

Evolution of Management: From Classics of Modernity to Post-Nonclassical Paradigm

Rezida Maskhutovna Nigmatullina and Evgeniya Mikhailovna Nikolayeva

Kazan (Volga) Federal University, Kazan, Russia

Abstract: The article is devoted to the study of the evolution of management as a specific field of activity. It is shown that the crisis of modernity as a universal project has showed signs of failure of the classical paradigm of management, which is based on linear rationality and rigid subject-object dichotomy. Modern science has shaped the contours of a new paradigm of management based on theoretical and methodological arsenal of self-organization theory (synergetics). Pathos of new management style is how to awaken motion and to give impetus to evolution by small resonance effects and relevant internal organization of the system. In this context, there is a failure of coercive control model based on a strict *hierarchy* of subject-object relationship in favor of a model where subject and object of management are bound with the relationship of *assistance*.

Key words: Modern • Management • Crisis of modernity • Freedom of subjectivity • Instrumental rationality • Post-nonclassical management model • Self-organization • Structure-attractors.

INTRODUCTION

The overall objective of the study, where this article is written, is to develop ideas about the evolution of management as a specific field of activity and socio-cultural foundations of this evolution. Social management is always contextual in nature, it is historically and culturally mediated (occurring in specific historical and cultural conditions). The Russian society over several historical periods has been living in continuous modernization that is striving to become a modern society, including in the field of management. Under the Soviet (and later Russian) modernization there was a goal "catch up and overtake" the West as a model of high level of technological and social development of society. But what are the cultural meanings that the society has to learn at the same time? One way to reconstruct the origins of modernity is to refer to the modern era that opened the possibility of a continuous innovation and continuous crisis of social development.

But before you do, pay attention to the paradox of the situation - in today's post-nonclassical practices when new methodological approaches to management, focused on procedural, non-linearity and groundlessness of the social context have already manifested themselves, the Russian reformers often continue to use the methods and techniques of management, founded by the classics of modernism. "Post-nonclassical practice – is spontaneous

holistic pluricausal (and interdisciplinary) complexes of interacting people and environments during which self-development both people, environments and relationships change that creates the possibility of a huge variety of these practices, their cycles and options for their implementation and intensifies the management problem" [1, p. 54].

The consequence of this paradox is that in recognizing social reality the subject of social control uses the classic picture of the world as a "reflective area" [2], which inevitably leads to the removal of the most important sections of the reality beyond the observability and reflection. "For a long time there has been no constant created world existent in the only real universal reality, which knowledge was the original program of science and its still existing classical model. The new world opening to us exists in a variety of channels of reality. It turns out to be created and rapidly evolving. Evolution of the person includes the work of all new realities of human and society. To work with them the language means of their awareness are necessary. Modern technology of going out of the impasse of scientific knowledge are required. The use of such technology would solve the problems that can not be solved in a single channel of reality of current classic basic model" [2, p. 59]. So, let us turn to the era of Art Nouveau and the model of governance, which is formed under the influence of classical science.

The Main Part: The main principle of modernity named yet by Hegel is the *freedom of subjectivity*. Spiritual foundation of Western culture, according to M. Heidegger, is an individualistic worldview, overemphasizing the man as "a measure of all things" and his personal identity as the basis of truth, law and government. Individualism is fixed by law in the form of legal equality and autonomy of private citizens.

The principle of self-identity and liberty of the subject "explains both the superiority of the world of modernity and its crisis: the world is experiencing itself as both a world of progress and the world of alienated spirit," [3, p. 17]. The key to the progress of the new world was the process of scientific and technological rationalization. The culture of capitalist society is to a large extent related to the development of technology and the new opportunities created by it. But the technique gives a sample of rationality, which is reduced to an exact calculation and quantifiable technical parameters. This rationale was formed under the influence of natural and experimental methods of Western science.

Science and technology have become a model of *instrumental* rationality, without which not only the modernization of social labor is impossible, but the modernization of the social sphere as well. So, the realm of law and governance were subjected to rationalization. Modern capitalism, according to M. Weber, "needs the rationally designed law and management based on solid formal rules, without which opportunistic, speculative trading capitalism and politically driven capitalism of all kinds can not do, but not the rational private economic enterprise with its core capital and accurate calculation" [4, p. 53].

Such rationality is inherent in *bureaucracy* as a specific form of organization of modern society. A crucial role in the organization should be played by technicians who use scientific methods of work. The principles of operation of a bureaucratic organization are known: the strict separation of duties between the members of the organization, strict hierarchisation of government, formally established and well-fixed system of rules, impersonality of administration and emotional neutrality of relations.

Weber calls the described rationality *formal*, it has *instrumental* nature. The progress of such *instrumental* (formal) rationality is detrimental to the sphere of personal displays, sphere of communication and dialogue, when the human world becomes a world of alienated¹ spirit (Yu. Habermas).

Habermas attempts to understand the philosophical foundations of thought of the time, which demonstrates such a controversial impact on human. Scientific and philosophical foundations of modern philosophy is rationalism, which means, above all, the rule of reason in knowledge. What does this means for the semantic meaningfulness of the modern culture of modern society? Rational science disenchant nature and releases the knowing subject who is committed to absolute power. It is a self-sufficient and self-understanding mind. No external authority can become a law for it. It is its own identity and its own authority.

When Hegel characterizes the modern world, he explains subjectivity through the "freedom" and "reflection", "The greatness of our time is in recognition of freedom, property of the spirit, namely, the fact that it is in itself" [3, p. 17]. Yu. Habermas gives some connotations of Hegel's notion of "subjectivity": "a) *individualism*: in the world of modernity the identity, no matter how special it is, can qualify for recognition; b) *the right to criticize*: the principle of modernity requires that the validity of what must be accepted by everyone was evident for him; c) *the autonomy of action*: the time of modernity is inherent in us to take responsibility for what we do; d) finally, the very *idealistic philosophy* - Hegel regards as an act of modernity that the philosophy understands the idea knowing itself" [3, p. 17].

The latter can be understood as the fact that the era of modernity to a greater degree than any other, is the product of conscious human activity. At this time, reflexivity, that is, the awareness of their own knowledge bases and consciousness in general are individual measurements of social development, just as in our time, the indicators of social development can be, for example, the quality of public administration or education level. Therefore, modernity is often referred to as *project* that is socio-cultural activities of people to transform their living conditions.

Modern man is wary of any project, whether it's intervention in nature or in social life, which is essentially a power by force "rectifying" and simplifying the complexity of what it is trying to change. Mankind is all too familiar with crises of all kinds, which are generally to be understood as a violation of the previous balance, disintegration and conflict². Modernity, in fact, laid the foundation of crisis of human existence, having absolutized mind and subjectivity, which are manifested through freedom and reflection. Of course, the reflection as a principle of philosophical thinking, aimed at

¹Split or lost its wholeness.

²Crisis should not be understood as an absolutely negative phenomenon. On the contrary, modernity creates conditions for continuous innovation (due to postulation of the subject freedom) and hence this is only an opportunity to reach new quality.

understanding and justification of one's own presuppositions, existed already in antiquity, but it was in the Enlightenment era and in modern times, when the subject not only opposed himself to nature as an object that he must subdue, but makes himself a subject to review.

Thus, in the activity of the mind, there is something that accelerates the development and at the same time makes it a continuous crisis that is the ability to dominate, turning all that falls within the scope of its attention to *object*. This fact has played a cruel joke with the man: striving for power, he also becomes the means of achieving that power. *Subject-object* relations is the first base of split and crisis of modernity: the mind, the spirit of the era, proclaimed itself free of any samples of the past, is forced to stabilize and draw all the normative content, on the basis of itself [3, p. 16-20].

The integrity of the culture of modernity is always problematic. If in earlier times, in pre-modern societies, religion has been a unifying force and the unity and integrity was guaranteed by any authorities (such as the existence of God), now the culture entered at variance with all the wonderful and the scope of knowledge stands apart from the sphere of faith. By the end of the XVIII century, three spheres of values or knowledge form and generate the normative content, universally valid norms for society: issues of truth, issues of justice and issues of taste.

How all of the above affects the semantic design of the management activities? First, in the classical science the world is represented as a system in equilibrium and natural and social processes occurring in it have a linear orientation. The dominating methodological principles and ideals of scientific knowledge oriented scholars to seek stability, order and balance. The tested objects are presented here as closed, equilibrium, stable systems that obey the principles of hard determinism. In the picture of the world formed by classical science, the time factor and the permanent volatility of the reality was not material and they tried not to take it into account. This gave rise to the illusion of purposeful movement of "management objects" in accordance with a project created by the subject. It creates the conditions for the emergence of a class of people who may feel that they are armed with the scientific, true knowledge and therefore have the right to subjugate others. So the foundations of ideology management as a professional, a specially trained group of people are laid. At the same time the traditional hierarchical management models (models of "clockwork"), which have great predictive power and allow tight control of the management object. In the logic of modern

management is identified with the policy action that is consistent with social object, characterized by an ontological stability, uniformity and constancy.

However, there always remains a possible situation in which norms, regulating these management relations may be challenged, but the subject of control can be the object of the will to power of another entity. General alienation, conflict and disunity are inevitable also in the field of management. Thus, it can be argued that the subject-object relationship on which the scientific knowledge is built, when transferred to the practical activities take the form of relations crisis requiring the strong reflexive position of the subject at actual passivity of the object.

Secondly, modernity opens new goal-setting mechanisms in transforming human activities, including in the field of management. When it comes to any organization, it is assumed that the goals of the organization are set outside. In pre-modern societies, social organization, or social order were "guaranteed" by the forces that stood above society: Cosmos, Logos, gods in antiquity and God - in the Middle Ages. God is the Supreme Good, to which all aspire. Aristotle believed that one of the four reasons for the existence of things, but matter, form and motion is the cause of the target, which has external source towards the thing. Science of new time refuses to purposefully explain the phenomena and the motion of bodies and all natural phenomena are determined not by the purposes but by mechanical causes.

Then there is the problem of social development goals: what is good for everyone, as it is formed and whether you need it at all as a common goal? If there is no external purpose, what is the basis for governmental purposes and public interest: the simple sum of individual interests or is it a common interest as something more than the sum of the individual ones? But then who has the right to declare these goals and interests on behalf of all? Enlightenment theory of the state as a result of the social contract neglects the divine origin of worldly power and represents the social contract as the self-construction of the people through mutual agreement. "Proud reflexive culture of the Enlightenment" had a quarrel with religion and placed it *next* to it or itself *near* it", - as Yu. Habermas quotes Hegel [3, p. 20]. It turns out that the rational nature of the contractual relationship of citizens formed from "inside" of the relationship and some normativity is preset only by the purpose of inalienable natural rights of human. It seems that this is rather shaky foundation on which a system constantly at risk of losing balance is built.

However, modern offers means of *crisis management*. The crisis as an essential characteristic of modernity and post-modernity makes untenable the expression common in Russian language "to overcome the crisis." In fact, the crisis can not be surmounted: the word itself implies *overcoming* the return to the old stable order³. But the stability and peace is just a relative moment of change and instability. The problem lies in the effective management of crisis, in the ability of the subject of management to transfer the system from one state to another without the catastrophic events of destruction and decay. In addition, the management, as it has been repeatedly emphasized, is an activity to streamline the system, the modern meaning of which is given by exactly the culture of modernity.

Rationalization is a universal meaning of integration, preventing disintegration processes in society. It creates normativity, formalizes and hence universalises the rules of social interaction. However, this is the "the paradox of rationalization". On the one hand, the process of universalization becomes possible due to the fact that the rationalization rests on the principle of science and, therefore, the *truth*, involving a critical approach: the validity of the fact that everyone should recognize, for it must be obvious [5, p. 353-354]. We see that it means the right of everyone to question the evidence of the established norms, that is, their *intelligence and rationality*. The basis of *effective* rationalization is individualism as the basis of the subjectivity of modernity. An individual acquires *freedom* - universalization, becoming the bottom up, from the individual to the general, protects the individual's will. We see that the rationalization and freedom are interdependent. It is specific for time modernity that the individual voluntarily assume the responsibility for the making (practical reason of I. Kant, philosophy of law of G. Hegel).

On the other hand, when we speak of "reasonableness and rationality of established formal rules", we are referring to what is called common sense that is reason. The cultural meaning of the concept of *rationalization* is associated with the traditional distinction in classical philosophy of reason and intelligence. Rationalization seamlessly replaces the mind. It contains a contradiction, which is fully realized in the modern world. Reason seeks to be absolutized and oust the mind, so rationality, which can be called instrumental, on the one hand, frees the subject in its interaction with the object, on the other hand, enslaves it, limiting the

means of self-realization. Criticism of modernity is directed primarily against the absolute *instrumental* rationality. M. Weber already aware of the contradictory effects of the expansion of rationalization. For example, the bureaucratic type of social organization as a form of application of formal and legal rules in public relations is a way to solve the difficult problem of matching the heterogeneous private interests, but at the same time the question it is very relevant in the social life and culture: when rationality becomes oppressive and from the positive value it turns into a negative one?

For management this issue takes the form of the problem of understanding the border or a situation where rationality turns, for instance into irrationality, that is, in some sort of a contrast, signaling that the control of social system is reduced. It is obvious that modernity rationalization is a necessary, but not the last step in the semantic development of the semantic concepts of good governance.

In the early twentieth century, the prospects of modernity crisis as a universal project were designated. Already in non-classical science signs of the collapse of universal rationality and universalist principles of the organization appear. For example, one of the leading philosophers of the twentieth century, Richard Rorty captures the situation of lack of universalistic bases of consciousness: law, morality and ethics [6, 7]. The output seems to him in recognition of language randomness, descriptions and self [8]. Nonclassics proposed new paradigmatic foundation of management. First of all, it concerns the introduction of the understanding of the socio-cultural factors to the theory of management that modify management practices in a given society. For example, a Yale University Professor J. Alexander, in his book "The Meaning of social life. Sociology of culture," writes about the latent cultural meanings, subject to non-linear dynamics, paradoxical syntheses and breaks affecting social life [9]. However, the main task of control still remains the preservation of the established order and its renovation in the event of failure. Homeostasis, consistency and return to the norm are the key concepts that make up the thesaurus management science in this period.

In a post-nonclassical science management thought in views about society increasingly comes from concepts such as "openness", "equilibrium", "non-linearity", "formation", etc. The central place in modern science is occupied by the "human-dimensional objects." Academician V.S. Stepin classifies these objects as

³Probably "surmounting" of the crisis will result in some new order, but this is not set as a conscious objective, since crisis in this case is understood as undesirable and destructive phenomenon for socium. Hence there is a yearning to return everything.

complex, historically developing, including man and commensurate with its activity "human-dimensional" systems. "In a broad sense, this may include any complex synergetic systems, which makes the interaction with the very human act in the components of the system" [10, p.459]. In such systems, there is a completely different (in comparison with the traditional hierarchical systems) cognitive position of the subject. It is not in the strict sense the division between subject and object, there is elimination of the position of "*off-the-findability*" of the subject. Cognition (management) is presented not as a simple explanation of reality and as a communicative process in which meanings and management goals are not pre-given, but are formed in the course of interaction, the dialogue between subject and object. The subject of management at that is directly incorporated into the social / natural life, is immanent to this life. It is organized in the acts of social / natural self-organization and at the same time organizes the environment, which includes realizing its own subjectivity.

This position allows you to neutralize the contradictions that arise between self-organization and management (organization) that inevitably arise if the managing subject takes a position of "*the outside-located*" observer. Now, the observer becomes a participant in the internal interactions of system elements, thereby management is translated inside.

In today's society there are new ideas about management, brought to life by the new socio-cultural context, which are signs of instability, the loss of the old foundation of substance - the uniqueness and linearity. The trends of post-managerization are formed more and more clearly. The content of this phenomenon is the shift of subject-object management model in the direction of the principles of self-organization. This means that the goal is to detect and control the implementation of management actions, which do not impose a control object from outside a given mode of behavior and form the inner (natural) self-organization mechanisms. I.R. Prigozhin has deliberately entered into the system (environment) to stimulate self-organizing mechanisms [11].

An important aspect of becoming the limits of control, which are determined by the cognitive abilities of the subject, the opportunity and the ability to create a rational management plan. F. Hayek in this regard, notes that "if we want to improve the social order, we must learn to follow the logic of complex entities and not roughly boss. Do not bend your model to the desired form and, like the gardener cultivate the phenomena such as plants, to improve the conditions of growth" [12, p.45].

The theory of self-organization essentially transforms our vision of the future, which is open and ambiguous and the performance of prognostic and monitoring functions for the control of the subject becomes problematic. However, the non-linear system as the control object latently contains a set of potential targets (structure-attractors) evolution, which have yet to emerge. The output of the system at one time or another vector of development is determined by the intrinsic properties of the system, its "history." Structure-attractors as future states, are determined by this "history" and in this sense pre-given. They exist in a folded, packed condition, providing the opposite effect on the course of this, which is formed in accordance with the future patterns of self-organization.

Pathos of a new management style, well-founded by the principles of self-organization theory, is how with small resonance effects, relevant to internal organization of the system, to awaken movement in it, to give impetus to the evolution of one of the areas that would be naturally associated with a previous *history* of the system. In this context, there is a failure of coercive control model based on a strict *hierarchy* of subject-object relationship in favor of a model in which subject and object relationship management are related with relationships of *assistance*. Here the translation of the system to a new, desirable condition (from the point of view of the subject) occurs naturally in tune with that one of the principles of ancient oriental philosophy - "manage without running."

Conclusion. Summing up the results of the analysis of the evolution of paradigms of governance note that the classical approach to management is based on linear rationality, according to which the result of management effect is directly proportional to the magnitude of the applied force. However, if the energy input does not resonate with proper development trends of the system, it "goes in the sand," and may even be harmful. In a "fluid modernity" (Z. Bauman) classical approach to management, which is the philosophical basis of rigid determinism, is gradually losing its relevance. In the modern era social management pursued a goal of maintaining and reproducing the already established states of society. Today, social management has to deal with constantly moving, changing sociality. In this regard, it is difficult to determine the object of control, the substantive basis on which to the control action shall be focused. In these circumstances, the knowing (managing) subject cannot use a single, universal, sustainable scheme dominating thought and imposing stereotypes of

understanding and behavior. In order to capture the slipping existence (at-least for a while), requires a constant search for new conceptual framework, methods and ways of interpreting reality. Here we are faced with a set of ontologies, which requires the control of the subject of a variety of methods of social impact.

According to the theoretical and methodological principles of synergetics, the effectiveness of the control action (it should be kept in mind that it can be both constructive and destructive) depends not on the magnitude of the effort, but on the well-selected topology impact. Exact (locally), small resonance effects may cause macro-scale changes, as there is a rapid increase in the spontaneous self-organization processes. The theory of self-organization questions the basic constructs of classical (modern) rationality, because it contains relativistic and irrational settings. However, at the same time, it offers a program for a new "plastic" rationality [13], the more relevant to the current state of social reality. The theory of self-organization enables the development of optimal management strategies not only for the stationary states of society, but also for the transition, characterized by instability and uncertainty.

Findings:

- In a post-nonclassical social practices when new methodological approaches to management, focused on procedural, non-linearity, groundlessness of the social context have already appeared, the Russian reformers often continue to use the methods and techniques of management, well-founded by modern classics. A consequence of this trend is that in the knowledge of the social reality the management subject uses the classic picture of the world as a "reflective area."
- Art Nouveau laid the foundation of the era of crisis of human existence, having absolutized mind, subjectivity, which manifest themselves through freedom and reflection. On the one hand, the management of the logic of modernity can be effective only when there is individual freedom, which leads to an increase in the importance of the initiative. This, in turn, is the basis of the principle of innovation of social relations. On the other hand, this era has formed the traditional hierarchical management models (models of "clockwork"), which have great predictive power and allow tight control of the management object. Moreover, the subject of control easily becomes the object in the subject-

object relationship. The essential need for reflection then is removed and the content of management process is "emasculated."

- In today's society there are new ideas about management, brought to life by new socio-cultural context, which signs are instability, the loss of the old foundation of substance - the uniqueness and linearity. The trends of pre-managerization more and more clearly form. The content of this phenomenon is the shift of subject-object management model in the direction of the principles of self-organization. The aim is to detect and control the implementation of management actions, which do not impose on a control object the mode of behavior given from outside, but form the inner (natural) self-organization mechanisms.
- In post-nonclassical management model the revision of the principles of rationality becomes an important aspect. The relativity of moral, legal and cultural foundations of management solutions requires scientific description and analysis of the "entry points" of management actions.

REFERENCES

1. Kizima, V.V., 2010. Post-nonclassical Practice: Reflexivity and Administration. Problems of Philosophy, 3: 54-65.
2. Arshinov, V.I., V.A. Burov and V.E. Lepskiy, 2005. Navigation, Reflective Areas and Channels of Reality of Postnonclassical Social Governance. Towards Postnonclassical Management Concepts, Eds., Arshinov, V.I. and V.E. Lepskiy. Moscow: Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences, pp: 266.
3. Habermas, Yu., 2008. Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures. Moscow: Ves' Mir, pp: 416.
4. Weber, M., 1990. Selected Works. Moscow: Progress Publishers, pp: 808.
5. Hegel, G.W.F., 1990. The Philosophy of Law. Moscow: Mysl', pp: 525.
6. Rorty, R., 1982. Consequences of Pragmatism. Minneapolis, pp: 237.
7. Rorty R., 1993. Holism, Intrinsicity and the Ambition of Transcendence. In Dennet and His Critics. Demistifying Mind, Edited by Bo Dahlbom. Philosophers and Their Critics. Oxford: Blackwell, pp: 184-202.

8. Rorty and his Critics, Ed. by R. Brandon, Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000, pp: 410.
9. Alexander, J.C., 2003. The Meaning of Social Life. A Cultural Sociology. Oxford University Press, pp: 296.
10. Stepin, V.S., 2003. Theoretical Knowledge. Moscow: Progress-Tradition, 744.
11. Prigogine, I. and I. Stengers, 1984. Order out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature. London: Heinemann, pp: 349.
12. Hayek, F.A., 0000. Fatal Conceit. Error of Socialism. Moscow: News Involving Catallaxy, pp: 304.
13. Zelenkov, A.I., 2010. Synergistic Style of Thinking and Perspectives of Plastic Rationality, Philosophy and Social Sciences, 1: 30-35.