



PAPER ID: 10A16J



PHILOSOPHY-BASED SCIENTIFIC ORIGINS OF MANAGEMENT THEORY AND PRACTICE

Rezida M. Nigomatullina^{a*}, Iskander F. Fakhriddinov^b

^a Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, RUSSIA.

^b Institute of International Relations, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, RUSSIA.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 29 May 2019
Received in revised form 14
August 2019
Accepted 06 September 2019
Available online 19 September
2019

Keywords:

Instrumental rationality;
Rational management;
Managerial rationality;
Technical rationality;
Value rationality;
Russian science;
Know-how; Philosophy
of economics.

ABSTRACT

The article analyzes two management paradigms, distinguished by the place that is assigned to it in the social system. Management can be seen as a superstructure, secondary process and as a basic process, which is the cause of social change. It is shown that in the first case, management is taken into account only as an external factor in relation to everyday economic, political, cultural interactions, and therefore its potential for social changes is often underestimated. This is also characteristic of Russian science. In the second case, management is considered as a basic process that assimilates cultural and value models of social development, and therefore it should be studied in the broad context of symbolic-semantic forms. They considered the features of normative and value rationality application to both paradigms.

© 2019 INT TRANS J ENG MANAG SCI TECH.

1. INTRODUCTION

Our task is to analyze the production and reproduction of various rationalistic mechanisms in such an area as management. The possibility of separating the problems of managerial rationality into a separate group is dictated by the special status of managerial activity in society. In the modern world, the organization of social order, the regulation of social interactions and the control of all these processes is of paramount importance. The management philosophy has a rather short history as compared to the philosophy of politics or the philosophy of economics. It begins with the scientific management of the 1920s, but today there is a need not only to develop rational management theories but to problematize the general scientific foundations of management theory and practice.

Theories are often treated as synonymous with an explanation. This is where the trouble starts in theory-practice debates. The trouble comes because, depending on how you portray explanation, you make it easier or harder to link explaining with acting. Traditionally, an explanation is viewed as a

generalization that offers reasons for or causes of an event, and thereby simplifies the context of the event. Explanations are a form of knowledge that essentially asserts that certain things follow from other things. They constitute knowledge that interconnections exist, but no knowledge of how to make those connections happen. A deeper understanding of theory and explanation is made possible by Fritz Roethlisberger's (1977) reflections on a lifetime of research on the action. He found that theorizing and abstract systems tended to be associated with a completely different mindset called simply 'B relations' than was true for action and concrete systems called 'A relations'.

Understanding, the third key term in theory-practice debates, is about know-how rather than the know-that of explanation. Thus, understanding is to practice as an explanation is to theory. To understand is to make sense of, to be conversant with, to apprehend, and to know thoroughly by close contact and long experience. Understanding is developed gradually rather than imparted suddenly. Understanding is as much about particulars as an explanation is about generalities. Understanding tends to come in wholes and patterns whereas explanation tends to come in parts and assemblies. This all seems quite tidy until you recall Kierkegaard's statement that stated 'It is perfectly true, as philosophers say, that life must be understood backward. But they forget the other proposition, that it must be lived forwards' (Gardiner 1988: 90). If he had said life is explained backward and understood forward, then this would have been consistent with the alignments of terminology already proposed. But he did not. If we stick with Kierkegaard's idea that life can be understood backward, then this means that it is possible for theorists to apprehend phenomena intimately and encode what they learn into know-how. And if they can do that, then there would be no theory-practice disjunction. But there also might be no theory as we traditionally envision that tool (Freeman 2000). For the moment, it is sufficient to note that Kierkegaard keeps the term 'understanding' in play. His usage keeps understanding from becoming the sole possession of either theorists or practitioners. As we will see later, it is that very fluidity that may be crucial for improved dialogue on theory-practice issues.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

The general research method is the deconstruction of stereotypical approaches to established concepts in science, as well as a sociocultural approach that allows you to include management analysis in a wide context of scientific research.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Two main management paradigms can be distinguished, in social theory, differentiated by the place that is assigned to it in the social system.

3.1 CATEGORIES OF MANAGEMENT

Management can be seen as a superstructure, secondary process and can be considered as a basic process, which is the cause of social change. In the first case, management will be something external in relation to everyday interactions that make up the essence of political, economic, and cultural processes. With this approach, it is believed that does not matter what to manage for the subject of management since the laws of managerial influences are universal. And here you can find the connection between the manager's activities and technical (instrumental) rationality. The technique and technology of raising funds to achieve management goals are necessary. Of course, the described approach becomes meaningless if the control subject, for example, transfers the methods of work in

the army to control culture. But this fact can also testify to misunderstanding and unprofessional use of certain management methods by a manager. The researcher who studied management in the framework of this paradigm was, for example, the American sociologist and economist G. Braverman (1922-1976). He represented management as a control process that leads to the exclusion of workers from management processes in such a way that their work is reduced to routine operations, knowledge and complex skills are unnecessary, as the conceptualization of labor and reflection are monopolized by managers. This thesis is called the “thesis of disqualification” and shows the negative attitude to scientific management by Braverman, primarily to the theory of administrative management by F. Taylor. Capitalist reality during the middle of the twentieth century provided G. Braverman with the material demonstrating the technical, instrumental role of administrator-managers in the growth of capital, which had its own economic logic. Braverman's scientific position is similar to the Marxist view of society, where labor analysis is carried out by philosophical and economic methods that practically do not include the managerial component, the system of interactions to achieve common goals, as if such goals could not be based on economic laws.

3.2 RATIONALITY

That is, we see that the actions of managers are dictated by certain technical rationality, but the problem is that this rationality has its origins and definitely complex nature, which, in our opinion, is poorly understood by management theorists and practitioners. And first of all, it is important to consider that the sources of any type of rationality are the reflection, which has its own structure and its own normativity. It is designed to problematize the relationship of its ideal designs to the world. But within the framework of technical rationality, “reflexive control shifts ... from the initial contours of the paradigm to the space of activity outlined by them.” The subject of control is the technique of action, the effectiveness of goal achievement in a given goal-setting system, a sequence of steps to solve the problem, etc. This is the essence of “formal rationality” (M. Weber)” (Porus, 1995).

It should be borne in mind that technical (instrumental) rationality is formed as a type of modern human activity acquiring individualized features, which entails a number of consequences that are understandable only in cultural-historical reconstruction. Due to this, it seems to us that the second paradigm is still more general and more adequate. In this case, management is seen as a basic or crosscutting process for all social structures. Society and its structure cannot be adequately described if the management sphere is not conceptually integrated as a basic process that has socio-cultural characteristics in each society and is a cultural mechanism for a certain social order development. In this case, it becomes important to include in the description of managerial rationality not only technical standards but also the values produced by the culture and which determine the formal or instrumental parameters. So, often goals have a value origin, and they, in turn, determine the corresponding technical characteristics of the activity. Can such rationality be called value-based as opposed to instrumental/technical? In the cultural-centric paradigm that we use, there is the Weberian concept of value rationality, but it is called to designate the rationality of traditional society as opposed to a modern, modernized one, where purposefulness is dominant. And in fact, Weber actually has instrumental/technical rationality. It is intended to explain the formation of modern society as a “world of magic”, where the main thing is a rationalistic or bureaucratic process, which is

the same for the great German theoretician. Therefore, it is natural to consider that management as a bureaucratic activity is basic in modern society.

Note that M. Weber does not particularly distinguish between goal-oriented and value-rational concepts and rules, since in both cases the researcher (observer) is focused on objective standards of values, and for the action of participants they have subjective grounds (Schlüchter, 2004). The very concept of value by Weber does not have any absolute, supra historical character, and this subsequently allowed T. Parsons to identify such concepts as “norm” and “value”. Normativity as objectivity given through subjectivity, or rather through inter-subjectivity, is the essence of rationality in M. Weber's sociology.

Understanding of rationality, first of all, as normative or technical, is important, since it “connects” various spheres of public life: economic, political, managerial, etc. On the one hand, this helps to understand the logic of management systems and processes through economic and political concepts. Turning to the history of the issue, we see that almost everything that modern management theory relates to explaining its foundations was developed in the philosophy of politics or the philosophy of economics. For example, according to the apt expression of the Nobel laureate Herbert Simon, the main exported product of the economy in its trade with other social sciences is the theory of maximizing rationality (Simon, 1978). Politics has the basic concepts of justice in its arsenal that are used by management, in particular, the theory of justice by Rawls. The theory of consistent preferences for goal achievement, which is used for the practice of reconciling interests in management, can also be called very valuable. The concepts of an economic person, an invisible hand of the market, an isolated individual as a market agent, acting rationally, the theory of public choice are associated with a more general theory of utilitarianism and, as a result, the work on management theory and related technical rationality.

We see that the rationality of management is included in the general rationalistic paradigm of other social sciences, it depends on it, but nevertheless, many researchers refuse the theory and practice of management to produce cultural value model independently.

Thus, K. Mannheim claims that politics is involved in the transfer from irrational to rational, while management activity is carried out within the boundaries of a rationalized structure, a ready language and a predefined perception of objects (Chernova, 2014). A. Badiou in his work “Apostle Paul. The rationale for universalism” denies the potential of the search for truth to the sphere of government and renders the following verdict: “So the modern world is doubly hostile to the process of truth. The symptom of this hostility is manifested, in particular, by the substitution of names: where the name of the procedure of truth should have stood, another appears, substituting the first one. The name “culture” will erase “art”. The word "technology" crosses out the word "science." The word “management” is substituted by the word “politics”. The word "sexuality" replaces "love". The system "culture-technology-management-sexuality" corresponds to the market quite properly, and all these terms are included in the heading "advertising"; this system has replaced another - “art-science-politics-love”, which typologically identifies the procedures of truth” (Badiou, 2019).

Even with the example of these authors, we see that the management sphere is predominantly represented as already rationalized, and the parameters of a specific type of rationality (goals, methods, habitual types of behavior, worldviews) are set from the outside: politically or economically. We partly agree with this position, therefore, research should inevitably touch upon

those areas from which managerial rationality draws its content, gets it in a settled, familiar form.

However, difficulties arise when we turn to the Russian material of the social sciences and to the practice of domestic governance. It should be said that, after inheriting the Marxist tradition, the Soviet social scientists for the most part also did not single out management as an independent factor of social changes, however, one could note the constantly present critical attitude towards the absolutization of technical, normative rationality by Western science. The feature of theoretical constructions in the social sciences is the desire to introduce value rationality, in which the norm plays a subordinate role in relation to value, the norm is a "reference to the value "standing" behind it and "expressed" in it, designed to become the central concept that explains these or those cultural forms. In the scientific discourse, the introduction of the concept of "value" thus understood is connected with the desire of researchers to take into account the cultural complexity and the symbolic content of social interactions. Thus, the problematic situation that has developed in science, and first of all, in domestic theoretical sociology in the 70-80s of the last century, is indicative. It concerned the clarification of the conditions for rationality theory acceptance in Western science, since Soviet sociologists working with the level of society as a whole (societal, institutional) developed the understanding of the impossibility of directly assimilation of the methodology by T. Parsons, M. Weber, and others during the study of modern rationalized societies (Gudkov, 2007).

How can values, including moral ones, be included and designated in managerial technical instrumental rationality? It seems to us that the answer to this question also determines the solution to such a problem as the conceptualization of communication or the unity of rationality and morality in management.

There are at least two deep reasons for the criticism undertaken, each of which requires a special, detailed analysis, which we also need to achieve the goals of this dissertation research.

The first reason concerns the difference in the levels of social and civilizational development of modernized and traditional societies. For example, the Parson paradigm of society as a system, popular in academic circles, is a model of a developed modern society where modernization is completed, while Soviet society of the second half of the 20th century, and, unfortunately, Russia of the beginning of the 21st century, are still formations with delayed, catching up modernization, even if the nature of modernization in the XXth and XXIst century is different. The tradition to be overcome was characterized by the famous researcher of modernization processes in Russia V.G. Fedotov: "dependence in the organization of social life on religious or mythological representations, personality; cyclical development; the collectivist nature of society and the lack of a distinguished personality; predominant orientation on metaphysical rather than instrumental values; authoritarian nature of power; lack of delayed demand" (Fedotova, 1995). In modern Western societies, rationalistic systems or institutions have been formed that allow them to develop dynamically, constantly producing innovations, complications, and differentiation of the structural elements of the social system.

Without doubting the course of our country on modernization, many researchers are nevertheless in search of building a "special" type of rationality, which would include metaphysical values, and, above all, moral. And this is the second reason for the critical attitude towards Western theories that social systems supposedly see-through "flat" rationalism or utilitarianism (Gudkov, 2007). In practice, in sociological works we see a widespread circulation of "value-normative orientations"

concept, which leads to the non-distinction of value and instrumental (normative) rationality, and, thus, to inadequate assessment of the goals, means and results of management activities for society modernization. The concept of value is included in the scientific revolution as a key concept designed to show the degree of modernization of the country.

4. CONCLUDING REMARK

Management is the basic mechanism, the process of regulation and organization of activities in any public sphere, whether it be a family or a state. The "cross-cutting" nature of managerial relations brings it close to such important and ubiquitous relations as politics and economics. Management, political, economic - these are the areas through which real social entities are explained and interpreted. In practice, these three areas may not differ, replace one another, condition one another: politics can replace management and the economy, the economy can dictate its rationality to politics, and management as the practice of economic and political task implementation can significantly modify the political and economic landscape of society.

5. DATA AVAILABILITY AND MATERIAL

All studied information is already included in this study.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University. Russian Federal grant is acknowledged.

7. REFERENCES

- Badiou, A. (2019). The Apostle Paul. The rationale for universalism. <https://predanie.ru/book/209540-apostol-pavel-obosnovanie-universalizma/> Reference date: July 22.
- Chernova, E. (2014). Sociological study of political thinking in situations of territorial planning. *Sociology of power*, 4, 58-78.
- Fedotova, V. G. (1995). Rationality as a premise and content of society modernization. Historical types of rationality Ed. in charge V.A. Lektorsky - V.1 - M., 350 p.
- Gudkov L. D. (2007). Problems of sociology by Yuri Levada. *World of Russia*, 17(3), 3-36. Extracted from <https://mirros.hse.ru/article/view/5141>
- Porus, V. N. (1995). Participation in discussions. Historical types of rationality. Ed. in charge V.A. Lektorsky. - M., 350 p.
- Schlüchter, V. (2004). Action, order and culture: the main features of the Weberian research program. *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*, 7(2), 22-48.
- Simon, H. A. (1978). Rationality as process and as product of thought. *The American economic review*, 68(2), 1-16.



Dr. Rezida M. Nigmatullina is an Associate Professor at Department of General Philosophy and Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, Kazan Federal University (KFU), Kazan, Russia. She got her PhD in Philosophy from Department of History, Scientific Communism, Kazan State University. Her research includes Social Philosophy, Cultural and Historical Integrity, and Managerial Philosophy.



Iskander F. Fakhritdinov is an Associate Professor and Chair of European Languages and Cultures, Institute of International Relations, Kazan Federal University (Kazan, Russia). He is a Candidate of Philology. His research includes Philosophy and Culture of Modern Society.