

## **Social capital in the context of the formation of deliberative management models**

Igumnov Oleg Aleksandrovich

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor

Moscow Pedagogical State University

**Abstract.** The article deals with the problems of new management models forming in the economic transformation conditions. It is noted that the change of the management paradigm actualizes the management models formation based on non-economic forms of interaction. The author suggests to consider social capital as one of the management resources in the new conditions as a specific form of capital determined by the presence and nature of social ties between employees and not directly related to functionally determined activities.

**Keywords:** management model, deliberative management, social capital, social interaction, structural social capital, cognitive social capital, relational social capital.

The inefficiency of the transformation of management systems and the instability caused by them cause the need to search for methods of improving industrial relations, ways of transition to new type of management practices in the new conditions of the functioning of the economy. In this regard, sociological science and management practice face problems of an innovative nature: the development of a conceptual model and mechanisms that ensure a harmonious combination of cooperation and interaction in organizational relations. A special place is occupied by the problem of ensuring stable growth of the quality of social relations on the basis of social capital as a resource for effective management of the organization.

In an industrial society production relations finally shed the burden of non-economic forms, acquiring relative independence from politics and at the same time receive such a way of regulating economic processes as an anonymous price-regulated market. For the first time economics and politics get the opportunity not to replace each other, but only to limit each other [7, s. 14].

In the modern neo-industrial society, opportunities are being formed to contain social qualitative changes that would lead to the establishment of significantly different institutions, a new direction of production processes, new forms of human existence [8, p. 48]. This containment of social changes is one of the significant achievements of a developed neo-industrial society, "one-dimensional" to determine the direction of their thoughts, especially socio-political beliefs, modeling the types of economic and consumer needs, forms of behavior

(primarily social). According to V. V. Zinchenko, "the needs with which an individual identifies himself are, in their essence, a means of domination and subordination in the hands of those who rule and control" [2, p. 266].

The dominant system puts new means of social integration, which open up a wider space for the exchange of activities and the harmonious development of a person, at the service of its corporate interests. As a result, a one-dimensional, uncritically thinking individual is formed, alienated from an objective and – especially – negative attitude to social reality.

These circumstances dictate the need to form new approaches to personnel management, since traditional management methods focused on quantitative indicators of mass production do not provide effective interaction of participants in production processes horizontally and no longer justify themselves. This can explain the significant breakdown of the established and well-established stereotypes of managerial thinking and the formation of a new management paradigm: "not people for the organization, but the organization for people".

Critical socio-economic theory, concepts of subsidiarity and models of deliberative management, developed within the framework of the concepts of modern neo-Marxism and post-Marxism, are focused on the need to analyze the phenomena of power and management/self-government in management models.

Unlike other theoretical concepts and management practices, deliberative management critically analyzes management systems to identify factors that distort organizational communications. In particular, we are talking about cronyism and corporatism, when a manager protects the interests of a narrow group of people, presenting them as quasi-social

In this regard, deliberative management indicates the appearance in this case of one of the forms of ideology, namely, the ideological illusion of universality. As a result, there is a danger of society functioning according to the rules and values of the dominant group (Gemeinschaft). Therefore, as noted by Yu. Habermas, "social theory takes the form of criticism of ideology" [7, s. 20].

Technological progress, which has spread to the entire system of domination and coordination, creates forms of life and power that pacify forces opposed to the system and destroy or destroy any protest in the name of historical prospects for liberation from hard work and domination. The experience of total integration of socio-economic groups on the basis of "consensual consent" [6, p. 31] in neo-capitalist societies makes the boundaries between socio-economic classes more and more conditional.

Management theories are evolving in the direction of "human resource management". The previous "rational", "Taylorist" management models, which were based on strict methods of administrative command management and a vertical hierarchical structure, are, according to

V.V. Zinchenko, "effective only in a separate area of production or society in cases of extreme need for the concentration of joint efforts" [2, p. 275].

Of course, modern management does not completely reject the model of rationalism. It remains the methodological basis for the formation of organizational structures, planning, conducting pre-project research, economic calculations, etc. The elements of rigid command control remain overwhelming in certain extreme conditions that require, for example, rapid concentration of efforts on any work site or when solving production tasks (for example, the production of mass standard products). However, in their essence, they stand in the way of establishing partnerships, experimenting, restraining initiative, which ultimately leads to a decrease in the efficiency of both production and social mobility. At the same time, in conditions of increased economic risk, an organic management model is necessary for the formation of effective horizontal and vertical social ties.

Even in the works of E. Mayo, it was noted that the created type of industrial society destroys interpersonal communication, its primary informal form, is bureaucratized, isolating a person, ignoring the world of human emotions. This creates a gap between the technological and economic development of society and its moral and ethical level. In organizations, this leads to their destruction, and in society – to increased social instability and devaluation of socio-ethical values.

A person is able to control himself and act in public solidarity in the case of striving for goals, the achievement of which will contribute to the satisfaction of his individual interests. The next step is the model of "deliberative communicative management" (from the Latin *deliberatio* – "discussion")

The deliberative management model proceeds from the premise that a decision that is based on a pre-developed and approved formula of actions and decisions cannot be considered truly legitimate. The goal of the deliberative management model is the constant reduction of wage-exploitative relations; the expansion of the system of self-government (both public and at the enterprise level). In this case, the subject of social and labor relations is also the subject (and not the object) of the management, distribution and control system. In this sense, the idea of a deliberative self-governing way, according to V. V. Zinchenko, "is the opposite of both the command-administrative type of management and the totally deregulated systems" [2, p. 278].

Democratic self-government should be sufficiently flexible, that is, the masses and the individual should be able to freely choose from a variety of alternative projects. The system and society of self-government based on collective and individual autonomy cannot simply borrow capitalist means of production and technologies with their hierarchical structure. The most important tasks of a free society include not only overcoming the social and technical division of

labor, but also the conscious transformation of technology. The technology should take into account the problems of autonomy and freedom of the individual, as well as the environment. Technologies that serve exclusively the interests of profit will become superfluous; instead, they will be used by those that the capitalist system does not allow to develop today. The new technologies will be highly decentralized, should be appropriate to the human scale; they can be "looked at" and controlled.

Deliberative management stands for the involvement of the majority of personnel in the daily management activities. With the elimination of managerial dictates, the problem of coordination takes on an absolutely different dimension. The issues will be resolved on the spot by a free agreement. The focus of life will shift from work to the sphere of relationships between people, which will contribute to the formation of a stable, evolving civil society of a new type – a polycentric and synergetic one.

An important resource for changing management models is the social capital of an organization, which we consider as an organizational resource determined by the presence and nature of social ties between employees and not directly related to functionally determined activities [3, p. 97].

Our definition proceeds from the fact that social interaction is an integral part of any organizational and economic activity, at least in the form of relations of economic exchange or the circulation of managerial signals. However, it seems to us that it is not quite correct to define such interaction itself as social capital, since its content specificity will thereby be "blurred". According to Coleman, social capital is "productive, making it possible to achieve certain goals that would be impossible in its absence" [5, P. 98].

Social capital is an independent and valuable organizational resource, a source of organizational advantages and efficiency improvement, which allows us to consider it as an object of purposeful management. In this capacity, social capital can be considered as an object of conscious investment, which is based on the expectation of future benefits from increasing and using it as an accumulated resource.

Social capital, being a complex, multicomponent organizational phenomenon, has multiple effects on various aspects of the organization's functioning that are significant for its productivity and efficiency. At the same time, social capital is one of the most universal types of capital, like financial and human capital, and unlike industrial, intellectual or natural capital. This means that the management of social capital is a significant area of management in various types of organizations.

Secondly, there is reason to believe that in the modern Russian economy, the objective prerequisites for the formation of social capital are rather unfavorable than in most developed

countries. This means that the management of social capital for Russian organizations is a more popular and urgent task than for organizations in countries with a high level of development.

Since social capital management is of practical importance for Russian organizations, it seems appropriate to consider these recommendations at two levels: strategic and instrumental.

Social capital permeates all organizational relationships and work processes, and in no way can be considered as a kind of "non-core asset", which is a burden in relation to the main business processes. The formation of the organization's social capital is its strategic task. In fact, the management of Russian organizations will have to solve the problem that was formulated by E. In the process of studying the phenomenon of conformism – the problem of embedding new forms of relations in a complex system that has its own core and periphery, institutions, organizational mechanisms, and resource base [4]. At the same time, we are talking about the dynamic integration of management practices for the formation of social capital in the conditions of transformation of Russian society and the processes of increasing the "fluidity" of society (according to Z. Bauman).

The list of the main directions of the development of social capital, in order of decreasing importance, is as follows:

- corporate culture;
- CSR and social policy;
- informatization;
- functional interdependence.

In the field of corporate culture, companies are recommended, first of all, to form an image of an employee-oriented organization. The translation of a system of corporate values in which the company recognizes and respects the interests and needs of employees, as well as the promotion of appropriate organizational practices, has a significant and universal positive impact on the development of all components of social capital.

The Russian business culture is characterized by an exceptionally high role of the goals and values of managers and, accordingly, their perception by employees [1]. Management interested in the development of social capital, taking into account this feature, should symbolically demonstrate and confirm in practice the rejection of a purely technocratic, functional perception of employees, recognizing their interests and expectations. Given that employee orientation is not a common type of corporate culture in Russian organizations, following this recommendation requires, first of all, changing the attitudes of senior management, at least at the declarative level.

Russian organizations interested in the growth of social capital can also be recommended to increase the level of openness and reduce the rigidity of control.

In the field of social sphere management, recommendations for the development of social capital are primarily related to the introduction and codification of CSR principles, social policy and the creation of mechanisms for resolving intra-organizational conflicts. These management decisions in practice embody the principles of an employee-oriented corporate culture, as they are perceived in the Russian business culture. In this sense, corporate culture and social policy complement each other, creating a social environment that is perceived as comfortable and promotes positive relationships in the team.

Informatization is an important part of managerial efficiency, but it is only indirectly related to the tasks of developing social capital. The latter is promoted, first of all, by corporate social technologies – means that allow not only and not so much vertical and unidirectional, but horizontal and interactive communications, which are not only formal, but also informal, which reflects one of the most important trends in modern management.

The introduction of corporate social information and communication technologies provides an impact on various components of social capital:

- structural (creating new simple contact opportunities and a virtual interaction space for employees);
- cognitive (ensuring the formation of a single information and semantic space and creating conditions for overcoming possible differences in the language, perspective and perception of the organizational environment, reducing the importance of many potential communication barriers);
- relational (increasing the flexibility of communication strategies and tactics, providing greater transparency of communications, reducing the possible stressful nature of personal contacts).

The informatization of organizational communications is especially valuable for the development of social capital in market and hierarchical relations. The advantages of corporate social information resources are complemented by relatively low implementation costs. Of exceptional importance are the high flexibility and adaptability of social information resources, which allow us to develop solutions taking into account the characteristics of the company and strategic tasks in the field of social capital.

A clear perception of social capital as an independent resource of organizational development and an understanding of the value of its balanced development for the formation of new management models based on a progressive management paradigm is of fundamental importance for the successful operation of an organization.

## **References**

1. Analiticheskij obzor po rezul'tatam issledovaniya «Cennostnye osnovy social'noj deyatel'nosti rossijskogo predprinimatel'stva». M.: Novard, 2015. 85 s.
2. Zinchenko V.V. Deliberativnye modeli menedzhmenta i samoorganizacionnyh sistem v global'nyh institucional'nyh transformacijah obshchestvenno-ekonomicheskogo razvitiya // MVA. Marketingovoe upravlenie predpriyatiem. 2013. № 2. T. 4. S. 263-296.
3. Igumnov O.A. Social'nyj kapital v sociologicheskom diskurse: teoreticheskie podhody i upravlencheskij kontekst : monografiya / O.A. Igumnov. – Saratov: Izdatel'stvo «KubiK», 2020. 250 s.
4. Fromm E. Begstvo ot svobody. M.: Progress, 1990. 272 s.
5. Coleman J.S. Social capital in the creation of human capital // The American Journal of Sociology. 1988. Vol. 94.
6. Fuchs A. Solidarität der Sozialpolitik. – Bonn: Taschenbuch-Verlag,, 2003.
7. Habermas J. Legitimationsprobleme im Spätkapitalismus. – Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 2002.-195 s.
8. Sintschenko V.V. Die ideologischen kriegler der globalisierung: feindschaft ideologische front des neoliberalismus gegen gesellschaftliche alternativen. - Dny vědy.- 2013. - Dil 24.-Praha. Publishing House «Education and Science» - 88 s. – S. 46-51.