DECISION-MAKING VS. PROFESSIONAL CULTURE: MODERN RUSSIAN UNIVERSITIES' DILEMMA

Konstantin M. Olkhovikov – Svetlana V. Olkhovikova

Abstract

Decision-making constitutes and expresses the universal features of management and public administration systems. However, the basic functions of decision-making are not isomorphic to the functions of management. Modern Russian universities come through drastic organizational changes, during the last five years. Moreover, these changes are touching not only the administrative superstructure and its subordinate functioning within federal higher school ministerial institutions, but these changes mingle with grass-root processes within vocational community of university professors. The latter is nothing but a staff of employees safeguarding the main technology to guarantee the existence and development of the university education. Professional interests and professional motivation of the educating staff are going through deprivation tests thanks to constant administrative changes aimed at purely external forms of control. This article offers a fresh look at the possibility to solve the existing contradiction in the actual management of modern Russian universities through the rehabilitation of key academic liberties and the restructuring of administrative superstructure via decentralization of decision-making somewhat similar to Industry 4.0 decentralization of 'clever' infrastructure.

Key words: decision-making, professional culture, university administration

JEL Code: J08, L30, M54

Introduction

If one wants to understand modern Russian universities situation, then it is quite impossible to ignore the matter of personality life career. Personality life way demonstrates the ambivalence of social regulation basic meanings in their application to university vocational community. The paper is not about the plague of corruption (Fursova & Simons, 2014), but is to concentrate the vocational community attention on the essential reasons of social anomy that looms in Russian university management. Classic and modern models of personality, management, social regulation nowadays intertwine in different elaborations of educational social technologies. The relationships of professors and administrators is mainly the subject of

survival by the axis of unique – typical. The reality is that „contracts of the Russian universities and colleges with teachers have a strong specificity, which is reflected in the predominance of long and indefinite employment contracts with teachers, in high workload (up to 900 hours of academic work per year)" (Burtseva, Stuken, Lapina, 2016, p. 268). Personality life career pushes the intent to rethink the socialization, and to develop actual possibilities of pragmatic anthropocentrism in university management.

1. University Management Ethics

The ethical sphere of modern civilization brings closer public and private regulators of human business activity (Kibanov, 2014). Moral criteria of entrepreneurial and administrative sanity rule the situations of such a convergence and directly determine the gain of success by corporation, personality, and group, or project team. The elementary social regulation is more distinctive in case of personifications, but mostly as a process than rather as a result. The brightest reflections of modern management ethics come with personality life career. The very social evolution of management have been bringing the interpretations of career to a somewhat similar to other "life institutions" (not the personality life world taken as a fundamental phenomenon, but exactly as the institutionally measured curve signifying personality life flow).

Although career decision-making includes strong cultural context, it is ubiquitous (Tien, 2005), but it is not purely psychological problem. The growth of humanitarian and ethical capabilities in the administrative arsenal leaves behind the authoritarian memories and brings closer the versatile forms of social communication. The ethical meaning of theories and models of motivation is apparent not in social administrative tools, but in their personal meaning and the very process of personification. The organizational culture in the context of moral regulation also takes the features of 'anthropomorphic' understanding and evaluation of the social regulation as such. Mentality and mores show respectively rational and emotional aspects of typical intentions of daily business activities; but actually, they mix with changing images, masks, and other dynamic stereotypes of personality. Types and reasons of human groups solidarity becoming are unthinkable without comprehending the group dynamics as a heterogeneous unity of personal life curves, which constitute the group, or had influenced the group formation. Internal needs, leadership, and external environmental pressure act as 'natural' factors of group solidarity, but they also make visible personal events as the milestones of personality life career.

Moralities and ethos, the specifics and the universalities, the relative and the absolute of business relations ethics are going hand-in-hand with the representations of self-management, coaching, and team building. Now workshops on university social responsibility are on a high demand (Schneller and Thöni, 2011). Subjective motives of domination within an organization arrive exclusively with some meaningful career curves that personify individuals who try to represent the organization. Objective criteria for corporate obligation influence the administrator individual self-realization only as principal variations of "looking-glass self", or "generalized other". Moral prototypes of business community in modern Russia are actually in search of such meanings, which are undoubtedly more effective than any ideological slogans. The power of worldviews in theory and practice of management is irrelevant outside the career achievements, past, present, and future. Ethical principles of pragmatism and the moral meaning of social technologies presuppose a successful personality as a reliable and universal denominator of the administration as such. Aggression and care that often obscure the analysis of quotidian situations within social administration; they are also functionally dependent on the representations configurations of personality life intentions as a social path.

Comparing the management models in the context humanitarian component growth is misrepresenting these dependencies; however, it shows the intentionality to privatize the image of a dynamic personality. Types of thinking and human characters that deviate from the prototypes and that are almost inevitable due to the application of psychological testing – they are understandable as unique human characters in action, in the hustle and bustle of life. These acting characters are unequivocally pointing to the borders between "them and us" in vocational activities. Modern management and modern administration pragmatism turns to the antipode of moral irrelevance through the growth of personal component, when subjectivity replaces objectivity but in sense of elevating the corporate code standards. Ethical traditions turns into a mirror of modern business activity (Clegg, Rhodes, 2012). Secular and spiritual factors of human relations in organizations could be easily summed up and coexist in personally significant representations of modern people. Social anthropological measurements of emulation, partnership, community, and publicity in modern business organizations are starting to mix in the globalization space that also is looking like a natural continuation of personality growth. Cultural criteria of decision-making now integrate some specifically global measurements. Social norms and adaptive behavior, including the deviant one, are on the move not by their own, but due to the incessant growth of personal trust as exclusive and final competitive resource. Faith and economical motivation now intertwine exclusively and in astonishingly various ways.

Modern Russia spiritual situation consists in search of intuitive prototypes for personal life career in the twenty-first century. The universal aspects of the search become clearer in comparison with other regional interpretations (Alzyoud, Bani-Hani, 2015). Ethical aspects of business technologies and business disciplines have become a common place because these disciplines and technologies are nothing but the competitive instrumental complexes that target the same social object. Still, the subject matters acquire distinctions on the way to a dynamic image of successful personality. Organizational structure goes by a morality order of social interaction not as an exclusion from traditional rationality, but as a typical problem of every company. Planning levels and their typical moral contradictions follow the coordination and gain not only within human resources management, but also as a personal problem for every employer, as well as employee. Extrinsic and intrinsic regulators of motivation do not come directly from personal apprehension of cultural tradition; they intermediately interact with manners, mores, norms, and patterns that circulate in management ethics applications. Moral borders and ethical criteria of social control represent the personality pragmatics in detail. Modern common sense lives by moral normative structures of marketing and by social missions of management to the extent of transparency of the both. Still, every common sense is nothing but a simplified and stereotyped original wisdom of true tradition. Administration social meaning goes from constant human social acting and interacting, which are impossible without morality as preceding every situation. However, business interests and moral impartiality have to be personal to interact within social situation of human rule, or even to formulate the basics of organizational order. Thus, social meaning of administration is a logical frame for business interests, and consequently, they exist through the personifications dynamic. Global and local ways in decision-making meet together in process of personal mobility within the vocational career, such as educational courses, internships, etc. Moral maxims are irrelevant in the global world without personifications. The uniqueness of moral judgement and decision-making go hand-in-hand (Daniel M. Bartels, et al, 2015). The same is true for types of social adaptation and their relations to dominant norms, unless they are not able to nurture the modern personality beliefs in unprecedented career possibilities. External and internal environment interact through human motives and evaluations – the company situation hires characters to personify even the typical scenarios of business activity, and the cases of its disruption as well.

2. Norms and sanctions are essential management tools

Human groups in organizations bear the past phases of normative evolution and vice versa; and to study culture means to study human values (Henslin et al., 2015, p.47). 'Horde', tradition, mechanic and organic solidarity are always actual for group leadership analysis. The Durkheim's specifics of moral facts is also good to reflect the personified forms of group and corporate business activity. Personal efforts nourish all types of communicative nets, including communal, private, public, contract, and civic ones. The collective representations mix with personal aspirations in a rather strange way just to reproduce the reliability of norms and sanctions in groups. These individualization scenarios include intermediate forms of 'social briefing' that rely on authority delegating. Planning the control in modern unpredictable world starts with spontaneous staging of probably adequate ethical evaluation of organizational norms in search of one's own specific mistakes. Personification helps in finding the structural pathologies in organizations (mixing the administrative levels, breakdowns of horizontal communications, and general backwardness of information infrastructure). Another step is in finding the ways to influence personal life careers via reevaluating employees' moral potential (introducing the 'pinpoint' coordination, counter-balancing the 'groupthink' effect, and restructuring the internal conflicts instead of their 'palliative cure' by compromises). These tools are incompatible with passive ('traditional') personnel administration. Activating employees and employers life careers leads to necessitating the 'internal labor market' perspectives. Terminal and instrumental criteria when applied to personalities within company guide to new realities of decision-making. Social group life cycle measured by integration, dynamics, and reorganization of the group also reproduces the personality career chances that need differentiation decision-making analysis. Diagnosing the company perspectives, most top-managers use the above-mentioned tools spontaneously. It could be useful to correlate such spontaneous criteria with E. Erikson model of human personality life-span development (Erikson, 1994).

3. Imperatives and objectives of management ethics cannot miss personified vocational culture

The economical behavior is indispensable of personal participation, which is also vocational and ethical one. Thus, even the corporate social responsibility resuscitates such seemingly archaic matters as conflicts of ascetic and consumerist motivation. Specifying the modern management as a vocation, we have to look for new priorities in decision-making. Goal setting becomes more personal than ever before – administrating the commands goes down to

operational levels of management (Land, 2008, p.41). Social regulation hierarchy relies on positive administrative deviance, which surpasses the classical conformity motivation. These problematic but desirable types of moral motivation (solidarity and deviance) come from understanding non-classical models of action and communication. Life world and social space of a company are models that oppose goal-rational bureaucracy and open the logical space for measuring the personal participation in decision-making (Habermas, 1990). Speech acts theory relying on the precedent legitimation principle is too dependent on common sense and so replaces 'personality' by 'individuality'. Postmodern pragmatism propagates horizontal social structures to rehabilitate the social heterogeneity in a new personalized form of behavioral practices. Still, K. Jaspers (Jaspers, 1973) was right to notice that a human being as a whole could never become the subject of scientific knowledge, and this explains the communicative and postmodern models of social activity as scientifically relevant. Competitive organization relies on morally acceptable forms of personal trust when coordinating the decision-making. Will and rationality support the internal autonomy, especially in case of restructuring, or situational decisions. Industry and inferiority conflict hangs over the role confusion in its vocational versions when the latter dominates decision-making. Public and private aspects of personality life career produce a closely-knit web of generosity and stagnation only in case of alienated administrative perception of vocational communities. Integrating company vets does not mean rigidity for career opportunities within a company, if supported by innovative capabilities of personnel. Motivation of industry and consumerism do not equate to individual types diagnostics, they need spontaneous articulating of managerial vocation not for managers only. Measuring the 'goal community' (Prigozhin, 1995), we look for various stereotypes, deviations, and personal conflicts that make the company. Thus, the communication efficiency, which is not purely financial, and tolerance not by words, but by practices, they ask for distinctive group slogans that are not appropriated, or hired from outside, but grow within the unique configuration of social and cultural distances of people in the organization. Personality organizational integration business or professional community realizes E. Erikson model of social integration in general.

Conclusion

Modern Russia management ethics dilemma is utterly distinctive in university management. Modern and classical interpretations of management ethics confuse 'chemically' in modern Russia (Lidokhover, Domsch, 2012). Decision-making goes against any (usually, local) remnants of vocational cultures, but craves for some universally applied formula to motivate

personal loyalty. Pattern variables of individual social integration make poor help in the situation. Social anomy key symptoms are obvious for everybody, publicly and privately, and everybody wishes to evade the darkest consequences. 'Soviet', 'criminal', and 'western' subcultures within modern Russia business community are mixing in life curves of post-soviet people. Key ethical categories (good and evil, obligation and consciousness, liberty and dignity, and sense of life and honor) are situational now, relying heavily on social success perception. The social success configuration is crucial prototype for expertise of corporate codes as well as real situations in business organizations. Observations, experiments, surveys, and documents analysis co-produce a version of biographical method applied equally to people and to organizations. Personal confidentiality ranks high in priorities of the social biography methodology. Pragmatic recipes dominate within modern Russia business community, preinstalling the demand for integrating methodology of decision-making. Still, the very university social mission definitely has its own ethical grounds (Chen, Nasongkhla, Donaldson, 2015). Corporations' ethical expertise is vital for professionals representing universities' staff. Therefore, Russian universities still have a chance to bring in their two pence for human civilization development. Also because „the amount of bankrupt companies worldwide is 145 times greater than the budget of the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe after World War II" (Benetti, 2016, p. 156)

Acknowledgment

References

Alzyoud S. A., Bani-Hani K. (2015). Social Responsibility in Higher Education Institutions: Application Case from the Middle East. *European Scientific Journal*, March 2015 edition vol.11, No.8, p. 122-129.

Bartels D. M., Bauman C. W., Cushman F. A., Pizarro D. A., McGraw A. P. (2015). Moral Judgment and Decision Making. *The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of Judgment and Decision Making*. Edited by Gideon Keren and George Wu. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 2015, p. 478-515.

Benetti K. (2016) Challenges of corporate risk management after global financial crisis. *The 10th International Days of Statistics and Economics*, Prague, September 8-10, 2016, p. 154-162.

Burtseva O., Stuken T., Lapina T. (2016) Transformation of the employment contracts of university and college teachers in Russia. *The 10th International Days of Statistics and Economics*, Prague, September 8-10, 2016, p. 266-275.

Chen S.-H. (A.), Nasongkhla J., Donaldson J. A. University Social Responsibility (USR): Identifying an Ethical Foundation within Higher Education Institutions. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, October 2015, volume 14, issue 4, p. 165-172.

Clegg S. R. (2012). *Management Ethics: Contemporary Contexts*. Ed. by S.R. Clegg, C. Rhodes. Routledge, 2012.

Erikson E. H. (1994). *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. W. W. Norton, 1994.

Fursova V. & Simons G. (2014). Social Problems of Modern Russian Higher Education: The Example of Corruption. *International Education Studies,* Vol. 7, No. 10; 2014, p. 25-31.

Habermas J. (1990). *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*. MIT Press, 1990.

Henslin J.M., Possamai A.M., Possamai-Inesedy A.L., Marjoribanks T., Elder K. (2015). *Sociology: A Down to Earth Approach*. Pearson Higher Education AU, 2015.

Jaspers K. (1973). *Allgemeine Psychopathologie. Neunte, unveränderte Auflage*. Springer - Verlag. Berlin. Heidelberg. New York. 1973.

Kibanov A.Ya. (2014). Upravleniye personalom: teoriya i practika. *Etika delovikh otnosheniy*. Pod. red. A. Ya. Kibanova. M.: Izdatelstvo Prospect , 2014.

Land S. (2008). *Managing Knowledge-Based Initiatives*. Routledge, 2008.

Lidokhover T., Domsch M.E. (2012). *Human Resource Management in Russia*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2012.

Prigozhin A. Y. (1995). *Sovremennaya sotsiologiya organizatsiy.* Interprax, 1995.

Schneller Ch. and Thöni E. (2011). *Knowledge Societies: Universities and Their Social Responsibilities.* Editors: Chripa Schneller and Erich Thöni. 2nd Asia-Europe Education Workshop. 5 - 7 June 2011, Innsbruck, Austria.

Tien H.-L. S. (2005). The Validation of the Career DecisionMaking Difficulties Scale in a Chinese Culture. *Journal of Career Assesment*, Vol. 13 No. 1, February 2005, p. 114–127.

Contact

Konstantin M. Olkhovikov

Ural Federal University

620002 19 Mira Street, Ekaterinburg, Russia (www.urfu.ru)

ok.konstantin@gmail.com

Svetlana V. Olkhovikova

Ural Federal University

620002 19 Mira Street, Ekaterinburg, Russia (www.urfu.ru)

S.V.Olkhovikova@urfu.ru