

Содержание:

Image not found or type unknown



Introduction

Management philosophy – those principles and ideas that are the basis of the organization's activities. The relevance of this issue is increasing every day. Without a clear goal of the organization, without articulating clear and understandable principles, the organization is doomed to slow extinction. Today, there are more and more global problems, but until their severity is understood, the methods of solving them remain the same, in many ways characteristic of the past centuries. The root of this contradiction is the backwardness of culture, including managerial culture, which is an organic part of the General culture of mankind. The world has already entered a period of diversity of new national cultures. The multiplicity of cultures is not a basis for increasing confrontation, but a condition for tolerance — mutual tolerance, mutual understanding of people. Examples of traditional and strong cultures that have already largely exhausted themselves are often imposed by force on the world and individual regions, which increases the state of social tension on the planet. In order to survive, humanity has yet to make a number of progressive changes in the organization of labor, industrial relations, in the establishment of the principles of civil society, self-government, and so on. The process of modernizing society is necessary, but cultural renewal must precede it and largely ensure it, determine the pace and timing. Only by changing the "parameters" of the culture of society, its individual regions, labor associations, and individuals can society be brought to a new qualitative stage of development. But here we are waiting for a new contradiction associated with the phenomenon of "cultural shock", when a person suffers from a collision with a foreign culture, changing the cultural environment, or as a result of the imposition of a new culture on the old one. In such conditions, a "culture shock" may occur — a complete disorganization of a person in the living space, for example, when a variety of forms of ownership, the formation of market relations, changes in forms of control, etc.

Is there a way out of this double contradiction and what is the technology for resolving it?

On the other hand, a person cannot dramatically change the cultural environment, because this leads to excessive stress overload, sometimes calling into question the

implementation of humanistic and ethical norms recognized by international law and aimed at protecting the human being as the highest value. In resolving this conflict, it is also necessary to reach agreement and tolerance, which is possible not on the basis of a naked denial of past patterns, their suppression, but on the basis of embedding new ones into old ones, using past cultural traditions with new requirements and new values. Violation of this principle not only does not contribute to the reform of society, but, on the contrary, generates powerful mechanisms of resistance in the mind, which is both the most innovative and the most conservative element of public life. In a situation of shock, the mind begins to work its own conservative mechanisms:

- holding on to the past at all costs because the best has already happened;
- shifting the focus not on innovation, but only on eternal values (moral, national, religious);
- "narcotization" of the spiritual world by mass culture and mysticism.

This raises one of the fundamental questions of our time: how to ensure that closed totalitarian cultures have access to an open dialogue with other cultures of the world, how to achieve their mutual enrichment on the basis of tolerance and ensure the formation of a new open culture of the XXI century, including management?

Integral culture is built not on the basis of suppression, imposing patterns, but on the basis of consent and selection of the best. It should unite and ennoble three types of management cultures:

1. administrative and command;
2. information-analytical;
3. socially oriented.

The first is typical of totalitarian regimes, based on strict bureaucratic regulations, a huge apparatus of officials, motivation of fear, responsibility and the rule of administrative law and state structures; there is a prevalence of force methods, which largely exclude mechanisms of self-regulation in civil society, alternative solutions, dissent, etc.

The second type is based on the dominance of information technologies and computer systems in choosing and making managerial decisions, in which the technocratic element prevails over the humanitarian and humanistic one.

The third is a socially oriented management culture that restricts the effect of market relations and partially includes the social factor in the regulatory mechanism, which contributes to the disclosure of a person's creative potential. It is characterized not only

by the legal, administrative-command, information-analytical type of regulation, but also by the inclusion of social motivation in the form of high social protection of its citizens, motivation for their work and all life activities.

Can we talk today about the General contours and features of a management model of the future that can withstand the challenges of the 21st century? This question can be answered in the affirmative, because the combined experience of many cultures allows us to do this.

American model management

In the 90-ies of the twentieth century in America, a classical school of management was formed, based on a number of ideas, the leading of which are the principles of coordination, hierarchy and regulation. The key concept of the classical school is the concept of "control function". Attempts have been made to classify management functions, since there is a belief that such functions are objective and suitable "for all enterprises" and "for all times". However, as practice has shown, the classical school of management focused on the mechanisms of managerial activity, was largely mechanistic in nature, and it lacked the main link of managerial activity-a person, his psyche, and mentality.

This led to the fact that in the 30s in America a new school appeared - the school of human relations, which proclaimed the idea that a person is the main link in an organization. The organization was considered as a system of relations between employees aimed at achieving common goals, and management is the process of achieving them. The school of human relations studies the behavior of employees in small groups, the influence of management style on the work of organizations (E. Mayo, A. Maslow, R. Likert, K. Argyris, etc.).

In the mid-50s, a new school appeared - empirical, combining the positive ideas of the classical and the school of human relations (P. draker, A. Sloan, W. Bennis, G. Miniberg, etc.). the Main idea of this school is the power of organization and management in managers. It is proposed to carry out strict selection and thorough training of managers, accumulation and use of their experience.

In the 60s of the twentieth century, the American school of social systems declared itself. The basic principles of this school are "system approach"and" social system". Creating sound communications for collecting and processing marketing information, on the basis

of which goals are set and a strategy is developed, is the key idea of this direction. Hence, decision-making becomes the main, but at the same time, the bottleneck in the development of organizations.

Finally, it should be noted that the idea that ethics can be and is the basis of the economy appeared in the 90s. The leading representatives of this idea were the American economists Weber, McGregor, Likert, M. Mayo and others. The core of this idea is the position that ethics as a system of moral values is the basis of public order and, in particular, determines the appropriate system of motivation in organizations. However, there is a vulnerability here: in business ethics, it is more about whether businessmen act morally in sensitive situations, and in business ethics, it is about how to behave correctly with a foreign partner. In such purely applied moments, the most important problem is overlooked and not justified: whether ethics as a branch of philosophy can be the basic basis of Economics.

Today, according to many experts, the intellectual line of Senge and Nonaka, which combines the ideas of the school of human relations and social systems, can be considered a promising direction. In this direction, the main focus is on the knowledge, skills, intelligence, and systems thinking of managers and specialists, which allows us to understand the development of organizations in terms of internal resources inherent in people working in organizations.

This idea is probably borrowed by modern scientists from the ancient Chinese philosopher Confucius and translated into the Western European style of thinking sounds something like this: to achieve a favorable development of the economy, it is necessary to train "managers" in a special way. The initial contingent should be ordinary people. The path of future managers is difficult, they must become perfect. To do this, you need to overcome yourself, your selfishness through self-improvement techniques, which requires training, education and self-education. The result should be full compliance of the person with the proposed activity. It is expressed in a humane attitude to people and complete selflessness. Only then can the management activity start. According to this philosophy, management activities should not be aimed at obtaining benefits or achieving personal success.

However, these ideas can also be found to have flaws. The emphasis on internal ethical perfection alone, without regard to reality, leads to utopianism. How it is possible to observe ethical management standards in real life is an extremely important and complex issue.

The Japanese model of management

It is known, for example, that in Japan, management culture is a combination of the classical concept of European management and Japanese traditionalism. The Japanese have carefully studied all the well-known management concept and built my own. As a country of contemplation, a close connection of man with nature, a land of temples and gardens, how did it manage to assimilate and largely rework the technical and humanitarian culture of the West, achieve the heights of technological progress, become a global economic superstar, while preserving its identity?

In response to this question, it should be emphasized that a modern management system has been created in Japan and a corresponding management culture has been formed, which reflects the trends of the future world culture. The uniqueness of this system lies primarily in the management's focus on long-term goals. Each firm is not content with temporary success, but looks into the future and solidly strengthens in the markets. "Forget about today and think about tomorrow" - this attitude of strategy and mass consciousness is fundamentally opposite to the Western mentality: "if there is a day, there will be food."

In General, the strategy in Japan is understood as "readiness for events". The main characteristics of the Japanese firm's management strategy are:

- change orientation;
- focus on the environment and place in the environment;
- the lack of a deterministic course of conduct;
- taking into account and using all the opportunities for survival in a changing world, not at a specific moment, but in the long term;
- allocation of equipment and technology as the main resource for survival.

It is interesting to note that the Japanese themselves are people of concrete thinking, but the requirements of the conceptual revolution in Japan were effectively mastered and given priority. Management usually includes four main functions: planning, organization, motivation, and control. The Japanese have found and mastered their key link — personnel management. They have developed unique methods of selection, placement and training of management personnel. William Ouchi, a well-known American expert in the field of management, characterizes the Japanese management system as a set of spiritual and cultural values that have developed naturally and logically follow from the uniqueness of the Japanese nation, as a complex of interrelated elements based on trust,

a fine understanding of people, relatives, and relationships similar to kinship.

One cannot disagree with this: the human factor is really at the center of Japanese management. Technical technologies in Japanese production are accompanied by the most modern, high-tech social technologies for motivating people to work and effectively organizing intra-group behavior. Japanese people in this field have long ceased to be students and today have become an example for the whole world. The Japanese company creates a specific atmosphere of consent, tolerance, and security for the employee, which encourages people to work effectively. It uses unique methods of truly human relations in production, which are organically combined with the traditional Japanese corporate culture, which is the main difference between Japanese management, for example, from the American one, where the main attention is paid to the technical aspect of production organization. Finally, the Japanese refer to the Constitution of Prince setoku: "harmony is above All things, and all encouragement and praise is due to the suppression of unjust behavior."

Management culture today

It turns out that it is not even Economics, not law, not technical technologies, but human behavior in the organization, in society, the laws of disclosure of the creative potential of both the Manager and each employee, the culture of human communication. In short, knowledge and understanding of a person and their behavior in a social organization is the most important element of managerial culture and the essence of the managerial revolution that the world is experiencing, which will undoubtedly form the basis of the new culture of the XXI century.

Many foreigners who visit Japanese companies are surprised how the Japanese, using the same technology, equipment and raw materials that are used in Europe and the United States, achieve higher quality products. The Japanese believe that the quality of products is not given by machines, but by people, but this is not understood by foreigners.