

Social and Value Foundations of Social Mobilization Capacity of Management System in the Russian Society

¹Sergey Mikhaylovich Dorokhov and ²Rashid Dumalichevich Khunagov

¹Southern Federal University, Pushkinskaya street, 160, Rostov-on-Don, Russia

²Adyge State University, Pervomaiskaya street, 208, Maikop, Russia

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is the analysis of little-studied problems of social value grounds of social mobilization capacity of the management system in the Russian society. On the basis of extensive sociological material author formulates a conclusion that the ruling triad of values in Russian society and achieved on the basis of this framework consensus of values, are conditions of the socio-stimulating effects of management practices.

Key words: Social value grounds • Value consensus • The triad of values • Mobilizing values • Motivation management.

INTRODUCTION

Since social values represent significant, subject-matter idealized objects and perform socio-orientating and socio-differentiating functions, form outlook positions of population [1] - in other words they influence like material factors - we define value specter of Russian society life as cardinal condition for managerial request of the society and hierarchy of managerial priorities and targets [2-5].

On the one hand, M. Gorshkov points out that the Russians define ideal state as state which will restore state sector of economy and in the same time will broaden private business and political opportunities of people (41%) [6]. This vague position to a great extent reflects non-satisfaction of the Russians with chaos in management system, the effects of deterioration of social situation. On the other hand, standing for achieved or won freedoms, especially in the sphere of private life. 1/3 of respondents point out to moral decline of society as one of negative phenomenon which took place in the 20-year period of reforms [6].

Such estimates give high level of criticism of the society in regard to the situation in the country and identification of management system's aim as keeping minimum stability with higher independence in social sphere. In the same time such position prioritizes state management system and to a great extent ignores the

significance of out-of-state, social, commercial impacts, establishing the border between them: the first is management type oriented to achievement of total "wealth" and the second is management in the name of "private" interests.

Let us consider which idea, in the Russians' opinion, could unite Russian society. In 2011 it was the idea of united nations of Russia, which dominated over the idea of strong Russia as a legal state and the idea of united nations of the world for solution of global problems which mankind must solve (42 % : 28 % : 26 %). We can argue that idea of united people is diffusion idea for the Russians, that is why it has uniting potential.

It is evident, that the society is sick and tired of social de-integration. Obviously the sphere of ethnic relations is up-to-date. Also it is worth noticing that the respondents making the management system similar to wealth-creating system form managerial requests in terms of quality breakthrough to building of "great state". Here some things must be clarified. Russians' moods can not be called revanchist and the notion "great state" means return of geo-political and political status of Russia [7], respect for the country, citizens' pride and real progress in different spheres of social life. The idea of legal state in spite of its up-to-datedness has no semantic attractiveness and viewed by people as important but local idea.

That is why we observe rather low interest of society in managerial priorities out of the zone of social self-feeling and attitude to the situation in the country. We also must emphasize that the Russians do not dream about the past because return to socialist ideals and values was wished only by 1/5 of citizens. But request for democracy is quite real as optimal form of organization of social life [6]. The Russians wish to make the political institutes system look more business-like, to tie up realization of managerial priorities to very highly positioned in Russian societies freedom values, justice, understood as equality of opportunities, labour, patriotism [6].

Formed in such a way value consensus in regard to values of different generations does not mean that society sees management (government) system as mechanism for realization of great ideas. In the Russians' opinion management system must be optimal, combine strategic planning and solution of current managerial tasks [8].

If we assume that social values fix ideal meanings while life purposes correspond to quite real requests related to social conditions of individuals, the Russians do not consider management system as monopoly for interference and managing all spheres of social life of community. In their opinion, management system must demonstrate higher level of competence in regard to understanding of current situation than ordinary citizens, but work professionally and in the same time act with maximum regard to the interests of society.

It is noticeable that the Russians citizens consider new order as status quo which can be criticized but nevertheless is completed and realized. Therefore, if pluralism of separate interests of social groups will grow up it will be necessary to re-distribute power in social conscience in favour of the state [6]. But in the same time we are talking about complete trust in state power - the state must take real responsibility of managerial tasks and in this respect it must control the system of non-state management strictly.

So, modernized variant of socio-mobilization potential is allowed, implemented through the return of the state to different forms of management in all spheres of social life. Taking into consideration the need of the Russians for equality and freedom we think that most effective will be soft variant of managerial impact determined by the opinion of only every fifth citizen that ordinary people can do a lot in everyday affairs [6] and regardless of the attitude to the system of management people are sure of its power status, the power that can change the situation.

This also determines the attempt to consider and evaluate the quality of managerial decisions as inferior to social interest. Since interest in provision of social justice in the society (31%) is more situational than provision of practical realization of equality of all people before the law, it is the system of state management which is hoped to make order only by civilized, legal, political, material ways.

So, triad of dominating in the Russians society values (social justice, equality before the law, freedoms and rights of citizens) characterize special opinion of how management system must act – the framework and value criteria. Dominating opinion - if you want to achieve something important you should act together with others who have the same problems (51%). It is important for understanding of the situation in which mobilizing potential of management can not be realized in full because of shift of social activity on social macro-level. But it will be very unright to believe that this obstacle can not be overcome.

Delegating significant managerial functions to governmental bodies the Russians demonstrate that the level of mobility can be moved greatly if the system of management will realize ideas about common wealth, increase the role of social and political institutes as links in making and realization of managerial decisions. These data testify high level of interest in authorized, fully active government, in changes which can solve a lot of most difficult tasks of social development.

Established traditions of restricted selective use of socio-mobilizing potential in management system corresponds to formed in the society attitude to the dilemma - "main thing is stick to tradition - main thing is search for the new". It is interesting that here the opinions differ greatly, but semantically managerial impacts associated with respect for traditions [9]. You can argue that the system of management is perceived positively if the decisions are efficient and if the system itself is habitual as power management. Also you can say that up-to-datedness of socio-mobilizing model of management show that mobilizing values are not popular with the Russians Even initiative, entrepreneurship, risk to be against the majority are referred to social microlevel.

Such position of practically all social layers determines keeping of the same distance between managerial social environment and management system because of their difference in status and in terms of decision-making. In short, the Russians prefer act as they used to do and out of groups, especially able for social risk in order to avoid situation when you get trapped by

non-realized managerial situation. Considering socio-value dynamics in the Russian society we must pay our attention that about 44% of the Russians think about material values as the key purpose of life which orientate management system not to political and legislative innovations but to policy of social mobility. In this respect management system is coherent to achieved value consensus.

It is worth mentioning that emphasizing the incompleteness of the processes of socio-cultural modernization, 60% of the Russians believe that freedom is ability to be boss to oneself (full freedom) [9] and this fact restricts socio-mobilizing impact as uniting: the resistance to mobilized norms if they are interpreted as restriction of freedom reduces managerial effect significantly and this fact must be taken into account while broadening of the boundaries of socio-mobilizing potential.

Of course, we can hope that for the Russians who stand for freedom, the effects of managerial decisions can be quite appropriate, however, the opposition for the control is quite strong to talk about the element of suggestibility to be influenced by authoritarian persons. But strengthening of this trend was emphasized by 30%, the reduction of the trend by - 28% of respondents [10].

You can say that socio-mobilizing activity correlates to inclination to be influenced by authoritarians, but if this inclination is voluntary related to recognition of the similar managerial interests. Suggestibility understood as ability to believe blindly is necessary element in the process of realization of managerial decisions. But these stereotypes must be dealt with great care because the accept of authoritarian behavior as dominating trend reduces greatly socio-mobilizing potential.

However the main reason is that there are new divisions in the society which relate not only to the aims of general development but the methods of their achievement, M. Gorshkov points out [10]. Everyone wants practically the same things but there exists differently oriented vector of understanding of the ways of realization, legitimacy, wealth, moral health of society. And in this respect expectations in regard to government contain risks of social shifts (strict variant of democratic order). This trend is neutralized by the fact that Russian management system is bureaucratized, has own managerial cycles and the influence of so called public opinion is only indicator.

Analyzing socio-value positions of the society which form managerial request we can say that in spite of the dominance of justice over law as declared by 40% of the

Russians [10] this bias is not so great to be able to move the system in direction of illegal populist methods and restore so called people's control over the management system in Soviet times.

In reality the Russians are pragmatists - not idealists - and their claims to management system are rather realistic. Idealized is only the attitude to global wealth idea, but as the majority understands that you can strive for what looks ideal but not realize it completely, the consensus positions in regard to other more realistic problems are found. It is not by chance that evaluation of management system in the Russian society is connected with the problems of public health care, housing and utilities services sector, education, employment [11].

The fact that such orientation forms managerial request differentially. In reality there are a lot of requests to increase efficiency of separate links of managerial or responsibility of the officials. On consensus level there are wishes related to changes in the management system in favour greater power resource, obligation to realize managerial decisions, restriction of the influence of group interests.

So we can say that given above data prove that if the Russians evaluate management system as bad it is not related to its incompliance with the idea of social wealth but determined by specific results in different spheres of activity. However it is understood that in terms of managerial situation such approach is narrow-sighted, not oriented to social strategy-making and in such a way significance of subjective factor of management will increase, as well as the attitude of the managers themselves to the aims of their activity and value motivations of such activity.

If value preferences are manifested they are found in the degree of trust in management system. Authority of management system suggests that in spite of failures the system works in optimal mode and provides normal life of society. If the matter is inefficiency of such system, not able to serve officials' interests it can be associated with inability of management system to cope with the situation as a whole.

In this context the key issue is which managerial requests different social layers of the Russian society try to realize. Taking into consideration that a dream about life in richness is prevailing in the society the management system is considered as working not only for provision of normal life, minimum degree of manageability but for increase in quality level of life of the population. The projection of formed situation of dissatisfaction onto management system can be characterized by the fact that

most of the Russians (40,7%) dream about fair society but do not think that the situation is unbearable or that government must be changed at once [10]. This important provision is determined by prevalence of pragmatics in most of estimates. Social justice does not become the measure of development of management system and it is assumed that if even the system is unjust the key thing is to avoid dead end of development.

On the other hand, it is important that public opinion does not refer building of fair society to the tasks of management system. Most people believe that more important for management system is to take necessary steps for smoothing of social situation - gradually but with some results, which confirms tool approach to management system but increase in its legitimacy is related to increase in the level of its power ability.

Opinions in regard to what the management system must look like are very segmented as it was mentioned earlier: on one pole there is the idea of strict order, on the other pole there are representatives of liberal approach who want to strengthen priority of law in structural and institutional spheres.

This means the following: in spite of the fact that for the last decade there is more or less single understanding in the society of management system as guarantee of normal life of society the focus is on which ways must be used by the system to satisfy public interests. Key moment is attitude to government as power system, the absence of the notion about non-state forms of government, about economic regulation sphere as the one where order must be made first of all, where state must intervene.

So, socio-mobilizing impact is characteristic for the representatives of strict order and is not shared by modernizers. But the latter believe also that the state makes very little in economic sphere to establish stable rules of the game. Socio-value preferences of the Russians show that management system is judged by justice criteria, appropriateness of managerial decisions, that motivation basis in regard to management system is often rather diffused notions about social justice, freedom and legitimacy. Diversity in regard to achievement of managerial targets show the transfer of positions conflict onto the management system - this picture is very characteristic for modern Russian society - where value framework is represented by supporters of strong state and modern market economy [10].

This determines hesitation in regard to choice of socio-mobilizing effect. If this socio-mobilizing impact is allowed in political sphere and related to the idea of

support of strong state, innovation economy as desired target of modernization remains out of socio-mobilizing impact. This is proved by the refusal of the Russians from influence on the management system – the domination of the opinion of “strong hand” supporters [10].

It is interesting that request for modern "democratic" management is manifested in less distinct form because the supporters of such approach do not formulate their attitude to the issue of strong state, very often their motivation looks like socio-anarchical and can be refused because management system becomes the subject of non-positive criticism, when they argue that management system must also be transformed, in the same way as all included in it institutes and structures of Russian society [12].

In our opinion, socio-value aspect of relations between management system and society is characterized by 3 moments of the attitude to socio-mobilizing potential of management system. Firstly, socio-mobilizing impact becomes the sphere of conflict interests because the supporters of strong centralized power want to return to mobilization practices of the past or at least borrowing of “rational” element from them. Supporters of democratization of management refuse from social mobilization fearing de-modernist trends in the management system.

Secondly, socio-modernizing practices are demonstrated only in regard to increase of social well-being of population. And here stimulating impact of management system is measured by provision of equality of opportunities.

Thirdly, management system in Russian society uses legal resources, achievement of the equality before law of all citizens is quite possible. This is proved by activity of the state in legal sphere.

However, this can not be called realization of mobilizing scenario and delegating full power to managerial structures: this only means that in order to raise its (democratic) authority our management system can use available resources, but these resources, because of prevailing legal resources, are insufficient for stimulation of development in other spheres of social life.

So, our society does not want socio-mobilizing management, the request for it is not articulated distinctly because value consensus contains a sub-text: realization of these values is often hindered by conflict positions in assessment of achievement of managerial aims.

We can say that in Russian society manageable social environment tends to restoration of order viewed as increase in efficiency of management excluding broad use

of socio-mobilizing impacts in traditional sense of the word but demanding the use of stimulating methods, especially in social sphere and delegating management system with full power to increase control and authority in the eyes of the Russians.

REFERENCES

1. Inglehart, R. and W. Baker, 2000. Modernization, Cultural Change and the Persistence of Traditional Values. *American Sociological Review*, 65: 17-32
2. Tajfel, H., C. Fugment, M. Billig and R. Bundy, 1971. Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *Europ. J. Of Soc. Psychol.*, 1: 22-29.
3. Tajfel, H., 1982. Social identity and intergroup relations. Cambridge - Paris, pp: 1-36.
4. Tajfel, H., 1984. Social stereotypes and social groups Intergroup behavior. Oxford, pp: 1-94.
5. Cane, P., 1987. Self-Regulation and Judicial Review. *Civil Justice Quarterly*. 6: 324 - 347.
6. Gorshkov, M., 2011. Russian society as it is. Moscow.
7. Coleman, M. 2004. Geopolitics as a Social Movement: The Causal Primacy of Ideas. *Geopolitics*. 9(2): 1-43
8. Goldstein, A., 2012. Revenge of the Managers: Labor Cost-Cutting and the Paradoxical Resurgence of Managerialism in the Shareholder Value Era, 1984 to 2001. *American Sociological Review*. 77(2): 268-294.
9. Gorshkov, M., 2011. Is Russian society ready for modernization? Moscow.
10. Gorshkov, M., 2012. About what the Russians dream? Moscow.
11. Duster, T., 2006. Comparative Perspectives and Competing Explanations: Taking on the Newly Configured Reductionist Challenge to Sociology. *American Sociological Review*. 71(1): 1-15.
12. Brooks, C. and J. Manza, 2006. Social Policy Responsiveness in Developed Democracies. *American Sociological Review*. 71(3): 474-494.