

УДК 36.075

Reikin Vitalii,
Doctor of Economics, Professor,
Lesia Ukrainka Volyn National University,
Professor of Management and Administration Department,
Lutsk, ORCID ID: [0000-0003-1395-6135](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1395-6135)
reikin.vitaliy@vnu.edu.ua

Andrii Kolosok,
PhD in Economics, Associate Professor,
Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University,
Associate Professor Department of Social Pedagogy
and Pedagogy of Higher School,
Lutsk, ORCID ID: [0000-0001-9167-5430](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9167-5430)
kolosok.andrew@vnu.edu.ua

<https://doi.org/10.29038/2786-4618-2023-01-96-100>

THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF SOCIAL MANAGEMENT AS RESEARCH OBJECT

Abstract. The paper is about the scientific category "social management". A number of derived theoretical and methodological problems regarding the essence of the category are formed. Differences between the interpretation of the general categories "management" and "managing" are given. Various definitions of the studied term are presented. The fact of terminological uncertainty and absence of a universal scientific approach to the interdisciplinary research object "social management" is noted, which is due to the polycomprehensiveness and certain uncertainty of the structural components. The author made an attempt to form a universal definition of the category "social management", which is based on a combination of two main aspects: management of social systems in combination with solving social problems. Various aspects of management of social systems (enterprises, organizations, collectives) and peculiarities of the researched category are presented. The general scientific principles and ideas formed by management classics: F. Taylor, H. Fayol, H. Emerson, are summarized. The role of the team as a kind of stabilizer in the process of enterprises and organizations functioning is analyzed, and various shortcomings in its evaluation are given. The fact of an integrated approach in forming methodological core, which synthesizes three interrelated paradigms: managerial, psychological, social and economic, is established. A number of specialized theories are singled out: the system theory of the firm, the theory of social action, and the theory of service state. Attention is focused on the methodology of the system theory of the firm, which is characterized by a certain fragmentation, different research subjects in the main areas: the processes of forming and implementing management decisions, the search for key factors of the firm's market success (strategic theory), concentration on the problems of the production sphere. A number of specific features of social management are given. It was concluded that modern management is primarily socially oriented.

Key words: social management, management, managing, scientific theories, social contradictions.

Рейкін Віталій,
доктор економічних наук, професор,
Волинський національний університет імені Лесі Українки,
кафедра менеджменту та адміністрування,
м. Луцьк

Андрій Колосок
кандидат економічних наук, доцент,
Волинський національний університет імені Лесі Українки,
кафедра соціальної роботи та педагогіки вищої школи,
м. Луцьк

ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ АСПЕКТИ СОЦІАЛЬНОГО МЕНЕДЖМЕНТУ ЯК ОБ'ЄКТА ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ

Анотація. Публікація присвячена науковій категорії "соціальний менеджмент". Сформовано низку похідних теоретико-методологічних проблем щодо сутності категорії. Наведено відмінності між трактуванням

загальних категорій "менеджмент" та "управління". Представлено різні дефініції досліджуваного терміну. Констатується факт існування термінологічної невизначеності та відсутності універсального наукового підходу щодо міждисциплінарного об'єкту дослідження "соціальний менеджмент", що обумовлено полізмістовністю та певною невизначеністю структурних компонент. Автором зроблено спробу формування універсальної дефініції категорії "соціальний менеджмент", що базується на двох основних аспектах: управлінні соціальними системами у поєднанні із вирішенням соціальних проблем. Подано різноманітні аспекти управління соціальними системами (підприємствами, організаціями, колективами) та особливості досліджуваної категорії. Узагальнено загальні наукові принципи та ідеї, сформовані класиками менеджменту: Ф. Тейлором, А. Файоном, Г. Емерсоном. Проаналізовано роль колективу в якості своєрідного стабілізатора у процесі функціонування підприємств та організацій, наведено різнополюсні недоліки при його оцінюванні. Констатується факт інтегрованого підходу при формуванні методологічного ядра, що синтезує три взаємопов'язані парадигми: управлінську, психологічну та соціально-економічну. Виокремлено низку спеціалізованих теорій: системної теорії фірми, теорії соціальної дії та теорії сервісної держави. Закцентовано увагу на методології системної теорії фірми, яка характеризується певною фрагментарністю, різним предметом дослідження за основними напрямками: процесами формування та реалізації управлінських рішень, пошуком ключових чинників ринкової успішності фірми (стратегічна теорія), концентрацією на проблематиці виробничої сфери. Наведено низку специфічних особливостей соціального менеджменту. Зроблено висновок, що сучасний менеджмент є, насамперед, соціально спрямованим.

Ключові слова: соціальний менеджмент, менеджмент, управління, наукові теорії, соціальні суперечності.

Formulation of the problem. Nowadays almost all economic sciences emphasize the social aspects of economic activity, the social orientation of individuals and various social groups, and their interaction with society and state. Since the management process solves not only the tasks of effective activity, but also actual theoretical and methodological problems, therefore, the research of the category "social management" is relevant both for science in general and as an educational component in particular.

When analyzing the practical application and research of the category "social management", a number of significant theoretical and methodological problems arise:

- terminological and conceptual "mosaicism": quite often several similar, but not completely identical terms are used in parallel, the definitions of which are mostly synonymous: social management, social managing, social work management, etc.;

- the category "social management" is closely interconnected with both sociology and management, which leads to some research subject "blurring" with related scientific fields;

- in scientific articles there is a large number of methodological approaches to understanding the essence of "social management" in relation to the categories "management" and "managing".

The aim of the study. To form a universal definition of the category "social management" and find out its features at the theoretical and methodological level.

Analysis of recent research and articles. The foundations of scientific management were formed by M. Weber, F. Taylor, H. Fayol, H. Emerson, E. Mayo, and P. Drucker. A number of foreign and domestic scientists devoted their articles to the study of the theoretical and methodological foundations of social management: G. Becker, O. Vikhansky, L. Kolbina, T. Nadvynychna, V. Partsvaniia, T. Sobol and others.

The main research presentation. First of all, we must note that "management" is dominated in the category "social management", but the sociological component is a derivative. At the same time, "social management" should not be completely equated with "social managing" since they differ somewhat in the interpretation of the categories "management" and "managing" [2; 7]. Although the foreign version of the English verb "to manage" is universal (it is used in the sense of "to manage"), the actual "management" implies the activity of the owner and can describe the procedure of hiring personnel as direct managers. In modern scientific articles "managing" is most often perceived as a specialized professional activity [1]. Therefore, we believe that the category "social management" is somewhat broader in terminological content compared to "social managing".

In general, the interpretation of the category "social management" is ambiguous, which is explained by the multi-content and certain uncertainty of the structural components. The term "social" includes too wide phenomena coverage, processes and relations related to both the direct interaction of people and various social spheres: politics, culture, economy, sports, etc. In this context the component "social" can be replaced by a synonymous term "public", but this will lead to much greater "blurring" of the category essence.

From a scientific point of view, social management directly includes various aspects of managing social systems (enterprises, organizations, collectives). Within the same educational component, as a rule, scientists consider first of all possible options for solving social problems of society by applying current conceptual approaches (to quality, risks management...) and modern management tools. Social problems mean discrepancies between existing and desired system state (migration processes, unemployment, poverty, excessive differentiation of population incomes, etc.). Social contradictions have a significant impact on solving social problems:

- between the principles of individualism and collectivism;
- between the principle of human rights protection and discrimination manifestations;
- between the ideology of democracy and the state right to use violence (in particular, the problem of the death penalty), between coercion and self-organization;
- between the need for sustainable development and increasing social differentiation;
- between the needs for expanded financing the social programs and the requirements for reducing the level of the tax burden.

At the same time, solving social problems at the nano-level is quite often interconnected with problems of a higher hierarchical level. Therefore, social management is also interconnected with activities of state institutions and authorities that manage the entire society functioning.

By its essence, any management can be considered social. At the same time, the studied category is a specific type of scientific management, characterized either by the social sphere of distribution (social processes and phenomena, social policy, social rights), or by application of social methodology, or at the same time by all of the above in a complex, where the dominant object is the collective. At the same time, the key goal of the social management is the rational use of human capital [10] to achieve the maximum social effect with minimal management costs.

So universalism of the category "social management" lies in our opinion in a binary definition: professional activity regarding various aspects of managing the social systems in combination with the social sphere problems. Social management universal understanding also makes it possible to consider as its subjects both organizations and state institutions, the population in general and social leaders in particular.

Among all possible aspects of social management, the greatest concentration of research is focused on the team management, which plays the role of a kind of stabilizer in the process of functioning enterprises, organizations, and corporations. At the same time, the team is considered not as a simple collection of employees related by human relations, but as an integral part of the organization and an independent entity. Shifting the emphasis from the employee to the team actually socializes management. At the same time, the excessive dominance of the team as the recipient of management decisions can be assessed as populism on the one hand, and hypertrophied attention to individual employees as a manifestation of favoritism [3].

The founders of social management can be considered a number of theoreticians and practitioners who formed the well-known basic scientific principles and ideas of scientific management:

- F. Taylor: rational organization of work, separation of managerial and executive functions, formal structure of the organization;
- H. Emerson: integrity of the management system, formation of standards, discipline, consulting, accounting, rationing, rational use of resources, etc.;
- H. Fayol: hierarchical order, division of labor, power and responsibility, unity of authority, subordination of personal interests to the general ones, fair remuneration, centralization, etc.

Based on the above principles and individual ideas, scientific concepts of management were formed, the methodological core of which is an integrated approach that synthesizes three interrelated paradigms: managerial, psychological, and social and economic. There is no clear distinction between these components, since any management decision reflects different aspects.

Such general concepts include classical and administrative, the concept of rational bureaucratic management, the school of human relations, process, system, situational and behavioral approaches. In addition to general scientific concepts within social management, "narrow" concepts and theories can be singled out that develop separate directions (managing risks, projects, personnel, marketing), as well as characterize informal cooperation (mutual support, involving the members of society into the management of affairs occurring in society and affect the life of an individual).

It is worth noting that a developed theory of social management, which would be significantly different

from general management, currently does not exist in the scientific field. Any management, even social, is always a partial case of general managing. Conceptual approaches in social management are mainly based on several theories: system theory of the firm, social action and service state. Regarding the methodology of the system theory of the firm, it should be noted that it is characterized by a certain fragmentation, different research subjects in the following areas: the processes of formation and implementation of management decisions, the search for key factors of the firm's market success (strategic theory), concentration on production issues [3, p. 246]. In turn, M. Weber, who investigated the origin of social problems and contradictions, formed the theory of social action: it is purposeful, oriented to the needs of the collective, motivated to act on the basis of basic human needs [6]. The state as a subject in social management is represented by the corresponding "service" theory: the focus of management on ensuring the proper quality of social services provided by government bodies for public institutions and the population.

The specific features of social management include the following:

- priority focus on the development of human capital;
- social orientation of the enterprises and organizations management based on the principle of social responsibility;
- practical application of management general principles for managing differentiated social groups at different hierarchical levels;
- administration of (non)governmental organizations regarding the provision of qualitative social services;
- socially responsible management regarding both internal and external aspects of the organization's activities;
- public and private partnership in the social sphere;
- social management is a separate interdisciplinary scientific direction;
- the effectiveness of social management is evaluated, first of all, according to social and not economic criteria;
- social management is important as an educational component which is included in a curricula and programs in training and improving the qualifications of personnel.

Conclusions. Based on world experience, we can conclude that modern management in the 21st century. is, first of all, management of social orientation. Social management as a scientific component is a universal category with a binary definition: professional activity regarding various aspects of managing social systems in combination with the problems of the social sphere. Social management in the applied aspect is possible not only as managing social and economic systems, but also as managing people in organizations and in society.

In general, the methodology of social management is not permanent, as its theoretical and conceptual approaches are developed and supplemented. As a separate phenomenon of managing, social management requires an integrated understanding and has a complex nature.

Джерела та література

1. Виханский О. С. Управленческая парадигма XXI века. *Менеджмент*. 1996. № 4. С. 24-28.
2. Горячев А. И. К вопросу о соотношении социального управления и менеджмента. *Экономика и управление в XXI веке: наука и практика*. 2014. № 1. С. 13-18.
3. Дементьев В. Е., Качалов Р. М., Клейнер Г. Б. Коллективные формы хозяйствования в современной экономике. М.: ИД «Научная библиотека», 2017.
4. Классики менеджмента / Под ред. М. Уорнера. Пер. с англ. под ред. Ю. Н. Каптуревского. Харьков; Минск : Питер, 2001. С. 480-487.
5. Надвинична Т. Соціальний менеджмент: перспектива технологізації. *Психологія управління*. 2001. № 11. С. 114-121.
6. Соболев Т. В. Соціальна дія та соціальна взаємодія – засади порівнюваності понять. *Вісник Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. Серія «Філософія. Політологія»*. 2009. № 91-93. С. 41-44.
7. Франчук В. И. Может ли менеджмент заменить социальное управление? *Социологические исследования*. 1999. № 2. С. 127-130.
8. Abrahamson E. Management fashion. *Academy of Management Review*. 1996. 21(1). P. 254-285.
9. Barker R. L. The social work dictionary. 3rd ed. Washington, DC: National Association of Social Workers, 1995.

10. Becker G. S. Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis. Columbia University Press for the National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, 1964.
11. Newell S., Swan J., Kautz K. The role of funding bodies in the creation and diffusion of management fads and fashions. *Organization*. 2001. № 8 (1). P. 97-120.

References

1. Vikhansky O. (1996). Upravlencheskaia paradigma XXI veka [Management paradigm of the 21st century]. *Management*. № 4. P. 24-28.
2. Goriachev A. (2014). K voprosu o sootnoshenii sotsialnogo upravleniia i menedzhmenta [On the question of the relationship between social managing and management]. *Ekonomika i upravleniie v XXI veke: nauka i praktika [Economics and Management in the 21st Century: Science and Practice]*. № 1. P. 13-18.
3. Dementiev V., Kachalov R., Kleiner G. (2017). Kollektivnyye formy khozyaystvovaniya v sovremennoy ekonomike [Collective forms of management in the modern economy]. Moscow: «Nauchnaia biblioteka».
4. Klassiki menedzhmenta [Management classics]. Ed. M. Warner (2001). Kharkov; Minsk: Piter. P. 480-487.
5. Nadvynychna T. (2001). Sotsialnyi menedzhment: perspektyva tekhnolohizatsii [Social management: perspective of technology]. *Psykhologhiia upravlinnia [Management psychology]*. № 11. P. 114-121.
6. Sobol T. (2009). Sotsialna diia ta sotsialna vzaiemodiiia – zasady porivniuvanosti poniat [Social action and social interaction are principles of concepts comparability]. *Visnyk Kyivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Tarasa Shevchenka. Seriiia «Filosofiiia. Politolohiiia» [Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National University. Series "Philosophy. Politology"]*. № 91-93. P. 41-44.
7. Franchuk V. (1999). Mozhet li menedzhment zamenit' sotsial'noye upravleniye? [Can management replace social management?]. *Sotsiologicheskiie issledovaniia [Sociological research]*. № 2. P. 127-130.
8. Abrahamson E. (1996). Management fashion. *Academy of Management Review*. 21(1). P. 254-285.
9. Barker R. L. (1995). The social work dictionary. 3rd ed. Washington, DC: National Association of Social Workers.
10. Becker G. S. (1964). Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis. Columbia University Press for the National Bureau of Economic Research, New York.
11. Newell S., Swan J., Kautz K. (2001). The role of funding bodies in the creation and diffusion of management fads and fashions. *Organization*. № 8 (1). P. 97-120.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 25.03.2023 р.