



*Asesorías y Tutorías para la Investigación Científica en la Educación Puig-Salabarría S.C.  
José María Pino Suárez 400-2 esq a Lerdo de Tejada, Toluca, Estado de México. 7223898475*

RFC: ATI120618V12

**Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.**

<http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseducacionpoliticayvalores.com/>

**Año: VI**

**Número: Edición Especial**

**Artículo no.:31**

**Período: Agosto, 2019.**

**TÍTULO:** El discurso como medio para establecer y mantener la capacidad de gestión en Internet: marco teórico.

**AUTORES:**

1. Dra. Mariia Rubtcova.
2. Dr. Denis Martyanov.
3. Dra. Natalia Martianova.

**RESUMEN:** El documento está dedicado al análisis del marco teórico del estudio del discurso como un medio para establecer y mantener la capacidad de administración en Internet. Los datos provienen de la literatura teórica, como la teoría del espacio gestionado y la metodología del institucionalismo intersubjetivo. Los autores demuestran cambios modernos en la capacidad de gestión del análisis, desde la capacidad de gestión de sujeto a objeto en la cibernética y la capacidad de gestión de sujeto en la teoría de la toma de decisiones políticas hasta la nueva versión de la capacidad de gestión de sujeto en objetos en comunidades virtuales cerradas. Los autores llegaron a la conclusión de que estos cambios llevaron a un aumento en el papel del discurso como un medio para establecer y mantener la capacidad de administración.

**PALABRAS CLAVES:** discurso, manejabilidad, internet, comunidades virtuales.

**TITLE:** Discourse as a means of establishing and maintaining manageability on the internet: theoretical framework.

**AUTHORS:**

1. Dra. Mariia Rubtcova.
2. Dr. Denis Martyanov.
3. Dra. Natalia Martianova.

**ABSTRACT:** The paper is devoted to analysis of theoretical framework of studying discourse as a means of establishing and maintaining manageability on the internet. Data comes from theoretical literature, such as theory of managed space and the methodology of intersubjective institutionalism. The authors demonstrate modern changes in the analysis manageability from subject-object manageability in cybernetics and subject-subject manageability in the theory of political decision making to new version of subject-object manageability in closed virtual communities. The authors made conclusion that these changes led to an increase in the role of discourse as a means of establishing and maintaining manageability.

**KEY WORDS:** discourse, manageability, internet, virtual communities.

**INTRODUCTION.**

Despite the frequent use of the term “manageability” in scientific and political discussions, it remains one of the little-studied social phenomena. The substantiation of the sociological study of manageability takes place against the background of the complexity of a multifactorial perception of manageability by the population. Broad segments of the population perceive manageability, first of all, technically and mechanistically. Society's manageability is associated with car handling or running well-adjusted hours.

Duality is also reflected in the modern slogans of applied management: *less management, more manageability*. We can see that manageability is contrasted with management, and even better, manageability - this is the most newly understood management, which means that it suffices to study and provide management, manageability will come by itself.

Rethinking this phenomenon is connected with the shift of emphasis in the definition of manageability from subordination to the process of goal setting and goal-achievement. Therefore, the purpose of this article is to analyze different types of manageability applied to cyberspace. However, the conceptualization of the phenomenon of manageability on the Internet is impossible without referring to the concept of “discourse” and its comprehensive analysis.

## **DEVELOPMENT.**

The problem of manageability has long been peripheral to sociological science. At the same time, the problem of formation of manageability as a quality of the social environment was touched upon by the classics of theoretical sociology (Spencer, 1898; Durkheim, 1995; Weber, 1990; Schutz, 2004; Parsons, 1991; Filippov, 2002), in whose works the difference of mechanisms of construction of the social environment by subjects/actors of social life in the process of their interaction was revealed.

The founder of sociology, O. Comte, laid the foundations of a sociological understanding of manageability as conformity to order, norm. Therefore, manageability, on the basis of O. Comte, streamlines society and gives it the ability to develop progressively (Filippov, 2002:59). E. Durkheim developed this understanding. Based on the concept of E. Durkheim, manageability is a certainty of the social positions of the individual, which gives rise to normal, controlled behavior, and uncertainty generates pathological, deviating, uncontrollable one (Atoy, 1992:38; Durkheim, 1995: 20).

Representatives of the systems approach in sociology (Parsons, 1991) borrowed the cybernetic theory of manageability. It is following cybernetics and understand the manageability as the achievement of the goal under the control of the subject of management. In cybernetics, which first introduced the term “manageability” into a wide scientific circulation, manageability and controllability are closely related.

Cybernetically understood, manageability means the ability of a system to achieve controlled parameters. In the encyclopedic dictionary “Organization Management”, manageability is defined as “system sensitivity to control action” (Kibanov, Gunin, 2001:128). N.V. Mysin writes that “*an object [process] is called manageable, if among all the influences on it there is one with which you can achieve your goal*” (Mysin, 2000: 476). Unmanaged object is not controlled and does not allow to achieve the goal.

The process of creation of manageability involves two steps: establishing and maintaining. The subject-object approach to establishing manageability is a traditional management approach. It proceeds from the definition of management as the subordination of the object of management to the goals and objectives of the subject of management. In this case, management is always an asymmetric interaction between the subject and the object of management with a clearly expressed dominance of the subject over the object. Manageability is defined as the ability to be managed and controlled by an institutional context.

The understanding of manageability developed in technical sciences was transferred to society, which caused a certain negative reaction of social scientists. Thus, the liberal tradition and the critical theory of society see in “managed society” and “managed democracy” the features of the crisis of modern society. In the liberal tradition, manageability is seen as a negative characteristic of an individual zombied by the media, or a “sick” civil society, incapable of critical analysis of power. Managed democracy is declared a direct path to dictatorship and fascism. Thus, in the theory of society, manageability has long been associated with its cybernetic definition of controllability.

However, on this basis, a controversial idea of the dynamics of public manageability arose (Rubtsova, 2007).

Manageability is considered as always limited, it describes some controlled field defined for each subject. The boundaries of this field, in principle, can be expanded and provide increased manageability. Beyond the boundaries of the controlled field are phenomena that the subject of control cannot influence, i.e. uncontrollable for him. This is closely related to the concept of "norm of manageability". The norm of manageability is understood as the number of objects controlled by one subject. Exceeding the norm of manageability led to a crisis and loss of manageability, and therefore to a change in the understanding of the very nature of this social phenomenon. The former subject-object approach to the understanding of controllability is replaced by subject-subject one. When using the subject-subject approach, the focus is on the subject. The subject is considered to be manageable, capable of activity and cooperation, taking on a leading management role (managing subject) for a certain period of time (Rubtsova, 2011).

Each person is a subject of management (Volchkova, Pavenkova, 2002). In the management process, he can act as a managing subject, and as a controlled subject. In order to ensure controllability within the framework of the subject-subject approach, it is necessary to constantly improve the self-learning skills of managing and controlled subjects. Moreover, the improvement of communication skills should be given no less attention than the growth of professional knowledge. In fact, society should operate according to the principles of a self-learning system. Then the positive experience of interaction will be focused in the institutions, which in turn will improve the atmosphere of further interactions and, consequently, will accelerate the achievement of manageability.

Spreading in society, manageability turns out to be an indicator of the adequate interiorization of norms and values, including their critical rethinking by the individual, allowing to make the choice more conscious. In this sense, all kinds of subjects should be managed. By joint actions they create

a social space that allows for the development of social interaction in the sphere of management. Thus, interaction generates manageability, and manageability produces interaction. Manageability within the framework of the subject-subject approach is considered as passing from interaction to interaction. Such controllability is not set at all, only its prerequisites are institutionalized. Manageability does not arise due to some objective reasons, but as a result of subject-subject interaction.

The subject-subject approach requires the creation of a dialogue between all parties to the interaction (Bakhtin, 1986). This dialogue is not based on a rational calculation, and not even on a common goal. It is based on intersubjectivity and an attempt to understand the Other. A common goal and means of their implementation is the result of this dialogue. This community is actually evidence of manageability (Rubtsova, 2011: 207).

Most theories that focus on a subject-subject approach offer rational means of improving communication skills, clearly or latently combining them with giving greater importance to ethics and morality. Such, for example, are the theories of the communicative action of J. Habermas (1994).

Thus, the advantage of the subject-subject approach is the emergence of a greater number of managed variables. In addition to institutionalized leverage, emotions, communication skills and abilities are used to enable actors to become more fully involved in the management process. However, the subject-subject approach insists on laborious, painstaking and energy-intensive work to improve social interactions from day to day.

It should be noted that the ability to appeal to the subject-subject approach directly depends on the level of development of the subjects, their education and is outlined mainly in the areas of intellectual work. The subject-subject approach is not applicable when there are no subjects as such (for example, during periods of mass hysteria).

Lately, in modern society, the importance of intellectual spheres - areas of work with information - has increased. Therefore, it is possible that the further development of the management methodology of the society, the improvement of its manageability will more and more lead to a subject-subject approach.

### **Data and methodology.**

The conceptual foundations of the study of the phenomenon of manageability are based on the theory of managed space and the methodology of intersubjective institutionalism, formulated on the basis of the sociological ideas of G. Simmel (1996) on the formal structure of social space; A. Schutz (2004) on the intersubjectivity of social relations; P. Berger and T. Lukman on their institutionalization (1995); theoretical positions of subject-subject approach in management by M.P. Follet (Gvishiani, 1970); theories of the development of civic participation in management by J. Habermas (1994).

### **Results.**

The rethinking of the phenomenon of manageability also began in the technical sciences and is associated with the emergence of synergetics (Haken, 1980). *“A new understanding of the problem of managing complex systems has appeared: it should focus not only on the manager’s desire, but on the development trends of these systems, as well as to allow the existence of zones (and moments) free from control — unpredictable”* (Vasilkova, 1999: 30).

Newly understood manageability was considered not as total continuous control, but as a point of subordination with continuous self-government and self-organization. Manageability is needed to set the direction of self-development. Here we can already talk about the institutional approach to manageability, in which the change in the mechanism of the emergence of manageability is an institutional change occurring in society as a whole.

Understanding of manageability as an institutional phenomenon shows that it is a specific quality of the social environment that allows socialized subjects to set and achieve certain goals in interaction with each other.

The critical theory of society (Marcuse, 1994; Fromm, 1990), in which the concept of manageability as a quality of the social environment was criticized, became a peculiar response to a technical, non-public understanding of manageability. In the works of representatives of this direction, controllability is declared a negative phenomenon — an attempt by the society to subordinate and level the personality. The terms “managed world”, “managed society” are used as nominal, meaning the emergence of new, imperceptible, but not losing their instrumental character means of oppression of the individual.

At the same time, criticism of manageability as a quality of the social environment does not lead to failure, but to its transformation as a category of social science. Thus, in the works of the late follower of the critical theory of society, J. Habermas suggested ways to create a society that pays more attention to communicative forms, dialogue and cooperation. The idea of a communicative society considers manageability as a positive quality of the social environment, forming a certain space in which each person is an effective subject of management. At the same time, J. Habermas, who laid the modern ideas about the construction of managed social spaces, does not seek to create a theory of managed space as such (Habermas, 1994: 343-348).

The interaction of subjects, creating manageability as a current quality, may be subject-object or subject-subject character. In modern society, subject-subject interaction has great potential in creating and ensuring manageability. The subjects of management reinforce the experience of acquiring manageability through institutions. Based on the methodology of intersubjective institutionalism, it is substantiated that, although most social institutions affect manageability in society, this does not mean that the institution itself creates and reproduces manageability. Institutions are specific intermediaries in the transfer of manageability between subjects.



M.V. Rubtsova identifies three types of institutions: sacred (unconditional authority, requiring complete loyalty and obedience to the rules produced by him), instrumental (public instrument of suppression of individual human nature) and communicative (institutional form of democratic decision-making) (Rubtsova, 2007). These types differ in the degree of necessary interiorization of institutional arrangements by social actors. Sacred institutions are intermediaries in the reproduction of manageability only with a high degree of interiorization of institutional arrangements and controlled and managing subjects.

Instrumental institutions are less demanding of the interiorization of institutional arrangements but turning to this type of institutions increases the risk of evading compliance with institutional arrangements. Communicative institutions are based on minimal interiorization, but they are supported by additional forms of participation of a wide range of subjects in their creation and adjustment. Communicative institutions reduce the risk of deviation from compliance and, from this point of view, occupy a middle position between sacral and instrumental institutions.

The greatest manageability is provided by the sacral institutions, the smallest one — by the instrumental institutions. At the same time, modern management focuses on working with instrumental institutes. Instrumental institutes seem to be the most suitable universal means of control, neutral to the inner convictions of a person (as opposed to sacred institutes) and his communicative skills (as opposed to communicative ones). However, the universality and ideological neutrality of instrumental institutions have certain disadvantages. Instrumental institutes do not have active adherents, they are characterized by a developed system of evasion from institutional requirements, which forces some subjects to introduce costly systems of control over other subjects, which further de-motivates support. At any given time in historical time, all three types of institutions take place, and the institutional structures of societies differ in their proportion (Rubtsova, 2011).

In the modern world, manageability can be seen not only in the traditional social space, but also in the cyberspace. The evolution of manageability is closely related to the dynamics of governance on the Internet. If classical virtual communities are characterized by a subject-subject model, active involvement of government and commercial actors in online communication has become a factor in changing the subject-subject model to a subject-object one.

The concept of Internet governance at the present stage of the development of the Internet has laid the new rules and regulations and introduced new decision-makers into Internet communication, which claimed not only the status of subjects, but also the transition of former subjects to the position of objects. The revision of the previous status quo is primarily due to the fact that several groups of actors appeared at once, who claim not only the role of creating the own rules and institutions of the subject, but also the designation by this subject of "their" management objects. In early 2000s it became obvious that the Internet without borders had come to an end, and discussions about the Balkanization of the Internet, its legal fragmentation, the formation of a large number of collective objects became increasingly relevant.

Of course, this process should not be viewed solely as the alienation of subjectivity from ordinary users. The legitimization of decision making in the conditions of modern democracy in one way or another requires adherence to the principles of co-participation, expressed, for example, in the concepts of e-participation. However, the transition to complicity and e-participation is possible only after the former subjects acquire object status.

Along with the governments, large network structures are trying to acquire the status of a subject within the framework of subject-object relations. In some cases, manageability is achieved here through the formation of the rules of the game (as, for example, in the case of Facebook), and in the other through the formation of much more hidden mechanisms for the formation of communities through management of discourse. In this case, the subject of manageability becomes not only people, but also artificial intelligence, and the manageability itself is established and maintained

through discourse.

By discourse, we mean the interactive process of transferring ideas. It exists in two forms: coordination and communication. Coordination discourse is inherent in interconnected individuals united in “epistemic communities” in transnational conditions based on common cognitive and normative conceptions. Communication discourse contributes to the transfer of ideas, programs developed in the context of coordination discourse, to the general public.

Virtual communities can combine the features of coordination discourse and communication discourse, as some cyber communities still resemble “epistemic communities” and can become real centers for generating political ideas. The process of the spreading of coordination discourse and the development of public communication is most noticeable, but already some contradictions are already visible that prevent the formation of a full-fledged public sphere.

The main obstacle to the creation of the public sphere is the spread of post-factual politics. An example of post-factual politics is echo chambers. Echo chambers can include media and communities in which individual ideological groups are more likely to dominate, but at the same time there are elements of public discussion (Martyanov, Bykov, 2017), and more closed groups that are based mainly on the subject-object manageability model (Martyanov, Martianova, 2019).

To analyze current trends in the manageability development on the Internet, it is necessary to analyze the growing role of artificial intelligence as an actor of social processes in the network. To this end, we would suggest relying on the theory of discursive institutionalism of V. Schmidt (2008) and the basic postulates of actor-network theory (Latour, 2005)

V. Schmidt identifies four types of institutionalisms: rational choice institutionalism (RI), historical institutionalism (HI), sociological institutionalism (SI) and discursive institutionalism (DI). The essence of discursive institutionalism is that discursive institutionalism “treats institutions at one and the same time as given, as structures which are the context within which agents think, speak,

and act, and as contingent, as the results of agents' thoughts, words, and actions", and the "discourse is the interactive process of conveying ideas" (Schmidt, 2008).

The author of the concept of discursive institutionalism V. Schmidt criticizes the understanding of discourse as a text or set of ideas because "*discourse is a more versatile and overarching concept than ideas*" (Schmidt, 2008). According to V. Schmidt, «discourse, in other words, refers not just to what is said (ideas) but also to who said what to whom, where, when, how, and why (discursive interactions). Defined in this way, discourse is not just about 'text' (what is said) but also about context (where it was said when, how, and why); and it is not only about structure (what is said or where it was said how) but also about agency (who said what to whom)» (Schmidt, 2008).

According to the theory of discursive institutionalism, the formation of new ideas and institutions "comes in two forms: the relationship between actors and the public." This concept, however, does not take into account the fact that a new factor, a technological one, plays an important role in the formation of ideas.

Analysis of search queries on the Internet, carried out by artificial intelligence, is becoming an increasingly important factor for the formation of the consciousness of users. Instagram is already using artificial intelligence as a psychological anti-bullying tool for users to think again before posting negative comments. Artificial intelligence thus becomes an actant who participates in the reproduction of new rules of the game and regulates the production of discourse. Also, it is already used for content selection. Youtube uses artificial intelligence to automatically spot objectionable content and to create your recommendation algorithm.

The development of artificial intelligence occurs so rapidly that researchers raise the question of the impact of artificial intelligence on human rights (Livingston, Risse, 2019). However, artificial intelligence becomes a factor in contextual traps when past user requests become part of a search algorithm. Artificial intelligence determines those materials that are most relevant to a particular person, forming a filter bubble, in which a person interacts only with a certain type of discourse.

The danger of developing artificial intelligence in this direction may, for example, consist in the formation of “individual echo chambers”, when the political views of the individual will not be formed within his chosen community, but on the basis of the history of previous searches.

## **CONCLUSIONS.**

We have considered the different types of manageability in relation to social space and cyberspace. In the middle of the XX century, it was possible to talk about the existence of classical manageability based on the cybernetic approach. It is characterized by subject-object interactions, in which the subject remains dominant with the complete subordination of the object. Further, due to the loss of manageability, we observed a transition to the subject-subject manageability, which was reflected in the situational approach in the management. The next stage assumes that subjects of manageability can be not only people, but also artificial intelligence.

Thus, artificial intelligence replaces the community that had previously formed an identity and was the subject of manageability. Virtual communities turn into a conglomerate of individuals who have similar views in a particular area, but at the same time are alienated from communication with each other. Mediated virtual communities are identities united by individuals without a community, distinctive atomized “communities” of individuals. The alienation from the community takes place through an artificial actant, which is well illustrated in practice by the actor-network theory.

The means of establishing and maintaining manageability on the Internet is discourse. Artificial intelligence determines those materials that are most relevant for a particular person, which in turn leads to the fact that in the cyberspace a person interacts only with a certain type of discourse.

## **Acknowledgments.**

The study was funded by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR) according to the research project № 19-011-31551\19 “Manageability and discourse of virtual communities in the context of post-factual politics”.

**BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.**

1. Atoy I. (1992). Sociology at the turn of the century: G. Simmel in comparison with F. Tönnies, M. Weber and E. Durkheim. Modern Western Studies of Sociological Classics: Ref. Ser / Ed. ed. L.V. Girko. Issue 1. Moscow.
2. Bakhtin M. M. (1986). The problem of speech genres. In Speech Genres and Other Late Essays, Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (eds.) Austin. University of Texas Press, 60–102.
3. Berger P., Lukman T. (1995). Social Construction of Reality. Moscow.
4. Bourdieu P. (1994). Social space and symbolic power. Bourdieu P. Beginning. Choses dites. Moscow.
5. Gvishiani D.M. (1970). Organization and management. Sociological analysis of bourgeois theories. Moscow.
6. Durkheim E. (1995). Sociology. Its subject, method, purpose. Moscow.
7. Filippov A. (2002) Sociology of space: general idea and classical problem development. Logos. 2002. № 2.
8. Fromm E. (1990). Escape from Freedom. Moscow.
9. Habermas J. (1994). The theory of communicative action: Reason and the rationalization of society: Vol. 1. Boston: Beacon Press.
10. Haken G. (1980). Synergetic. Moscow.
11. Kibanov A. Ya., Gunin V.N. (2001) Organization Management: Encyclopedic Dictionary. Moscow.
12. Latour. B. (2005). Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory. Oxford University Press
13. Livingston, S., Risse, M. (2019). The Future Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Humans and Human Rights. Ethics & International Affairs, 33(2), 141-158.
14. Marcuse G. (1994). One-dimensional man. Moscow.

15. Martyanov D., Bykov I. (2017) Ideological Segregation in the Russian Cyberspace: Evidences from St. Petersburg. In: Alexandrov D., Boukhanovsky A., Chugunov A., Kabanov Y., Koltsova O. (eds) Digital Transformation and Global Society. DTGS 2017. Communications in Computer and Information Science, vol 745. Springer, Cham. pp. 259-269.
16. Martyanov D. S., Martianova N. A. (2019) Communication Strategies of Networked Feminism in Russia, 2019 Communication Strategies in Digital Society Workshop (ComSDS), Saint Petersburg, Russia, 15-17.
17. Mysin N.V. (2000). Theory and history of social management: The experience of Russia and foreign countries. St. Petersburg.
18. Parsons T. (1991). The Social System. London.
19. Rubtsova, M. V. (2007). Manageability: Sociological theoretical analysis of notions. Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya, 12, 32-38.
20. Rubtsova, M. V. (2011). Governmentability in interactions of subjects. Traditional and new practices. Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya, 2, 46-53.
21. Schmidt V. (2008) Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse. Annual Review of Political Science. June 2008.
22. Schutz. A. (2004). Selected: A world that shines with meaning. Moscow.
23. Simmel G. (1996) Sociology of space. In: Simmel G. Favorites. In 2 t. T.2. Moscow.
24. Spencer G. (1898) Foundations of Sociology. T.2. St. Petersburg.
25. Vasilkova V.V. (1999) Order and chaos in the development of social systems. St. Petersburg.
26. Volchkova, L. T., Pavenkova, M. V. (2002). Sociology of management. Theoretical principles. Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya, 3, 141-144
27. Weber M. (1990). Selected Works. Moscow.

**DATA OF THE AUTHORS.**

- 1. Mariia Rubtcova.** Doctor of Sociological Sciences, department of Social Management and Planning; St. Petersburg State University; St. Petersburg, Russia. E-mail: [infosoc@bk.ru](mailto:infosoc@bk.ru)
- 2. Denis Martyanov.** Candidate of Political Sciences, department of Political Institutions and Applied Political Research; Saint Petersburg State University; St. Petersburg, Russia. E-mail: [dsmartyanov@mail.ru](mailto:dsmartyanov@mail.ru)
- 3. Natalia Martianova.** Candidate of Sociological Sciences, department of sociology; Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia; St. Petersburg, Russia. E-mail: [nmart@bk.ru](mailto:nmart@bk.ru)  
[abc33@yandex.ru](mailto:abc33@yandex.ru)

**RECIBIDO:** 8 de julio del 2019.

**APROBADO:** 19 de julio del 2019.