

ORIGINAL PAPER



DOI: 10.26794/2304-022X-2023-13-1-95-105

UDC 658(091)(045)

JEL B20, N01, Y80

History of Management Thought in the Works of Domestic Authors: Essential Characteristics of the Subject of Study in the History of Management Thought

I.V. Dvoluchansky

Lomonosov Moscow State University. M.V. Lomonosov, Moscow, Russia

ABSTRACT

The aim of this work is to identify the essential characteristics of the subject of the history of management thought (HMT) in the works of domestic authors, published in the period from 1985 to 2022. To achieve this task, the following problems were solved: the works of leading scientists on this topic, who formulated their own position on the subject of HMT research, were analyzed. Three essential characteristics of the subject of HMT research were identified; a critical analysis of the essential characteristics of the subject of HMT research was carried out. During the study, such approaches as analysis, synthesis, and comparison were used. The current formulation of the research subject of HMT as a science was critically analyzed, and the identified essential characteristics of the HMT. The subject can be the basis for further development of HMT research in specific areas. This approach to the understanding of the subject of HMT research may serve the further development of historical-management research and consolidation of HMT as a separate scientific discipline.

Keywords: history of management thought; history of management; subject of research of the history of management thought; subject of research of the history of management; methodology of the history of management thought; management; organization management; organization

For citation: Dvoluchansky I.V. History of management thought in the works of domestic authors: Essential characteristics of the subject of study in the history of management thought. *Management sciences*. 2023;13(1):95-105. DOI: 10.26794/2304-022X-2023-13-1-95-105

INTRODUCTION

This paper analyzes the different points of view of domestic scholars on the subject of the history of management thought (HMT). Between 1985 and 2022, more than two hundred works of various kinds were published in the Russian academic environment directly devoted to HMT. D.N. Bobryshev, S.P. Sementsov [1] and V.I. Marshev [2] were the authors of some of the first publications in which this field of knowledge was specifically studied as a scientific discipline. These works have attracted the attention of the scientific community to the study of the history of management thought, and in 2010 HMT was included in the basic syllabus of the bachelor training program in management as a major.¹

¹ Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation of 20.05.2010 No. 544 "On Approval and Enactment of the Federal State Educational Standard of

The accumulated research material illustrates the evolution of HMT from a simple sum of knowledge to an independent science based on one of the basic distinguishing criteria — the presence of its own dedicated subject of study. Therefore, this article examines the views of Russian scholars on this fundamental notion that forms and determines HMT as a science.

The object of this study is the domestic works devoted to HMT from 1985 to 2022. The bulk of the analysis is made up of tutorial works due to their quantitative predominance over works of research nature and their more widespread coverage of the audience. All the works analyse only the author's position on the basics of the scientific discipline being studied — the HMT. For these reasons,

Higher Professional Education in the Field of Training 080200 Management (Qualification [Degree] "Bachelor"). URL: <https://base.garant.ru/5638395/>

tutorials are an important part of the object of this study.

The article analyses the authors' reflection on the essence of what is the history of managerial thought and what exactly it studies, i.e., it examines the process of changing scientific views on the subject of HMT research. Thus, the subject of the research in this paper is the process of changing scientific views on the subject of the history of managerial thought research.

Based on the above, the research question is formulated: what essential characteristics are present in the definition of the subject of HMT research in the works of Russian scientists?

The aim of the work is to identify the essential characteristics in the subject of HMT research in the works of Russian authors. In order to achieve the research goal, the following tasks were solved: the works of leading authors on this topic, who have formulated their own position on the subject of HMT research, were analyzed; the essential characteristics of the subject of HMT research in these works were identified; a critical analysis of the identified essential characteristics of the subject of HMT research was conducted.

WORKS FROM THE LATE 1980S AND EARLY 1990S.

From the very first works devoted to the history of managerial thought, a scientific discussion about the content and formulation of its subject of research of the history of management thought began. Thus, in one of the first works devoted to HMT, namely the 1985 textbook by D.N. Bobryshev and S.P. Sementsov, the authors draw attention to the existence of the HMT's own subject of research [1, p. 6]. At the same time, they do not give a definitive formulation and explain that "the subject of research can be ultimately determined only in the process of a consistent study of the history of managerial thought." [1, p. 6].

D.N. Bobryshev and S.P. Sementsov explain the complexity of this path by the interdisciplinarity of HMT: "Many branches of science have contributed

significantly to it: philosophy, political economy, specific economics, cybernetics, mathematics, sociology, psychology, technical sciences". [1, p. 6]. In addition, they note that this problem is also associated with some partial borrowing and use of ideas about management in related disciplines, such as "history of philosophy, history of political economy, history of economic doctrines, history of political and legal doctrines". [1, p. 7].

It should be noted that the mere fixation of having a separate subject of research in the history of management thought without introducing a precise formulation is in itself a contribution to the development of science, as it opens up a problem field for future HMT research.

In 1987, V.I. Marshev's textbook "The History of Managerial Thought" was published. [2]. In the first edition, the author expressed a deep understanding of the essence, structure, and research process of the chosen field of knowledge. In particular, he was the first to define HMT, which became the basic definition: "By the history of the science of management of social production (history of managerial thought), we understand either the process of the emergence, development, struggle, and change of the knowledge system (teachings, concepts, views, ideas, notions and judgments) on the organization of managing social production (in general or specific problems) of representatives of all classes, estates and social strata of different specific-historic social-economic formations or the system of scientific knowledge on these processes". [2, p. 7].

In addition, V.I. Marshev singled out a separate scientific field in HMT, namely the history of management (HM) of social production: "By the history of management of social production we mean either the process of emergence, development and change of specific management systems (or their individual elements) and the organization of management of social production in specific historical conditions in the past, or the totality of scientific results (knowledge) about these processes". [2, p. 7]. At the same time, the two

mentioned disciplines are not opposed to each other, but, on the contrary, as the author emphasises: "... the real managerial activity and the development of knowledge about it are interconnected and interdependent". [2, p. 8].

The formulations of HMT and HM implicitly answer the question of *what these disciplines investigate and research*, and it can be argued that they also contain ideas about *what the subjects of the study* in the history of managerial thought are. In this context, this author's definitions will hereafter be regarded as formulations of directly HMT research subjects.

The analysis of V.I. Marshev's definitions of HMT and HM shows the presence in them of an essential characteristic of the subject of research in HMT, which is the basis for the existence of the two subjects of research in one science: the study of changes in management practice and the study of changes in ideas about management.

It is also important to pay attention to the fact that the author's formulations contain a certain kinetic component, i.e., V.I. Marshev refers to the phenomenon under study as a dynamic, rather than statistic object. Not only does he declare the changes in the subject, but he also implements this interpretation throughout the text of the manual, and even formulates his original interpretation of the science of history of management thought, stressing that "the most ancient and traditional subject of the history of science — is the development of scientific knowledge, including the development of knowledge of scientific methods". [2, p. 21].

Thus, in the definitions of V.I. Marshev we have identified the two essential characteristics of the subject of HMT research: the first essential characteristic of the subject of HMT research is associated with the duality of the subject of research, which is expressed in the presence of two areas of knowledge: the study of changes in ideas about management — the history of management thought and the study of changes in management practice — the history of management; the second essential

characteristic of the subject of HMT research is associated with the kinetic property of the subject of the research, which is expressed in the dynamic or static nature of the phenomenon under research.

Analysis of the above formulations shows that with regard to the first essential characteristic of the subject of HMT study, the author's position is to separate the phenomenon under study into two subjects of research, and with regard to the second essential characteristic — to consider the dynamics of the change.

DEVELOPMENT OF VIEWS IN THE WORKS OF V.I. MARSEV

In 2005, a new textbook was published by V.I. Marshev, which is a logical continuation of the 1987 manual. [3]. In it, the author provides basic definitions of the two subjects of HMT and HM research, included in the definitions of the two sciences: the history of management thought and the history of management. "The history of organizational management is understood as either the process of emergence, development, struggle and change of specific organizational management systems (or their individual elements) under specific historical conditions in the past, or the system of scientific knowledge about these processes".

"The history of managerial thought is understood as either a process of emergence, development, struggle and change of doctrines, concepts, theories, views, ideas, perceptions of organization management (in general or in its separate functional areas) in various specific-historical conditions, or a system of scientific knowledge about these processes". [3, p. 20]. Comparing the definitions of sciences in both editions of the textbook, it should be noted that in the latter the author's attitude to the two essential characteristics of the subject of HMT research is preserved.

The socio-political paradigm shift that took place between these publications (1987 and 2005) was reflected in the formulations of HMT and HM. There was a clarification of what should be meant by "the object of managerial influence". The "social

production (as a whole or of individual problems)” and “the representatives of all classes, estates and social strata of various specific-historical socio-economic formations” [2, p. 20] has been replaced by the laconic “management of an organisation (as a whole or in its individual functional areas)” [3, p. 20].

Based on the reinterpretation of the basic definition of the HMT science and the introduction of the new terms, namely “management of organization”, V.I. Marshev specifies what is meant by the new definitions and determines the concept of management as an activity and the concept of an organization as an object of managerial influence: “This textbook will deal with the history of ideas of management of any social object. The object of management will be understood as an organisation as a set of two or more people united by common goals, using different kinds of resources, transforming resources into products (goods and services) and exchanging (selling) products for the necessary resources to maintain its existence and development. The management of an organization will be understood as a deliberate purposeful impact on the organization”. [3, p. 10].

A new version of the textbook by the same author was published in 2010 [4]. As with the previous edition, the definition of the history of managerial thought remains the same. In the formulation of the term “history of organizational management” there is a clarification that one should observe not only the changes in the management system of an organization, but also management relations in general: “The history of organizational management means either the process of emergence, development, struggle and change of specific management systems (or their individual elements) and management relations in organisations under specific historical conditions in the past, or the system of scientific knowledge about these processes”. [4, p. 31].

Although there are no significant changes in the formulations of the terms HMT and HM, V.I. Marshev clarifies the definitions of what he understands by the “organisation” and “organisation

management”. In particular, he emphasises that the management impact is not only purposeful, but it also has a systemic nature: “...organization management will be understood as a conscious purposeful systemic impact on the organization”. [4, p. 13].

The new understanding of the organisation expressed by the author of the textbook (in contrast to the formulation in the 2005 edition) implies its division into two components: organisation in its static form and in its dynamic form. “An organisation in its static form is a collection of at least two individuals who share a common purpose and a formalised structure. The term ‘structure’ refers to the set of elements and the links between them. In other words, in any particular organisation there is only one group of elements (individuals) with two attributive characteristics — the purpose and its formalised structure”. [4, p. 13].

“Organisation in its dynamic form is the purposeful interaction of individuals and/or the performance by individuals of their roles according to the agreed rules (prescribed in the structure). Organisation in its dynamic form is the “life of the organization” manifested in the implementation of the following key roles: Searching for resources; Converting resources into products: Goods/services; Sharing products with other organisations or individuals. These activities require purposeful influence on the members of the organisation, enable the achievement of the goals set, the achievement of the results and, ultimately, the functioning of the organization”. [4, p. 27].

In 2021, V.I. Marshev published not only a new version of the textbook “History of Management Thought”. (Russian edition) [5], but also its authorised English-language translation “History of Management Thought” [6]. In this textbook, the author continued to develop his ideas related to the development of basic problems of historical-management studies and, for the first time, he directly formulated the subjects of HMT and HM studies. In previous editions, V.I. Marshev did not explicitly highlight them, but the author’s

understanding of the subjects of HMT and HM research was implicitly present. Based on the formulations defining the sciences of HMT and HM and the context of the textbook narrative, it was clear how the author understood the subjects of HMT and HM research. Explicitly in the new edition of the textbook, these formulations became the following: “The subject of management history (as a science) is the process of emergence, development, struggle and change of specific management systems of an organisation (or their individual elements) and management relations in organisations under specific historical conditions in the past. <...> the subject of the history of managerial thought (as a science) is a process of emergence, development, struggle and change of doctrines, concepts, theories, views, ideas, perceptions of organisation management (as a whole or its separate functional areas) under different specific-historical conditions”. [5, p. 45].

In the same edition, V.I. Marshev formulated eight key terms, among which he introduced the three new ones: “the subject of the history of management thought”, “the subject of the history of organizational management” and “the historiography of historical management research”; the terms “organization”, “organisation model”, “history of organisational management” and “history of management thought” were left unchanged. At the same time, the understanding of “management of the organization” has been supplemented. The new version adds five more characteristics to the basic characteristics of “management impact on the organization” (which are “purposeful” and “systemic”): “conscious”, “meaningful”, “legitimate”, “permanent”, “responsible” [5, p. 25].

An analysis of all of Professor Marshev’s aforementioned works has shown us a consistent evolution of the scholar’s views on the subject of HMT research and the presence of essential characteristics in it.

The first essential characteristic of the subject of HMT research concerns the presence of a duality in the phenomenon under study — the practice of

real management and (vs.) ideas about this practice. This duality gives rise to the need for the author to clarify exactly what the history of managerial thought explores. It is difficult to study this phenomenon in its entirety. Therefore, V.I. Marshev solves this problem by dividing HMT into two very close, yet different, subjects of research. The author believes that in the history of managerial thought as a science, there are two subjects of research simultaneously: the subject of research directly into the history of managerial thought—exploring the change in ideas about management, and the subject of research into the history of management—exploring the change in the practice of managerial activity.

The second essential characteristic of the subject of HMT research, which can be traced in V.I. Marshev’s formulation, is the emphasis on the dynamic nature of the phenomenon under study. The author proposes to investigate ideas about governance by studying the dynamics of transformation and change of ideas about different elements and aspects of governance. Simultaneously examining not only the current idea, but also what preceded it, what has changed with it in parallel through an understanding of what possible context the idea under study is part of. The author extends a similar approach to the subject of management history research, applying it to changes in specific management systems (or the implementation of management impact) in specific organisations.

THE RESEARCH FRAMEWORK IN THE WORK OF E.B. KORITSKY

Next, let us pay attention to the works of E.B. Koritskiy, which made a significant contribution to the development of historical-management sciences, the history of economic doctrines and the science of management. In the works written in 1989–1990, the author did not specify what exactly the history of managerial thought studies. However, his analysis of the author’s term “Soviet managerial thought — SMT” indicates that the latter

contains the essential characteristics of the modern understanding of HMT.

In the 1989 work by Y.A. Lavrikov and E.B. Koritsky “The Problems of the Development of the Management Theory of Socialist Production”. [7], the authors formulate the prerequisites for understanding the subject and tasks of SMT research: “Today the task is to thoroughly study the most complicated process of emergence and development of Soviet managerial thought (SMT), a process evolving in stable dependence on the changes taking place in the productive forces, production relations and superstructure, that is subject to its own objective laws and to the unfolding in an acute polemical struggle of ideas, views, concepts and teachings”. [7, p. 3]. And in 1990, E.B. Koritskiy, Yu. A. Lavrikov and A. M. Omarov proposed that the subject of SMT research should be “the process of managerial thought movement reflecting the regularities of the formation and development of socialist economic management relations” [8]. [8, p. 5].

In this formulation of SMT there are already the signs of the modern understanding of HMT, which allows us to say that their essential ideas are identical. The analysis reveals that the first essential characteristic of the subject, namely the division into the study of management practices and ideas about management, is missing. At the same time, the second essential characteristic — the kinetic aspect of the phenomenon under study — is presented by E.B. Koritsky and his coauthors explicitly and is characterised by them as having a dynamic character.

It should be noted separately that the definition of the subject of SMT research proposed by E.B. Koritsky and his co-authors in the 1990 paper indicates the presence of the concept of “regularity” (consistency) in it. The assertion of the “regular nature” of the development of this or that phenomenon requires at least a primary scientific justification, which leads to the necessity of choosing a research position on the issue in question. The study of the *change of ideas* and the patterns and regularity of their change are on

different levels of cognition, the latter being derived from the former. The theses on the derivative elements of scientific research included in the definition of the subject of HMT research provide a basis for identifying the third essential characteristic of the subject of HMT research.

DEVELOPING A COMPREHENSIVE UNDERSTANDING OF THE SUBJECT OF HMT RESEARCH

The third essential characteristic of the subject of research is nothing more than the author’s position on the derivative elements of historical research, and a striking example of the presence of the third essential characteristic in the subject of research is the book by S.I. Smetanin “The History of Entrepreneurship in Russia” published in 2002. [9]. It states that “the history of entrepreneurship is the science of the patterns of development of entrepreneurship.” [9, p. 7]. The author argues that the history of entrepreneurship is part of economic history. Therefore, the author considers the regularities of entrepreneurship development in the context of changes in the specific historical conditions of the economic activity [9, p. 7].

The second essential characteristic of S.I. Smetanin’s HMT subject of research is evident in his approach to the material under study, namely through his authorial choice towards the study of dynamic processes of entrepreneurship development: “...entrepreneurship is a process, a development, and the current condition is only a moment of the process. If you do not know the course of economic development, it is impossible to see its direction, it is impossible to determine the consequences of certain economic decisions”. [9, p. 8].

The first essential characteristic is not explicitly recorded in Smetanin’s methodological framework. However, the analysis of the content of this work through the prism of modern understanding of HMT illustrates that it is a study of the practice of managerial activity. Thus, the work is devoted to the study of one of the subjects of the history

of managerial thought, namely the history of management (HM).

In 2004, Lomonosov Moscow State University Press published a textbook by V. G. Fedorov, M.Y. Yakimov, and N.V. Fedorov "From the History of Management (Theory and Practice of Management)". [10]. The authors argue that "the subject of the research and study of the history of management is managerial thought" [10, p. 3]. This formulation reflects a different point of view from the previously discussed works on the second essential characteristic of the subject of HMT research. The authors use a static model when formulating the subject of HMT — "managerial thought"; such a semantic construction lacks the emphasis on the fact that managerial thought is subject to changes in general, and in specific historical conditions in particular.

A.V. Vinogradov expresses a similar idea about the subject of HMT research in his textbook "The History of Management": "The history of management has its own subject of study, it is managerial thought" [11, p. 9] and adds that "the history of management operates with the same categories and concepts as the science of management". [11, p. 9].

The monograph "Joint Stock Companies in Russia: XIX — early XX century" by L.E. Shepelev stands out in some way from the mass of studied works on the subject. [12], in which the subject of the study is defined as "regularities of the development process of joint-stock companies". [12, p. 13]. Based on this short formulation, we can draw a number of conclusions. Firstly, although the author does not explicitly state it, he explores management practices directly, i.e., management history (HM). Secondly, he emphasises changes in management practice, calling it a "process of development...". Thirdly, along with E.B. Koritsky and S.I. Smetanin, L.E. Shepelev's formulation of the subject contains a reference to "regularities of the development process". Taken together, this tells us that the author's view of the three essential

characteristics of the subject of HMT is given in his formulation of the subject.

Along with the above-mentioned authors, A.V. Raichenko in his work "History of Management" [13] also includes derivative elements in the subject of HMT research, namely: "historical relations, cause-effect relationships and dependencies of chronologically positioned phenomena and events". [13, p. 9]. In other words, the author understands the subject of research to mean: "...the relevance of identifying, researching, and presenting exactly... the logic of causal transformations of emergence, formation and development of professional organisation management". [13, p. 6].

Attention should be drawn to the works of scholars from the Russian State University for the Humanities (RSUH), created with the participation of RSUH professor N.V. Ovchinnikova. The textbook "The World History of Management Thought" [14] does not explicitly formulate the subject of research in the stated field of knowledge. Analyzing the material presented by the authors, we can conclude that they study the history of public administration, emphasizing the practice of management. Thus, based on the first essential characteristic of the subject matter of HMT (the dualistic nature of this subject matter), it can be argued that this paper is devoted more to the study of HM than to HMT.

The book by I. N. Makashov and N.V. Ovchinnikova "Managerial Thought in Western Europe, the USA and Japan (XIX–XX centuries)" [15] was published in 2011. As in the previous work, it does not define the subject of research in the stated field of knowledge. However, the analysis of the presented material shows the authors' attention drifting from the study of management practices towards the study of management ideas within the territorial and temporal limits they set. In this regard, it can be argued that this paper contains the first essential characteristic of the subject of HMT research.

In addition, in comparison with the previous work, the second essential characteristic of the subject of HMT research began to emerge. The

authors emphasized the dynamic nature of the phenomenon under study: “For modern management as a social institution, it is important to consistently consider the process of origin, formation, development of managerial thought, accumulation of managerial knowledge...”. [15, p. 6].

In subsequent works of the representatives of the RSUH academic school, namely in the textbook “History of Managerial Thought” (2013) [16] and the book “Managerial Thought in Russia (IX – early XXI centuries)” (2016) [17] the authors formulate the definition of what is meant by the history of managerial thought [17 p. 9]. At that, the expressed formulations coincide with the definitions of V. I. Marshev [3, p. 20]. Thus, the study of the development of ideas about the essence of HMT within the scientific school of RSUH leads to the conclusion that the understanding of the essential characteristics of the subject of HMT research, formulated by V. I. Marshev, began to be shared by the representatives of the RSUH school in their subsequent works.

The influence of Professor Marshev’s ideas can also be seen in the works of other authors. In particular, R.Sh. Zakirov in his textbook “Management Theory. History of managerial thought”. [18] gives his own formulation of the subject of HMT research, which has many points of overlap with the definition of V. I. Marshev set out by him in the textbook “History of Managerial Thought” [3]: “The history of managerial thought is understood as a process unfolding in space and time of emergence, development, struggle and change of doctrines, concepts, theories, views, ideas, perceptions of organisation management in various specific-historical conditions and the practical managerial decisions and actions related to them”. [18, p. 4].

The search for the subject of HMT research is continued by I. I. Semenova. In her work, the author focuses on the first essential characteristic: the duality of the subject of HMT research. She captures the subject matter of her field of study in her work “The History of Management”: “The history of

management has its own subject of study — the theory and practice of management”. [19, p. 5]. It is important to emphasize that this seemingly insignificant example reflects the presence of scientific debate on the essence of the subject of HMT research. Its duality forces researchers to decide on the author’s position on what HMT studies: the practice of management activity, management thought about this practice or all together in the context of historical changes.

There is no less striking controversy about the second essential characteristic of the subject of HMT research — the kinetic properties of the phenomenon under study. The textbook by V. D. Golikov and V. A. Kolesnikov “Theory, Methodology and History of Management” (2011) [20] talks about the dynamic nature of scientific views on management, which allows us to see in it “not just the structure of knowledge in its static form or dynamic form, not just the difference between this knowledge and many others similar or close to it, but the connection, continuity between the knowledge or different schools of knowledge. And then the history of management appears as an organised, systematised self-movement of knowledge, because the sources, driving forces, motives of movement and development are rooted in it. Without this, any historical process is simply the sum of conditions”. [20, p. 8–9].

V. D. Golikov and V. A. Kolesnikov emphasise that the history of management should be considered precisely in the context of the development of management ideas, thus fixing their authorial choice. The resulting knowledge, according to the authors, must meet four requirements: “...as an organic totality of structural components, as an internally connected and functioning whole, as a system; ...in terms of process, i.e., a set of historical relations and dependencies of its internal components following each other in time; in terms of identifying and fixing qualitative changes in its structure as a whole; in terms of revealing the regularities of its development, laws of transition from a separate historical state of knowledge to

Table

**The result of the analysis of the essential characteristics of the subject
of the ISM research in the works of domestic authors**

The essential characteristics of the subject of the HMT study	Variants of the author's position	Authors
The first essential characteristic of the subject of HMT research: the duality of the subject	Two subjects of research	V.I. Marshev; I.I. Semenova
	One subject of research	E.B. Koritskiy, Yu.A. Lavrikov, A.M. Omarov; S.I. Smetanin; V.G. Fedorov, M. Ya. Yakimov, N.V. Fedorova; A.V. Vinogradova; L.E. Shepelev; N.V. Ovchinnikova, I.N. Makashov, O. Yu. Artemov, K.A. Chistyakova, S.A. Ovchinnikov, A.V. Kozhanov; R. Sh. Zakirov; A.V. Raichenko; A.A. Rudskiy; L.V. Sekretova; E.P. Kostenko; E.V. Mikhalkina
The second essential characteristic of the HMT subject: the kinetic property of the subject	Statics	S.I. Smetanin; V.G. Fedorov, M. Ya. Yakimov, N.V. Fedorova; A.V. Vinogradova; I.I. Semenova; A.V. Raichenko
	Dynamics	V.I. Marshev; E.B. Koritskiy, Yu.A. Lavrikov, A.M. Omarov, A.I. Vasyukov; L.E. Shepelev; N.V. Ovchinnikova, I.N. Makashov, O. Yu. Artemov, K.A. Chistyakova, S.A. Ovchinnikov, A.V. Kozhanov; R. Sh. Zakirov; V.D. Golikov, V.A. Kolesnikov; A.A. Rudskiy, L.V. Sekretov; E.P. Kostenko, E.V. Mikhalkina
The third essential characteristic of HMT's subject of study: the relation to the derivative elements of historical enquiry	Derivative elements	E.B. Koritskiy, Yu.A. Lavrikov, A.M. Omarov; S.I. Smetanin; L.E. Shepelev; A.V. Raichenko
	No derivative elements are present	V.I. Marshev; V.G. Fedorov; M. Ya. Yakimov; N.V. Fedorova; A.V. Vinogradova; N.V. Ovchinnikova; I.N. Makashov; O. Yu. Artemov, K.A. Chistyakova, S.A. Ovchinnikov, A.V. Kozhanov; I.I. Semenova; R. Sh. Zakirov; V.D. Golikov; V.A. Kolesnikov; A.A. Rudskiy; L.V. Sekretov; E.P. Kostenko; E.V. Mikhalkina

Source: compiled by the author.

another historical state with new knowledge". [20, p. 10].

It is worth paying attention to A.A. Rudsky's and L.V. Sekretova's vision of the subject of research in "History of Management Thought" (2012): "the subject of the history of management doctrine is the study of the evolution process of management as knowledge in general and as a scientific discipline in particular". [21, p. 4]. Despite the conciseness of the formulation, it captures the presence of two essential characteristics of the subject of HMT research. Scholars do not choose to study the practice of management (the first essential characteristic of HMT), but study management knowledge in a dynamic context (the second essential characteristic of the subject of HMT).

A similar point of view is expressed in the textbook by E.P. Kostenko and E.V. Mikhalkina "The History of Management" (2014) [22]. The authors distinguish the subject of the discipline as follows: "The process of emergence, development, struggle and change of managerial ideas at all stages of historical development". [22, p. 9]. It is important to note that E.P. Kostenko and E.V. Mikhalkina emphasise the need to study the second essence aspect of the subject of study exactly in its dynamics, since "without this, any historical process is a simple sum of conditions" [22, p. 12]. This formulation of the subject of research demonstrates the author's choice in three essential characteristics: the study of ideas about governance, in dynamics, without derivative elements.

CONCLUSIONS

The fact that there is an ongoing accumulation of educational, methodological and research works on the history of managerial thought suggests the need for their theoretical understanding and conceptualisation. The development of methodological problems, the most important of which is the formulation of the subject of research, is the primary task for the further development of this scientific field. The consolidation of the subject matter of the history of managerial thought into a separate field of knowledge is necessary to determine the final status of the discipline.

As a result of the analysis of the works of leading scholars, who set out their positions on the subject of HMT research in the author's texts, the three essential characteristics of the subject of HMT research were identified.

The first intrinsic characteristic of the subject of HMT research — is the duality of the subject. It is revealed either through the division into two subjects of study within the same work — such as ideas about management and management practice in a particular

organisation — or by the study of one of these subjects.

The second essential characteristic of the subject of HMT research — is the kinetic property of the phenomenon under study, which is expressed in the dynamic or static nature of the phenomenon under study. The study of changes in management ideas and changes in management practices in a particular organisation can be considered a manifestation of dynamics in the subject of study. In the absence of a focus on these changes, the subject is studied as a static object.

The third essential characteristic of the subject of HMT research — is the author's position with regard to the derivative elements of historical inquiry. To such elements we refer any statements about cause-effect relations, expressed by the authors through "regularities" or any other semantic constructions. Judgements about the regular nature of historical events are derivative conclusions, and in such cases should follow first from an analysis of changing historical events.

The opinions and contributions of the academic authors of the papers reviewed in this study are presented in the *Table*.

REFERENCES

1. Bobryshev D.N., Sementsov S.P. History of managerial thought. Moscow: Academy of National Economy under the Council of Ministers of the USSR; 1985. 138 p. (In Russ.).
2. Marshev V.I. History of managerial thought. Moscow: Moscow State Historical and Archival Institute; 1987. 238 p. (In Russ.).
3. Marshev V.I. History of managerial thought. Moscow: Infra-M; 2005. 731 p. (In Russ.).
4. Marshev V.I. History of managerial thought. Moscow: MAKS Press; 2010. 648 p. (In Russ.).
5. Marshev V.I. History of managerial thought. Moscow: Prospekt; 2021. 944 p. (In Russ.).
6. Marshev V. History of management thought. Cham: Springer-Verlag; 2021. 710 p. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-62337-1
7. Lavrikov Yu.A., Koritskii E.B. Problems of development of the theory of management of socialist production. Leningrad: Leningrad University Press; 1989. 272 p. (In Russ.).
8. Koritskii E.B., Lavrikov Yu.A., Omarov A.M. Soviet management thought of the 20s. Brief name guide. Moscow: Ekonomika; 1990. 233 p. (In Russ.).
9. Smetanin S.I. History of entrepreneurship in Russia. Lecture course. Moscow: Paleotip; Logos; 2002. 196 p. (In Russ.).
10. Fedorov V.G., Yakimov M. Ya., Fedorova N.V. From the history of management (theory and practice of management). Moscow: Moscow State University Publ.; 2004. 139 p. (In Russ.).

11. Vinogradova A.V. History of management. Smolensk: Smolensk Center for Scientific and Technical Information; 2005. 180 p. (In Russ.).
12. Shepelev L.E. Joint stock companies in Russia: XIX — early XX century. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State University Publ.; 2006. 604 p. (In Russ.).
13. Raichenko A.V. History of management. Moscow: The State University of Management Publ.; 2015. 61 p. (In Russ.).
14. Makashov I.N., Ovchinnikova N.V. World history of managerial thought: A short course. Moscow: Russian State University for the Humanities; 2007. 672 p. (In Russ.).
15. Makashov I.N., Ovchinnikova N.V. Management thought of Western Europe, USA and Japan (XIX–XX centuries). Moscow: Sputnik+; 2011. 744 p. (In Russ.).
16. Ovchinnikova N. V., Makashov I. N., Artemov O. Yu., Chistyakova K. A., Ovchinnikov S. A., Kozhanova A.V. History of managerial thought. Moscow: Russian State University for the Humanities; 2013. 688 p. (In Russ.).
17. Makashov I.N., Ovchinnikova N. V. Management thought in Russia (IX — early XXI centuries). Moscow: Sputnik+; 2016. 688 p. (In Russ.).
18. Zakirov R. Sh. Theory of management. History of managerial thought. Chelyabinsk: South Ural State University Publ.; 2012. 101 p. (In Russ.).
19. Semenova I.I. History of management. Moscow: Unity-Dana; 2008. 199 p. (In Russ.).
20. Golikov V.D., Kolesnikov V.A. Theory, methodology and history of management. Ufa: Ufa Law Institute of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia; 2011. 102 p. (In Russ.).
21. Rudskii A.A., Sekretova L.V. History of managerial thought. Rostov-on-Don: Rostov State University of Economics; 2012. 75 p. (In Russ.).
22. Kostenko E.P., Mikhalkina E.V. History of management. Rostov-on-Don: Southern Federal University Press; 2014. 606 p. (In Russ.).

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



Ivan V. Dvoluchansky — Senior Lecturer, Department of Organizational Management, Faculty of Economics, Lomonosov Moscow State University. M.V. Lomonosov, Moscow, Russia
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5178-8905>
dvoluchansky@gmail.com

Conflicts of Interest Statement: The author has no conflicts of interest to declare.

*The article was submitted on 11.10.2022; revised on 19.12.2022 and accepted for publication on 15.03.2023.
 The author read and approved the final version of the manuscript*