the risk of failure, social embarrassment, loss of status, or being labeled a troublemaker. An organization's climate—the shared perceptions of the practices, policies, procedures, and rewards that shape daily behavior—is the tangible, felt expression of its deeper culture. CCI that successfully fosters an innovation climate is characterized by high psychological safety, a constructive tolerance for intelligent failure, openness to diverse and dissenting ideas, and a dominant focus on learning and improvement rather than on assigning blame and protecting turf (Edmondson, 2018, pp.12-15).

**Psychological Safety as the Foundational Enabler:** When CCI promotes the shared belief that taking calculated risks and experiencing well-intentioned failure is not only acceptable but is a valued source of organizational learning, individuals and teams feel safe to voice half-formed ideas, propose unconventional solutions, experiment with new management tools, and openly critique existing processes without fear of humiliation or retribution. This psychological safety is the critical antidote to the “not invented here” syndrome, fear of reprisal, groupthink, and passive compliance—all of which are potent inhibitors of innovation. In a safe climate, the cost of proposing a new management idea is lowered, thereby increasing the volume and diversity of innovative inputs.

**Enhanced Cross-Boundary Idea Flow:** A climate nurtured by cultural values of respect, intellectual humility, inclusivity, and constructive debate facilitates the cross-pollination of ideas across departmental, hierarchical, and even organizational boundaries. This is essential for breakthrough EMI, as transformative management solutions often emerge at the intersection of diverse perspectives, knowledge domains, and lived experiences. For example, a logistical insight from a warehouse employee might inspire a novel inventory management algorithm (process innovation), while a perspective from a financial analyst collaborating with an HR business partner might lead to an innovative, predictive talent risk-sharing model (HR/process innovation). The climate determines whether these connections are made or whether ideas remain trapped in silos.

### 3.3 The Organizational Learning Mediation Mechanism: Generating and Institutionalizing Novel Knowledge

Organizational learning—the collective capacity to create, acquire, interpret, transfer, and integrate knowledge, and to modify organizational behavior to reflect new knowledge and insights—is the vital engine that translates a cultural predisposition for innovation into tangible innovative capability. CCI directed towards fostering a learning culture (one that prizes curiosity, critical reflection, knowledge sharing, fast feedback loops, and adaptation) directly fuels EMI through two key, sequential sub-processes:

**Knowledge Creation for Innovation:** EMI requires novel solutions to complex, often wicked, management problems. A genuine learning culture encourages systematic reflection on both successes and failures (conducting “post-mortems” and “pre-mortems”), promotes disciplined experimentation through pilots and prototypes, and facilitates active environmental scanning for best practices and disruptive threats. This continuous, disciplined cycle of exploration (searching for new possibilities and questioning current paradigms) and exploitation (efficiently refining and implementing existing competencies)—a state known as organizational ambidexterity—is the primary generator of the new knowledge, insights, and actionable prototypes necessary for management innovation (O’ Reilly & Tushman, 2013, p.326). Without this learning engine, EMI efforts are based on guesswork and imitation rather than on situated, evidence-based insight.

**Knowledge Diffusion and Institutionalization:** For an EMI to move beyond a pilot project and become an entrenched, sustainable organizational capability, the underlying knowledge, new routines, and revised mental models must spread virally and become embedded in the organization's daily life, its systems, and its stories. A culture that encourages mentorship, cross-functional communities of practice, after-action reviews, storytelling of successful (and failed) experiments, and open documentation of processes accelerates this critical diffusion process. The classic exemplar is Toyota's pervasive culture of kaizen (continuous improvement) and hansei (deep reflection), which systematically generates, shares, and hardwires management innovations (like the kanban pull system or the andon cord) into the fabric of the global organization, turning local discoveries into global standards and common sense.

## 4 Pathways and Synergies: Corporate Culture Innovation in the Digital-Intelligent Era

The pervasive and accelerating integration of digital technologies—Artificial Intelligence, Internet of Things, big data analytics, blockchain, cloud computing—is not merely a technological shift but a paradigm-level force that is fundamentally reshaping the logic of competition, value creation, organizational design, and the very nature of work. This new context, termed the digital-intelligent era, demands specific, coherent, and interdependent directions for CCI, which in turn redefine the frontiers, substance, and urgency of EMI. These directions are not mutually exclusive but form a synergistic, self-reinforcing system that addresses the multi-faceted challenges of the modern business ecosystem.

### 4.1 From Execution to Entrepreneurship: Distributing Agency and Confronting the Control Paradox

The industrial paradigm was underpinned by a culture of reliable, efficient, and standardized execution within clear, stable hierarchies—an “Execution-Oriented Culture” that prized predictability, control, and specialization. The digital-intelligent era, with its premium on speed, hyper-personalized customer intimacy, rapid experimentation, and innovation at the edges of the organization where information is freshest, necessitates a fundamental shift to an Entrepreneurial Culture. This involves instilling an owner's mindset (treating resources as one's own), accountability for outcomes (not just activities), comfort with ambiguity and emergent strategy, and a bias for action and experimentation at

all organizational levels. It is about creating a nation of intrapreneurs.

**EMI Implications:** This cultural shift is the primary driver of radical EMI in organizational architecture and governance. It fuels the deliberate proliferation of decentralized, cell-based, agile, or “team of teams” structures (e.g., Haier’s Rendanheyi micro-enterprises, Spotify’s squad/guild/tribe model). Corresponding management innovations involve designing sophisticated platform-based support systems (shared data services, AI capability hubs, legal and financial platforms) that empower and enable these autonomous units rather than seeking to control them. Leadership models must evolve from command-and-control to context-setting, coaching, removing impediments, and providing strategic guardrails. Incentive systems require complete reinvention to directly reward value creation, outcome sharing, and customer impact (e.g., project-based profit sharing, internal venture capital funds, equity-like instruments for teams) rather than rewarding positional authority, tenure, or adherence to bureaucratic procedure.

**Theoretical Challenge – The Control Paradox:** The core theoretical and practical challenge in this transition lies in resolving the “Control Paradox” : how to balance radical autonomy and speed with overall strategic coherence, resource optimization, and risk management. Excessive decentralization can lead to strategic fragmentation, duplication of efforts, internal market failures, and a loss of scale advantages. Theoretical insights from complexity leadership theory, evolutionary economics, and viable system models suggest that effective EMI in this context involves designing “minimal specifications” or “simple rules” that define only the essential strategic boundaries, core principles, and non-negotiable values, while granting maximum freedom and authority within those wide constraints. The primary management innovation task thus becomes one of meta-governance or organizational architecture—designing and curating the systems, platforms, and cultural context that enable productive self-organization, rather than trying to design the organization itself in detail.

## 4.2 From Competition to Symbiosis: Governing Ecosystems and the Trust Imperative

While traditional competitive dynamics certainly persist, the densely interconnected, platform-driven nature of the digital economy elevates the strategic necessity of collaboration across traditional firm boundaries. Success increasingly depends on the health and vitality of one’s business ecosystem. A Symbiotic or Ecosystem Culture therefore emphasizes co-creation, partnership, mutual success, and long-term relationship building with a broad network of actors: lead users, suppliers, technology complementors, research institutions, startups, and even competitors in “cooperation” relationships. It shifts the mental model from a firm-centric “fortress” to a network-centric “node.”

**EMI Implications:** This cultural evolution dramatically expands the scope and complexity of EMI beyond the firm’s legal boundaries. The primary focus of management innovation becomes ecosystem governance and orchestration: designing the formal and informal rules, roles, rights, protocols, and standards that facilitate value co-creation and fair distribution across a network of legally independent but economically interdependent entities. This includes innovating dynamic partnership contracts, establishing secure and equitable data-sharing agreements and API economies, building digital reputation and trust scoring systems, and creating transparent, algorithmic value-sharing mechanisms (e.g., revenue-sharing models on platforms). Entirely new management roles emerge, such as ecosystem orchestrators, platform managers, or partnership architects. Consequently, strategy formulation itself transforms from a planning exercise for a single entity into a continuous process of ecosystem positioning, platform architectural design, community cultivation, and governance evolution.

**Theoretical Challenge – The Trust Imperative:** The fundamental barrier to effective symbiosis is a lack of trust, exacerbated by information asymmetry, fears of opportunism, and intellectual property concerns. Theoretical perspectives from relational contracting, institutional theory, and social network analysis inform the necessary EMI. Innovations may include the use of blockchain and smart contracts for transparent, immutable, and self-executing transaction records; the design of hybrid governance structures that blend market, hierarchy, and community mechanisms to align long-term incentives; and the active cultivation of shared identities, norms, and “ecosystem citizenship” behaviors among partners. Crucially, management control systems must learn to measure and manage “network health,” “partner success and satisfaction,” and “ecosystem innovation vitality” as key leading indicators of the firm’s own sustainable performance.

## 4.3 From Internal Focus to Social Spillover: Integrating Purpose and Performance Measurement

Digital connectivity and social media have intensified societal scrutiny, stakeholder activism, and employee demand for meaningful work. In this environment, a culture with a Social Spillover Orientation internalizes the creation of positive social and environmental impact as a core driver of innovation, talent attraction, brand legitimacy, and long-term value creation. It moves beyond treating Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as a peripheral, philanthropic, or reputational function and integrates it into the core value creation logic. Purpose and profit become intertwined.

**EMI Implications:** This cultural direction demands profound and sophisticated EMI in performance measurement, integrated reporting, incentive design, and strategic decision-making frameworks. It necessitates the deep integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) criteria into the very core of strategic planning, capital allocation committees, product lifecycle management, supply chain oversight, and risk management protocols. Management innovation involves developing and adopting new accounting and measurement tools, such as social return on investment (SROI) analysis, integrated reporting frameworks (e.g., following the International Integrated Reporting Council <IR> standards), and experimentally, impact-weighted financial accounts. It drives business model innovation towards circular economy principles (designing out waste), inclusive design (serving marginalized communities), and base-of-the-pyramid markets, which in turn require concomitant innovations in R&D processes, marketing strategies, and reverse logistics management.

**Theoretical Challenge – The Valuation and Temporality Dilemma:** A core theoretical and practical challenge is the “dual dilemma.” First, the valuation dilemma: social and environmental value is notoriously difficult to quantify, monetize, and compare with financial metrics, making integrated trade-off decisions complex. Second, the temporality dilemma: the benefits of social spillover often manifest over a longer time horizon, conflicting with intense capital market pressures for short-term financial returns. Stewardship theory and stakeholder theory provide a normative foundation for addressing these. EMI responses include innovations in governance structures (e.g., appointing dedicated ESG-focused directors to boards, creating stakeholder advisory panels), developing “patient capital” financing models and engaging with long-term-oriented investors, and, crucially, crafting compelling strategic narratives that articulate how social purpose mitigates systemic risk,

unlocks new markets, drives operational efficiencies (e.g., through energy savings), enhances brand equity and customer loyalty, and is therefore intrinsic to long-term financial resilience. The management innovation lies in creating closed-loop feedback systems that connect social impact metrics to strategic learning, adaptation, and executive compensation.

## 5 Conclusion

This theoretical exploration has established that Corporate Culture Innovation and Enterprise Management Innovation are inextricably linked in a dynamic, causal, and recursive relationship. CCI is not a vague, supportive “soft” factor to be considered after the “hard” systems are designed, but a strategic intervention in the organization’s deepest operating system. It operates through concrete, identifiable, and manageable mechanisms—value reshaping, climate cultivation, learning mediation, and change capability enhancement—to create the necessary cognitive, social, motivational, and behavioral conditions for EMI to emerge, take root, flourish, and become self-sustaining. The proposed integrated framework advances organizational and innovation theory by providing a more granular, process-oriented, and mechanistic understanding of how the often-opaque and abstract concept of culture tangibly influences the practical domain of management systems, structures, and processes. It moves the discourse from “culture matters” to “how and why culture matters specifically for management innovation.”

The digital-intelligent era adds further theoretical richness and specificity to this framework. It specifies the dominant directional vectors of necessary CCI (towards entrepreneurial, symbiotic, and spillover orientations) and theoretically illustrates how these vectors interact to redefine the very problems EMI must solve—shifting the focus from internal coordination and control to ecosystem orchestration, platform governance, and integrated multi-capital measurement. This underscores the critically contingent nature of the CCI-EMI link; the most effective pathways for culture-driven management innovation are context-dependent, being shaped by overarching technological, economic, and socio-political imperatives.

For practitioners and leaders, the primary theoretical implication is the imperative of strategic cultural intentionality. Leaders must approach organizational culture not as a static, inherited trait to be managed reactively or lamented, but as a dynamic, malleable, and potent strategic asset to be proactively diagnosed, shaped, and aligned with strategic vision. Management innovation efforts that are not preceded and accompanied by a deliberate, honest, and courageous process of cultural assessment and evolution are likely to be shallow and ephemeral. The four mechanisms outlined provide a pragmatic diagnostic and intervention checklist for leaders: Are the new values we proclaim being authentically lived and rewarded by leadership? Is psychological safety being actively nurtured in teams and meetings? Are our organizational learning processes generating relevant, actionable knowledge for new management approaches? Are we consciously investing in and strengthening our organizational change capacity?

Future theoretical and empirical research should build upon this framework in several promising directions. First, rigorous empirical studies, both quantitative (large-N surveys testing the structural model) and qualitative (in-depth case studies tracing the mechanisms over time), are needed to test, refine, and validate the proposed mechanisms, examining their relative strength, sequential relationships, and potential interactions in different organizational settings. Second, research should explore important contingency factors such as industry velocity (high-tech vs. utilities), organizational size and age, lifecycle stage (start-up vs. mature corporation), and national cultural context, which may significantly moderate the strength and expression of the CCI-EMI relationship. Third, the potential “dark side” or unintended consequences of aggressive, poorly managed CCI, such as cultural cynicism, employee anxiety and change fatigue, the emergence of coercive “cult-like” conformity, or the erosion of valuable traditional strengths, warrants careful theoretical and ethical investigation. Finally, longitudinal, process-oriented studies tracing the co-evolution of culture and management systems over extended periods—through successes and failures—would provide invaluable insights into the temporal dynamics, critical junctures, and sequencing of these complex, reciprocal changes.

In conclusion, navigating the profound uncertainties and opportunities of the modern business environment requires a dual mastery: the capacity for both deep Cultural Innovation and consequential Management Innovation. This paper has argued theoretically that the former is the vital, enabling, and often neglected foundation for the latter. Organizations that develop the metacapability for continuous cultural introspection, learning, and purposeful innovation will be best positioned to generate the transformative, context-aware management practices necessary to build resilient, adaptive, responsible, and ultimately meaningful enterprises for an increasingly complex future. The journey begins not with a new organizational chart, but with a courageous conversation about “who we are” and “who we need to become.”

## References

- [1] Anonymous. Research on the Influence of Corporate Culture on Organizational Management Innovation [D]. Southwestern University of Finance and Economics, 2021, pp. 1–80.
- [2] Anonymous. Analysis of the Mechanism of Corporate Culture's Effect on Management Innovation [J]. Modern Economic Information, 2018, (21): pp. 50–52.
- [3] Anonymous. Research on Corporate Culture Innovation in Enterprise Management [J]. Investment and Cooperation, 2022, (02): pp. 54–56.
- [4] Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture: Based on the Competing Values Framework [M]. 3rd ed. Jossey-Bass, 2011, pp. 16–45.
- [5] Edmondson, A. C. The Fearless Organization: Creating Psychological Safety in the Workplace for Learning, Innovation, and Growth [M]. Wiley, 2018, pp. 1–30.
- [6] Hamel, G. The Why, What, and How of Management Innovation [J]. Harvard Business Review, 2006, 84(2): pp. 72–84.
- [7] O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. Organizational Ambidexterity: Past, Present, and Future [J]. Academy of Management Perspectives, 2013, 27(4): pp. 324–338.
- [8] Schein, E. H. Organizational Culture and Leadership [M]. 4th ed. Jossey-Bass, 2010, pp. 1–40.