

СОЦИАЛЬНЫЙ КАПИТАЛ КАК РЕСУРС УПРАВЛЕНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИЕЙ: ЦЕННОСТНЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ ФОРМИРОВАНИЯ И РАЗВИТИЯ

Игумнов Олег Александрович,
к.п.н., доцент
ФГБОУ ВО «Московский педагогический
государственный университет»

Аннотация. В статье представлен аксиологический подход к анализу социального капитала как ресурса управления организацией. Автор, рассматривает социальный капитал в качестве основной формы социальных ресурсов. Ценностные аспекты социального капитала обусловлены его потенциалом и спецификой структуры, формирующей среду «опредмеченных ценностей». Отмечено, что ценностный подход в социологическом анализе логично определяет субъект-субъектные отношения и процесс совместного формирования социального капитала субъектами управления как обладающие ценностным компонентом. Социально ориентированное управление, складывающееся в результате взаимодействия субъектов в процессе формирования и развития социального капитала, также образует организационную ценность.

Ключевые слова: социальный капитал; социальные ресурсы; аксиология; ценность; субъект-субъектные отношения; социально-ориентированное управление.

SOCIAL CAPITAL AS AN ORGANISATION MANAGEMENT RESOURCE: FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT VALUE ASPECTS

Igumnov Oleg Aleksandrovich

Abstract. The article presents an axiological approach to the analysis of social capital as an organization management resource. The author considers social capital as social resources main form. The social capital value aspects are determined by its potential and the structure specifics that the environment of «objectified values» forms. It is noted that the value approach in sociological analysis logically defines subject-subject relations and the process of joint formation of social capital by management entities as having a value component. Socially oriented management which develops as a result of the subjects interaction in the process of social capital formation and development also forms an organizational value as well.

Key words: social capital; social resources; axiology; value; subject-subject relations; socially-oriented management.

Recognition sociology management study object value character, in our opinion, contributes to the productive expansion of ideas both about the object itself and about the scope of its research as a social existence sphere.

In the modern conditions of a common cultural space formation the universalization of the values organizing it not only their convergence is recorded but also divergence along various lines. The current socio-political situation determined by the sanctions pressure on the Russian Federation and the aggravation of Russian organizations competitiveness problem significantly increases the relevance level for Russian organizations in the search and use of new resources to increase the sustainability and organizations innovative development level in conditions of limited opportunities due to new socio-political challenges.

Social capital is a resource of social management with significant potential. By social capital we mean a resource of social management essentially determined by the form and nature of social relations between the subjects of management mediated by functionally determined activities and socially significant interests [see: 3; 4].

In this capacity social capital does not require significant financial investments but it is able to change the Russian organizations social architecture as well as to rebuild their management system based on the subject-subject approach, strengthening social connectivity, strengthening social and labor partnership and social solidarity formation. Since these possibilities of social capital are determined by the level of social relation, mutual trust and norms we consider social capital as a resource of an immaterial nature (which is not substantially identical to the traditional concept of «intangible resources»).

In addition, social capital provides a manifestation of «social energy» which is interpreted as a synergistic effect formed by social capital and other social

resources. This effect is achieved in coordination with the activity approach based on the activity of subjects as a collective activity with common goals and relevant meanings.

Social capital acts as an innovative management resource for two reasons: 1) it has traditionally been studied at the level of large social communities or attributed to a personality as its integral feature while social capital at the level of an organization has not been considered as a phenomenon of social relations in sociological research; 2) in the practice of social management social capital has not previously been considered as a resource due to insufficient research of its potential.

The appeal to the axiological aspects of social capital as a managing organizations resource is due both to its potential, briefly presented above, and to its structure specifics which determines its exemplification. The social environment, according to V. Brozhik, is considered as primarily a value environment, an environment of «objectified values» [2]. One of the main values of any organization is its resource potential the formation, development, and rational use of which represents its leading competence.

In the structure of organizational resources material and intangible resources are traditionally allocated the value of which is determined primarily from their ability to generate cash flow point of view. A group of social resources, as a rule, is not considered from the standpoint of their ability to provide managerial effects that are difficult to quantify in economics terms due to their explicit sociological connotation.

Social capital in this group of resources acts as their main form providing significant management effects. In this sense social capital fits into Socrates value formula who understanding it as a good, interprets it as «realized value – utility»; value and benefit appear to him as same entity two sides that resolves the classical binary opposition «value – not value» («useful – not useful»). Social capital has value in itself as a resource for an organization managing as well as a «realized

value» that brings significant benefits to a social organization expressed in its social energy and total resource potential increment.

The value, in M. Weber's approach, is considered as a norm, a way of being that is significant for the subject; a well-known sociologist proposed an interpretation of social actions on the basis of this idea. The formation of social capital is a process of collective creativity of all organization members based on their constant interaction within the organizational structure and common goals – the development of deeper quality social relations based on mutual trust and norms transparency in social networks.

This process is also a process of the organization forming common values and meanings which determines the management subjects way of interaction. Co-action presupposes co-existence with other subjects which, in turn, leads to co-change and co-creativity in interactions variety and «polyphony of connections and dependencies» [5, p. 57]. This forms social relations special background in the organization for the formation of its social capital which makes it possible to interpret the organization as a social space of «co-existence and co-action of many people» and to highlight the proposed interpretation two aspects.

Firstly the subjects act as a condition for each other's existence within the organization influencing, one way or another, each other's activities and its results. Secondly in the emerging social space the «field» of the organization's activity is reproduced where its dynamics is realized, as K. Marx noted, arguing that «the conditions and objective embodiments of the process themselves are equally its moments and only individuals act as its subjects, but individuals in their relationships which they both produce and reproduce» [6, p. 222].

It should be noted that in this case it is problematic to talk about "mastering" values or teaching «values»; the essence of the of formation and development of social capital process in the organization was expressed by V. Frankl who argued that «we cannot learn values – we must endure values» [11].

The M. Weber's approach was developed in the T. Parsons' structural and functional analysis in which the concept of «value» acquired a generalizing

methodological meaning as identifying and describing social relations means. An organization, as a social system, assumes the existence of values shared by all its members in order to ensure coherence as integrity. In this case we are talking about social capital as a socially valuable, unique resource that provides social effects recognized as such by everyone who identifies themselves with the organization.

The leading component of social capital is its relational component based on social relations different level in the organization than traditionally appears. This level is determined by the level of the organization members subjectivity which is considered as a key indicator of the management model in the sociology of management.

In practice, management models, in a broad sense, are characterized by multiple repeatability provided that the management activity subject develops algorithms for solving management tasks implemented by management objects as well as means of influencing the object adequate to the task. From the sociology of management point of view the subject of management enters into subject-object («manager – subordinate») and subject-subject («personality – personality») and relationships with other subjects.

In contrast to the stereotypical idea of the object of management as such in a broad sense, as a rule, is «the joint activity of people in the process of achieving a certain future state of the object of their activity» [10, p. 50]. Recognition of this feature requires a logical differentiation of social relations in the organization two types:

- 1) subject-object in a broad managerial sense when the management object represents a part of the management system dominated by the subject, the management object is activity as such and the goal activity is the socially significant product (service) production;

- 2) subject-subject described in the language of management sociology and assuming that the role of the object as a social actor, in fact, is the subject as the «other man», the partner in interaction (and not the «object»); the management object in this case is the relations about the activity formation which transforms the

purpose of management transferring it into the social plane – social relations new quality formation.

A subject involved in an organization life lives by its problems organizing himself in the process of the organization social management. In fact the recognition of the former «object» subjectivity of management defines the social management polysubjectivity as a hierarchically organized process. In addition polysubjectivity also defines the regulatory actions main purpose in a social organization which is to coordinate the management subjects interests in the social interaction process for the social relations harmonization.

This approach also reflects one of the basic management features which V. Shcherbina defined as «a type of directed regulatory influences in which it is and only a social subject (a person or some social formations) that is considered as a source of influences" [12, p. 58]. The vector of this influence is also directed at another subject (a person or a social formation) in order not so much to maintain as to change the nature of their condition (or behavior).

It can be stated that a new factor in the development of organizations in modern society is the factor of awareness reflecting a person's ability to be an active, creative and responsible source of social interaction. As the German sociologist H. Plesner rightly noted «the organization acts as a means for a person to manifest himself (selfhood), a means of self-affirmation against the background of the activity object and, finally, by means of this activity itself" [7].

Social capital conditioning the «selfhood manifestation » forms the conditions for its further development and increasing the importance of each individual as an «acting actor» (A. Touraine).

At the same time we agree with S. Anisimov's opinion who warns against «dissolving» the axiology subject in sociology by simply ignoring the specific value relationship existence fact [1, p. 67]. Our idea of social capital value is not reduced to a direct reduction of the value attitude to the specific concept of «social attitude» since we proceed from the social capital value component understanding in a broader sense. Its value lies not so much in the fact of the social relationship

itself which forms the social capital basis as in the essential specifics of the relationship content and its basic character in the social capital forming process.

The value attitude to social capital is formed in the process of cognition of its nature and content. The willingness of management entities to work together consciously to form social capital increases interest in learning the mechanisms of the process itself during which the assessment is formed. As well all known, there is no cognition without interest in the object being cognized and without cognition, an assessment of value degree of the cognition result and activity is not formed.

As S. Anisimov notes, «the of value concept expresses not only (and not even so much) the very fact of the relationship emergence value, but a certain – namely positive – quality of this relationship which is fixed in consciousness in the form of a representation, concept, judgment, feelings about this quality – evaluation [1, p. 67].

We also agree with the opinion of S. Rubinstein who noted that «reflection is not only knowledge about the phenomena of reality but also attitude to them; it reflects not only the phenomena themselves but also their significance for the subject reflecting, for his life and activity" [8, p. 164]. In the structure of the relationship value, the value forms, that is, the positive social capital value in terms of its ability to meet the of the organization needs and its members needs in the innovative social management resource formation and increment.

Management itself receives a different assessment in terms of values acquiring the character of a socially oriented process «that is based on the realization of the individuals, social groups and communities interests and needs through their active participation in the management process in which the traditional of management subject and object constitute a functional and organic unity». At the same time, the object of management is «presented externally not in itself but as a self-organization subject» [9, pp. 292-293].

The axiological approach to the assessment of social capital organically fits into the resource specifics structure of social capital sociological analysis since

it allows to compare its value with the needs of the organization's life on the basis of interdisciplinary analysis as well as to establish its value and determine further development goals.

Список литературы

1. Анисимов С.Ф. Введение в аксиологию. Уч. пособие для изучающих философию. – М.: Современные тетради, 2001. – 128 с.
2. Брожек, В. Марксистская теория оценки. Пер. со словац. Д.С. Прасолова; под общ. ред. и с послесл. Ю.Н. Солодухина. – М.: Прогресс, 1982. – 261 с.
3. Игумнов О.А. Социальный капитал в социологическом дискурсе: теоретические аспекты и управленческий контекст : монография / О.А. Игумнов. – Саратов: Издательство «КубиК», 2020. – 250 с.
4. Игумнов О.А. Социальный капитал как ресурс управления: формирование и развитие в российских организациях. – М.: Издательство «Перо» 2021. – 219 с.
5. Кемеров В.Е. Общество, социальность, полисубъектность. – М.: Академический проект; Фонд «Мир», 2012. – 252 с.
6. Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Соч. – Т. 46. – Ч. II.
7. Плеснер Х. Ступени органического и человек. Введение в философскую антропологию [Электронный ресурс]. Режим доступа: URL: <http://musa.narod.ru/ples.htm>. (28.01.2023)
8. Рубинштейн С. Л. Бытие и сознание [Текст] : О месте психического во всеобщей взаимосвязи явлений материального мира / Акад. наук СССР. Ин-т философии. – М. : Изд-во Акад. наук СССР, 1957. – 328 с.
9. Социология управления: Теоретико-прикладной толковый словарь / Отв. ред. А.В. Тихонов. Изд. 2-е, испр. – М.: ЛЕНАНД, 2016. – 480 с.
10. Социология управления: фундаментальное и прикладное знание / Отв. ред. А.В. Тихонов. – М.: «Канон⁺» РОИИ «Реабилитация», 2014. – 560 с.

11. Франкл В. Человек в поисках смысла. [Электронный ресурс]. Режим доступа: <https://libcat.ru/knigi/nauka-i-obrazovanie/filosofiya/269847-20-viktor-frankl-chelovek-v-poiskah-smysla.html>. (31.01.2023)
12. Щербина В.В. Социология управления как специальная социолого-регулятивная теория: генезис, состояние, перспективы // Социологические исследования. – 2020. – № 5. – С. 56-65.