

© S.E. MARTYNOVA

*status.sm@mail.ru*

UDC 316.4

### **THE CONCEPT OF “SERVICE” STATE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE POST-INDUSTRIAL PARADIGM OF SOCIAL MANAGEMENT**

*SUMMARY. This article focuses on the parameters of social management in the post-industrial sociality, whose main representatives are sovereign, active, and intelligent individuals. These parameters comprise the subject, the object, the objectives of social management, its decision-making principles, values, nature of management processes, principles of resource management, organizational structure, and technology. On the basis of these parameters, content analysis of the concept of “service” state has been made. It has been found out that this concept reflects the characteristics of the post-industrial paradigm of social management. In particular, the “service” model comprises the basic principles of decision-making and active participation. Citizens as subjects of social management affect the range and content of public services, and society regulates the provision and quality of services by assessing citizens’ level of satisfaction. In their turn, authorities transfer the responsibility for providing services and resources to non-governmental organizations and open networks which make use of the knowledge and experience of their members in order to improve the quality of services.*

*KEY WORDS. Postindustrial sociality, social management, “service” state.*

Public administration reforms which began in the late 1970s – early 1980s in Europe and the USA have acquired an international character. Such changes took place in many countries, different in their political systems and level of development (from Mongolia to the United States) [1, 11]. Russia is also included in the list of the countries undergoing these reforms. The main ideological basis of these changes is the concept of the “service” state which advocates a new approach to the role of government in society. The basic idea of this ideology is that the state is seen as an institution that provides its citizens with quality services. The same ideology applies to the municipal level.

The “service” state is often seen as a state efficiently rendering a number of services, such as: creation of multifunctional centers, provision of services in the electronic form, reduction of the time to receive services. In our opinion, the “service” model deserves scientific analysis from the viewpoint of sociology, and first of all – in terms of its relationship with the modern paradigm of social management. In order to understand the idea of the service model better, we are going to turn to a larger context.

The new paradigm of social management is associated with post-industrial sociality. On the basis of the latter, one can distinguish the following characteristics of social management of the 21<sup>st</sup> century:

1. In post-industrial society the central role is given to the individual [2, 11], [3,30], [4,7]. This premise logically leads to the idea that the role of **the subject of social management** belongs to an active and intelligent person. Since the majority of countries live in an information society and can acquire and accumulate knowledge rather quickly, any citizen is capable of taking part in state government.

2. Sovereign and active individuals’ interaction can only be based on the principles of respect, tolerance, and equality. The importance of these principles is emphasized in scientific literature [5]. Consequently, people can no longer be regarded as **objects of social management**. It is relationships and processes in the state that should be governed, not people.

Change of the object of management brought about re-evaluation of terminology. A number of scientists expressed the view that the term “management” in relation to society was considered unacceptable, and that all the processes related to the impact of a governing body on the community of people should be politically correctly termed “formation” and “regulation” [6]. A good illustration of this opinion can be found within an organization where this terminological shift has already taken place: nowadays the new term “human resource development” is used alongside the old-fashioned term “personnel management” [7].

3. Post-industrial society is oriented towards bringing out the best in its every member. Suppression of individuals or social groups for the sake of strengthening state power or society as a whole is no longer acceptable for a sovereign entity [8]. This fact raises the question of purpose of social management. In scientific literature this purpose is described as creation of conditions conducive to releasing an individual’s creative potential [9, 45], to forming a fully developed personality and to satisfying people’s social needs [10].

4. In a society consisting of individuals, rigid centralization and hierarchical structures are deemed obsolete. According to sociologists, expansion of social relations and interactions inevitably disrupts the idea of subordination and hierarchies typical of bureaucratic government [11, 19]. In this context, the concept of *decision-making principles* comes to the fore. The main principle is that of involvement of members of society in the development and implementation of management decisions, i.e. this principle can be termed the principle of “collective” management.

5. “Collective” management cannot exist without agreement. In this regard, one can introduce the notion of *values* which are meant to unite people and help them arrive at unanimous decisions. Therefore, since modern society is oriented towards releasing a person’s potential, economic or political benefit, traditions and etiquette rules – everything that restricts freedom of expression – it can no longer act as a basis for decision-making. Therefore, values of active management should include moral and cultural norms [12], [13]. It is important to note that in the process of communication different values and modes of behavior are no longer accepted or rejected as given, but they are gradually formed, thus bringing interlocutors closer to one another. In this sense, people’s social qualities may also be included into the set of objects of social management.

6. Absence of subordination and hierarchy eliminates the idea a social system being run by someone from the “above”. Consequently, self-organization becomes one of the vital functions of the system. Expansion of social networks contributes to this. In this regard, one can say that another characteristic of social management is its self-organization and self-regulation.

7. “Collective” management is also based on the availability of resources that belong to society. From this point of view, we also distinguish the principles of co-ownership and co-management of resources.

8. Expansion of social ties, facilitated by modern information and communication technologies, leads to the appearance of organizational structures of a new type. These structures have a network nature, which, in our opinion, does not necessarily imply that the Internet contributes to their development. The main idea of an organizational structure is based on equal status of its members who are regarded as co-partners of interaction. This idea can also be applied to all types of network structures including the state. The state as a member of the network structure is gradually giving more and more of its functions to the structures of civil society.

9. In the context of rapidly changing social processes, management techniques should be innovative in order to facilitate quick adaptation of the society to changing conditions. It should be emphasized that innovations are deemed easy to implement due to a person’s ability to learn and to create [14, 56].

Thus, in our view, social management in post-industrial society can be characterized in terms of the following parameters: the subject, the object, the objectives of management, decision-making principles, values helping to reach agreement, nature of management processes, principles of resource management, organizational structure, and technologies. Having described the parameters of the new paradigm of social management, we would like to turn our attention to the question of whether one can consider the concept of “service” state the embodiment of this paradigm. In order to solve this problem, we are going to give a detailed account of the main peculiarities of the “service” model.

We view “service” social management as a complex phenomenon. Taking into account the definition of a “service” state given by Ya.V. Kozhenkov and A.Yu. Mamycheva, we consider it as a particular form of political organization of public authority which has a special administrative apparatus, is aimed at providing public services to individuals; it is a social and legal system that ensures a person’s rights to life, security, liberty and justice [15, 46]. In such a state we consider it necessary to emphasize the central role of the citizen and the auxiliary role of the government, which is formed to render different kinds of services. These services include creation of such a legal and political environment that could contribute to meeting a person’s needs. The state ceases to be paternalistic: it recognizes the individual’s right to self-determination and creates favourable conditions for self-realization.

Orientation towards citizens’ needs leads to the fact that the types, content and technology of public service rendering depend on social demand [1, 14]. The quality

of service means, first and foremost, citizens’ satisfaction with services rendered by the state [16, 67]. In contrast to the previous paradigm of government, when a state official’s quality of service could be interpreted rather subjectively, the “service” model contains objective parameters and methods for measuring the level of its quality.

The need to change the range and content of services brings about the necessity to improve organizational structures, to reject centralization and bureaucratization in favour of responsiveness and efficiency. This results in flexible modular forms similar to network systems, which also include non-governmental organizations [17], [18, 131]. The network-like character of interaction between an organization and a citizen allows to reveal citizens’ opinions and needs and to make use of their knowledge in order to find ways to meet their needs. This is the essence of co-management. Moreover, a number of services are undergoing the process of demonopolization, which results in handing over control of public services to for-profit corporations (outsourcing).

In summary, we would like to compare the features of the post-industrial paradigm of social management to the characteristics of the “service” state. The post-industrial paradigm characteristics mentioned above will serve as parameters for comparison. Results of the comparison are presented in the table below (see Table 1).

*Table 1*

**Correspondences between the characteristics of the “service” state  
and of the post-industrial paradigm of social management**

<b>Characteristics of the post-industrial paradigm of social management</b>	<b>Characteristics of the concept of the “service” of state</b>
The subject of management is a person, since everyone has the right to participate in the process of management and decision-making	Any citizen can affect the content and quality of public services. It is the citizens who decide what state organizations should do; it concerns not only serving people in general, but also includes a specific range of actions and services
The object of management is social relations which are subject to agreement and expedient ordering	In view of the fact that citizens are becoming the subjects of management, their relationships with the state are aimed at expedient streamlining of public services
The objectives of social management are to create favourable conditions for each individual to help them realize their potential, and to meet their social needs	The main function of public authority is to render quality services that would meet individuals’ and society’ needs
The basic principle of social management is absence of hierarchy which results in people’s equal involvement into the process of management	The state does not prevail upon its citizens, it recognizes its role of a “service” organization
The values that people are guided by in a decision-making process are humanistic	The main criterion in the adoption and implementation of management decisions is citizens’ and society’s satisfaction

Characteristics of the post-industrial paradigm of social management	Characteristics of the concept of the “service” of state
Management processes are based on self-organization and self-regulation	Taking into account their needs, citizens determine the range and quality of services; they initiate and regulate service rendition by means of assessment of their own level of satisfaction
“Collective” management entails the principle of co-ownership and co-management	Public services are being demonopolized, their powers and resources are transferred to non-governmental organizations
Organizational structures within which the state and society interact have a network structure	The state is one of the members of the network alongside businesses, non-profit organizations and citizens. Formation of open networks is part of the program aimed at improving the quality of public services by identifying community needs and mobilizing the knowledge and resources of network members
Innovations in management technology are considered necessary	Implementation of the model of the “service” state is associated with a number of innovations: conceptual, organizational, and operational.

On the basis of the above-mentioned, we can draw the following conclusions:

1. Modern social management is oriented towards meeting a person’s and society’s needs and towards involvement of members of the society in the development and implementation of management decisions.

2. The concept of the “service” state reflects characteristics of the post-industrial paradigm of social management. According to this model, the role of state and municipal government is to provide public services to citizens, thereby satisfying their needs. The main principles of the “service” state are defined by citizens themselves who take active part in determining the type and scope of services rendered. They assess the quality of services on the basis of the level of society’s satisfaction. Another principle of the “service” state lies in the fact that governmental structures hand over control of public services to non-governmental organizations. And last but not least, people join open networks and share their knowledge and experience in order to improve the quality of services.

3. Social management in post-industrial society can be characterized in terms of the following parameters: the subject, the object, the objectives of management, decision-making principles, values helping to reach agreement, nature of management processes, principles of resources management, organizational structure, and technology. All these parameters fully coincide with the characteristics of the “service” state.

#### REFERENCES

1. Monitoring v sisteme okazaniya gosudarstvennyh i municipal’nyh uslug kak instrument realizatsii strategii povysheniya kachestva gosudarstvennogo i municipal’nogo upravleniya

[Monitoring in the system of state and municipal services as a tool to implement strategies to improve the quality of state and municipal government]. Moscow, 2008. URL: [http:// www.penza.ru/files/monitoring.pdf](http://www.penza.ru/files/monitoring.pdf). (in Russian).

2. Jahimovich, Z.P. *Cennostnye orientiry i priority v transformirujushemsja mire* [Values and priorities in a transforming world]. Moscow, 2010. Pp. 9-28. (in Russian).

3. Efremenko, D.V. [Abstract] *Social'nye i gumanitarnye nauki. Otechestvennaja i zarubeznaja literature* [Social Sciences and Humanities. National and foreign literature]. 2008. Ser. 11. № 3. Pp. 30-38. Ref. art.: Sztompka P. New perspectives on trust: Rev. essay. *American journal of sociology*. 2006. Vol. 112. № 3. Pp. 905-919. (in Russian).

4. Efremenko, D.V. [Abstract]. *Social'nye i gumanitarnye nauki. Otechestvennaja i zarubeznaja literatura* [Social Sciences and Humanities. National and foreign literature]. 2008. № 3. Pp. 5-11. Ref. art.: Touraine A. *Sociology after sociology*. *European journal of social theory*. Brighton, 2007. № 10 (2). Pp. 184-193. (in Russian).

5. Orlov, M.O. *Social'naja dinamika: filosofsko-metodologicheskie osnovanija diskursivnogo upravljenija v uslovijah globalizacii* (Avtoref. diss. kand.) [Social dynamics: the philosophical and methodological foundations of discursive management in the context of globalization (Diss. Cand.)]. Saratov, 2009. 42 p. (in Russian).

6. Urzha, O.A. *Social management: challenges and opportunities*. *Jelektronnaja biblioteka Sociologicheskogo fakul'teta MGU im. M. V. Lomonosova — Digital Library of the Sociology Department of Moscow State University in the honour of M.V. Lomonosov*. Moscow, 2003-2004. URL: <http://lib.socio.msu.ru/library?a=q&r=1&hs=1&e=p-000-00---0kongress--00-0-0-0prompt-10---4-----0-11--1-ru-50---20-about---00031-001-1-0windowsZz-1251-00&h=stx&t=1&q=%F1%EE%F6%E8%E0%EB%FC%ED%EE%E5+%F3%EF%F0%E0%E2%E B%E5%ED%E8%E5>. (in Russian).

7. Kvashenko N.S. *Coaching in the development and use of human resources* [Kouching v razvitii i ispol'zovanii chelovecheskih resursov]. *Chelovecheskie resursy kak factor jekonomicheskogo razvitija: M-ly 2 Sibirskogo kadrovogo foruma* (Human resources as a factor of economic development: materials of the II Siberian human resources forum). Novosibirsk, 2009. Pp. 303-306. (in Russian).

8. Touraine, A. *Sociology without society* // The Institute for Sociology of Russian Academy of Sciences: official website. Moscow, 2007. URL: <http://www.isras.ru/files/File/Socis/2004-07/tourain.pdf> (30.11.2010). (in Russian).

9. Bekov, H.A. *Ocenka personala upravlenija (teoriya i praktika)* [Evaluation of staff management (theory and practice)]. Moscow, 2002. 364 p. (in Russian).

10. Stojanov, A. *Social management and global information space: problems, prospects and social responsibility* // Digital Library of the Sociology Department of Moscow State University in honour of M.V. Lomonosov. Moscow, 2003-2004. URL: <http://lib.socio.msu.ru/library> (дата обращения: 03.01.2011). (date of address: 03.01.2011). (in Russian).

11. Potehin, V.A. *Improvement of power relations as a condition for the modernization of management activity*. *Vlast*. 2010. № 6. Pp. 18-22. (in Russian).

12. Chekushov, A.A. *Social management of the region: value interaction. Jekonomika regiona — The economy of the region*. 2007. № 18. December (part. 2). Vladimir. URL: <http://journal.vlsu.ru/index.php?id=868>. (in Russian).

13. Akulich, M.M. *The concept of social agreement* // Digital Library of the Sociology Department of Moscow State University in honour of M.V. Lomonosov. Moscow, 2003-2004. URL: <http://lib.socio.msu.ru/library> (in Russian).

14. Basov, N.V. Stanovlenie i razvitie innovacii v processe samoorganizacii social'nyh sistem (Diss. kand.) [The formation and development of innovations in the process of self-organization of social systems (Diss. Cand.)]. Saint-Petersburg, 2009. 214 p. (in Russian).

15. Kozhenko, Ja.V., Mamychev, A.Ju. Service state: challenges of theory and practice of implementation. *Vlast*. 2010. № 3. Pp. 44-46. (in Russian).

16. Maslov, D.V. CAF model to improve the quality of public management. *Gosudarstvennaja sluzhba — Public service*. 2009. № 6. Pp. 67-69. (in Russian).

17. Gaponenko, A.L. The implementation of new management technologies in regional and municipal management // The Department of Management of the Russian Academy of Public Administration under the President of the Russian Federation // URL: <http://www.koism.rags.ru/publ/articles/03.php>. (in Russian).

18. Dubrovin, Yu. New directions of modern administration reforms in the leading countries of the European Union. *Vlast*. 2009. № 1. Pp. 131-134. (in Russian).

19. Kotljarov, I.D. The use of outsourcing of management activities in the Russian Federation. *Voprosy gosudarstvennogo i municipal'nogo upravlenija — The issues of public and municipal administration*. 2012. № 2. Pp. 112-120. (in Russian).