

**PHILOSOPHY AND MANAGEMENT:
PARALLELISM AND CORRELATIONS IN THOUGHT EVOLUTIONS**

Joseto N. Bernadas Jr.^{1,2}, Eko Armada Riyanto¹

¹Widya Mandala Catholic University, Surabaya,

²Gereja Redemptor Mundi, Surabaya, Indonesia

Email: joseto.2018mm045@civitas.ukrida.ac.id

Abstract: *This study aims to trace the historical parallelism and correlation in thought evolutions between Philosophy and Management. Historical parallelism speaks about the side-by-side progress of Philosophy and Management as distinct disciplines, whereas correlation deals with how they relate and interact with each other. Philosophy and Management, though in themselves are distinct and self-determining disciplines, are significantly interrelated. The central problem in this research paper is to find out when, how and why do Philosophy and Management mutually impact and enrich each other. Consequently, this study is conducted using the historical-hermeneutical research methodology, which requires reading a lot of resources on the thought evolutions of both sciences. The analysis progresses by first looking separately into the early thought developments of Philosophy and Management, wherein a general treatment on the nature and essential elements of both Philosophy and Management are laid down. Afterwards, the researcher focuses on how these two disciplines advanced and converged as related thoughts, which are articulated in the following formulations: “Philosophy in Management” and “Philosophy of Management.” Hopefully, the outcome of this study would significantly aid students to find more meaning and relevance in studying Philosophy and Management as correlated and integrated sciences.*

Keywords: *Philosophy, Management, Parallelism, Correlations, Thought Evolutions*

1. Introduction

This study was triggered by the researcher’s experience in a philosophy class at Widya Mandala University, Surabaya, Indonesia. The said philosophy class is one of the required course offerings for a doctoral degree in Management. On the first day of classes, Professor Armada Riyanto CM, gently stirred his students not only to see the beauty and relevance of philosophy as a discipline, but also to really do Philosophy, that is, to actively engage in philosophizing. He challenged his students in strategic and marketing Management:

“Berfilsafatlah! Berpikirlah!” In response, one of the students candidly asked him: “What do we exactly study in this class? The relationship between Philosophy and Management? Or the art and science of Philosophizing itself?” To such questions, Prof. Armada responded: “Both.”

Philosophizing does not only mean to express some personal ideas on the state of matters. It is more of an attempt to see unquestioned matters in a new problematic way. As such, philosophy is fundamentally conceptual in nature, whether in challenging, refining or crafting new concepts (Balsas & Silva, 2018). However, as doctoral students in Management, their usual background is quite understandably management, not philosophy. For this reason, many of them encountered two levels of difficulties. First, being new to the philosophical thought processes, they find it difficult to actively engage in philosophizing. Second, they also have trouble seeing the relevance of the philosophical insights they painstakingly wrestled with to Management as a separate science.

For instance, when Prof. Armada discussed about how certain truths is arrived at through Myths and then compared and contrasted it with the way Philosophy attains certainty, many of them ended up confused and dumbfounded. After sometime, however, some of them began to catch up on the entire process and somehow made more sense of the ensuing discussion. But the lesson was still simply about Myths and Philosophy. They have yet to discover the interrelatedness of Philosophy and Management (Asseng, et al., 2006). As a matter of fact, even towards the end of the semester many of the students are still having problem philosophizing as articulated by one of the students in these words:

“Is there a trick so we can know how to see and review things from a philosophical perspective? Oftentimes, what is being conveyed in class sounds good but since the way we think is not philosophical, we normally ended up lost and confused in the discussion process. What is the way to think philosophically? How do we connect the philosophical concepts to management science? As a medical student before, and now as a doctor lecturer, I had never engaged in active philosophizing. I never had proper training and input in the art and science of Philosophy. I was never been taught based on Philosophy. That is why, I personally experience some difficulty in fully engaging myself in this class.” – Dr. Asra Al Fauzi (26 November 2021)

This predicament impelled the researcher to trace the parallel growth in thought evolutions, and more importantly the interconnectedness, between Philosophy and Management. The main concern is to identify the core concepts and issues of both sciences and then spot their points of convergence. The output of this research is aimed at enabling students to understand and appreciate more fully Philosophy and Management as allied disciplines.

2. Conceptual Review

At this point, the researcher shall gather, analyze and lay down the basic information of the essential concepts pertinent to the current study. This is a vital step in doing conceptual research, which does not involve conducting any practical experiments. Philosophers have long used this form of research method to develop new theories or interpret existing theories in a different light. The concepts which shall be dealt with are those directly related to philosophy and management.

Philosophy

Socrates (470-399 BCE), the founder of moral philosophy, once pointed out that an unexamined life is not worth living. While thorough scrutiny about important life issues disturbs, it also soothes and comforts. Aristotle (384-322 BCE) on his part claimed that philosophy begins with a sense of wonder at the world marvels and mysteries. Indeed, philosophy begins with the ancient Greeks and continuing down through Thomas Aquinas, Rene Descartes, Immanuel Kant, John Stuart Mill, and Frederick Nietzsche among others, up to the present time.

As an academic discipline, philosophy seeks to understand the fundamental truths about human beings, the world they live in, and their relationships with the world and with one another. Philosophy is a unique field of studies in terms of its methods and in the nature and extent of its topic of interest. It pursues questions in almost all dimensions of human life, and its systems apply to problems in any arena of learning. For this reason, it can be described as a persuasive pursuit of fundamental truths, a search for understanding, and a study of principles of conduct. Philosophy searches for ways to see the world from the viewpoint of other individuals and other cultures. It seeks to elevate one's personal sense of meaning and significance in this world. But fundamentally, what does philosophy mean? And what are its pivotal stages and major branches of studies?

Definition

The Greek word for philosophy is *philosophia*, which is actually composed of two words, namely: *philo* and *sophia*. Philo means love, whereas sophia means wisdom. Etymologically therefore, philosophy means “love of wisdom.” In a broader sense, philosophy is the study of the most basic and profound matters of human existence.

Philosophy studies the fundamental nature of knowledge, reality, existence, organizational leadership, education, management, and more. It begins with a penetrating sense of wonder at the world, aims at truth and wisdom, and leads to a meaningful and morally upright life. It focuses on expounding concepts and creating arguments regarding life's recurring and confounding questions. It involves serious thinking about essential life issues. Practically, all vital humankind matters come within the domain of Philosophy.

Reflection is the normal way of Philosophy, not experimentation. However, to a great extent philosophy finds affinity in science in its character and method. Moreover, contrary to the

common claim that philosophy is a pure speculative science, it is rather a very practical one. It is more active than a passive science since true act of philosophizing happens only when the knowledge gained moves one into action. In fact, for this reason, Socrates was charged of corrupting the minds of the young because his students, after doing philosophy with him, started to think differently and acted in a counter-cultural way. Indeed, a true philosopher cannot simply stay calm and manage to sleep soundly upon knowing the root causes of the evils in the society.

Pivotal Stages

As to the question when and where philosophy first began to develop, there is no exact answer. A simplistic answer could be that it would have begun the first time someone asked what is life, why they were born, how they were supposed to understand their lives, and what are they supposed to do to live a meaningful life. Nevertheless, philosophical systems are thought to have developed first in the East, and a working outline proceeds from Mesopotamia to Rome and on to the present time.

Ancient Period. (600 BCE-345 CE) Before philosophy, there was religion or myth. The questions pertinent to daily existence find answer in the myths. The stories about the gods provide ready answers to all human queries and confusions. It reached to a certain point, however, that some people, the early philosophers, questioned the answers provided by mythical stories. This started with the Pre-Socratic Philosophers: Thales of Miletus (624-548 BCE), Anaximander (610-546 BCE), Anaximenes (flourished 545 BCE), Xenophanes of Colophon (624-548 BCE), Parmenides (born 515 BCE), Heraclitus (540-480 BCE), Empedocles (490-430 BCE), Anaxagoras (500-428 BCE), Democritus (460-370 BCE), Zeno of Elea (495-430 BCE), and Pythagoras (570-490 BCE) among others. They find mythical explanations as illogical and unreasonable or unsatisfactory.

Indeed, it normally happens that a particular philosophical thought emerges when religion or myth is perceived to have failed in coming up with answers to fundamental life questions. Some people began to search for the rational and more logical explanations of human affairs. They started philosophizing by searching for the basic element of all creation. Some thought of it as water, others pointed to fire, still others believed it to be air or soil. And some others thought of it as a combination of some or all of the elements above.

The search for the fundamental element that may provide explanation to human longings shifted focus with Socrates. He ignited an intellectual revolution that would challenge traditional notions of morality and value forever. Instead of looking for answers to human questions from around him, he searches for them deep within man himself. He set his eyes on humanity itself. This movement was followed through by his student Plato (428-348 BCE), and Aristotle, the student of Plato. Both of them expanded the new discipline of philosophy introduced by Socrates and paved the way for Western intellectual thought with their discussions of logic, ethics, poetry, myth, politics, physics, and metaphysics.

Many of the ideas proposed by Socrates, Plato, Aristotle and others have helped set the agenda for much of the subsequent development of Western philosophy. These three philosophers started to place man at the center of philosophizing. This has been the trend until today. Philosophy is meant for bringing out the best in man and society. This stage in the ancient period is called the Socratic times, or the ancient medieval period.

Medieval Period. (345-1600 CE) At the beginning of this period the leading thinkers were St. Augustine of Hippo (345-430 CE), Boethius (480-525 CE), and pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite (flourished 500 CE) who merged the thinking of Plato and Aristotle with Christianity. This molded Medieval Philosophy until the rediscovery of Aristotle in the 1200s when St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274 CE) managed a similar synthesis of Aristotelianism with Christianity.

In other words, this period took place when the philosophical thought of Greek philosophers meets the thought of Christian philosophers. For this reason, medieval philosophy is also known as the medieval Christian philosophy. This philosophical stage can be split up into four different periods: the Dark Ages (476-800 CE), the Carolingian Renaissance to the rediscovery of Aristotle (800-1200 CE), the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Renaissance (1200-1400 CE), and the Renaissance to the end of Scholasticism (1400-1600 CE).

Modern Period. (1600-1800 CE) The demarcation line between modern philosophy and its predecessors, which are the ancient and medieval philosophy, can hardly be established with absolute accuracy (*Modern Management Theory*, n.d.), (*Introduction to Modern Philosophy*, n.d.). Unlike traditional philosophy, which had certain aspects that had not been properly explored and were based on myths, modern philosophy is a school of thought based on research findings. Facts about modern philosophy are written down unlike the traditional ones that were passed from one generation to another.

Modern philosophy can be characterized mainly into Rationalism and Empiricism. Rene Descartes (1596-1650 CE), Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677 CE) and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716 CE) were the leading rationalists. For rationalism, reason is superior to experience as a source of knowledge. Whereas for empiricism, experience or sense perception is more reliable source and basis of knowledge. The first great empiricist was John Locke (1632-1704 CE) of England. George Berkeley of Ireland (1685-1753 CE) and David Hume of Scotland (1711-1776 CE) further developed empiricism.

Contemporary Period. (1800-present) Contemporary philosophy technically refers to the philosophy characterized by increasing professionalization of the discipline and the rise of analytic and continental philosophy (Hussain et al., 2019). It may be described as the present period in the history of Western philosophy beginning at the end of the nineteenth century with the rise of analytic and continental philosophy. Hence in contemporary terms Western philosophy refers to two main traditions of Contemporary philosophy: Analytic philosophy and Continental philosophy.

Analytic philosophy follows in the tradition established by the great late-nineteenth and early-twentieth philosophers Gottlob Frege and Bertrand Russell. It is marked by a focus on questions about the nature of language, meaning and thought, and how does the mind relate to the world. Analytical philosophers pursued these questions through methods of argument and proof similar to those used in mathematics and logic.

Continental philosophy started with the works of Franz Brentano (1838-1917 CE), and Edmund Husserl (1859-1938 CE) on the development of the philosophical method of phenomenology. It is often characterized by a focus on certain themes, like: history, politics (particularly the politics of gender and sexuality), the self and self-consciousness, freedom, desire and the will. The techniques of continental philosophy are as wide-ranging as its subject matter, from close historical analysis of texts, to creative reading of ancient and modern literature, to reflection on one's own lived experience.

Major Branches

In its systematic pursuit for answers to life's most basic questions, philosophy is usually divided into four major branches of study, namely: logic, ethics, metaphysics, and epistemology. What follows is a brief elaboration of each.

Logic. One important aspect in the study of philosophy is learning the art and science of correct inferential thinking. This is the role of logic. It provides sound means for distinguishing good from bad reasoning. It does not only study the nature and structure of arguments. It also helps to find arguments where one might simply see a set of loosely related statements, discover hidden personal assumptions, and formulate the minimum claims to prove a point.

Ethics. The study of ethics often concerns with what we ought to do and the way to do it best. In struggling with this issue, larger questions about what is good and right arise. An ethicist attempts to answer such questions as: What is good? What makes actions or people good? What is right? What makes actions right? Is morality objective or subjective? How should I treat others?

Ethics takes up the meanings of our moral concepts – such as right action, obligation and justice – and formulates principles to guide moral decisions, whether in private or public life. What are our moral obligations to others? How can moral disagreements be rationally settled? What rights must a just society accord its citizens? What constitutes a valid excuse for wrongdoing?

Epistemology. As a study of knowledge, epistemology is concerned about the nature and scope of knowledge. More succinctly, it deals with man's knowing capability. The distinctive questions it deals with are: What is knowledge? Do we know anything at all? How do we know what we know? Can we be justified in claiming to know certain things? What does it mean to know the truth? And what is the nature of truth? What sorts of things can be known? Is there knowledge beyond the reach of science? What are the limits of self-knowledge?

Metaphysics. The study of metaphysics is primarily the study of the nature of reality, its world existence, likeness, and order. Metaphysicians normally ask questions like the following: Is there a God? What is truth? Who is a person? What makes a person the same through time? Is the world strictly composed of matter? Do people have minds? If so, how is the mind related to the body?

In other words, metaphysics seeks basic criteria for determining what sorts of things are real or that which exists outside the mind. This concern would lead one to further ask the following questions: Are there mental, physical, and abstract things? Or is there just the physical and the spiritual? Are persons highly complex physical systems? Or do they have properties not reducible to anything physical?

Management

Management has become a very popular and extensively used term. All organizations are involved in management, since in terms of fundamental function, management helps and directs the various efforts towards a definite purpose. But what does management exactly mean? What are its pivotal stages of development, and its major branches of specialties?

Definition

Management can be generally described as a universal phenomenon, a purposive activity, something that directs group efforts towards the attainment of a fixed goal. As a working process of achieving organizational goals, it creates a conducive environment, both internal and external, which enables and empowers people to do their tasks effectively and efficiently. Being effective means being capable of doing the suitable assigned task, whereas being efficient means doing the task properly at the least possible cost and with minimum wastage of resources. More particularly, Frederick Winslow Taylor (1856-1915 CE) defined management as an art of knowing what to do, when to do and see that it is done in the best and cheapest way. Harold Koontz (1909-1984 CE) on his part defined management as an art of getting things done through and with the people in formally organized groups.

Pivotal Stages

It is very important to know the background in the evolution of management thought and the corresponding development that brought about the current business practices (Nkemdilim, 2020). Such knowledge enables one to better understand the management principles that are helpful in managing people more effectively and efficiently. The evolution process of management thought started since the time man considered living in groups (*The Evolution of Management Thought*, 2002). Indeed, management has been practiced to a great extent since civilization began. Excellent examples of this are the well-trained military forces of ancient Greece and the cohesive organization of the Roman Catholic Church in the olden days. To better understand and appreciate the evolution of management thought (Agogbua & Abugbum, 2017),

it shall be presented in different stages or periods, namely: early management thought period, scientific management period, social man management period, and modern management period.

Early Management Thought Period. Before the industrial revolution, a great amount of management happens at home, where managers are usually the heads of the family handling family members as workforces for limited and local production. Obviously, in this kind of arrangement, filial attachment comes almost inescapably in the workplace.

With the inventions of steam engine, electricity and the telegram in the 18th century, the means of transportation and communication quadrupled in speed and efficiency. This paved the way for industrialization, which had significant impact on management as a whole. The market expansion in terms of area coverage and bulk demand for varied commodities drastically changed how businesses raise capital, organize labor and produce goods. Suddenly, entrepreneurs had access to all the factors of production such as land, labor, and capital. The management focus at this time was in combining these aspects to attain a targeted goal successfully.

The Classical Management Theory system of belief pronounces that employee are only motivated by physical and economic needs. It calls for a clear structure of management where the workforce is divided into owners, middle management, and supervisors. This theory views the workplace as an assembly line, with each worker completing a specialized task instead of multitasking. People who subscribe to this theory believe that workers are motivated by financial rewards based on the competency of their work. When companies put this theory to practical use, they often see an increase in productivity. It can help restructure a company and make employees focus on the bottom line.

But since the theory does not take much into consideration social needs, job satisfaction, and human relationships, it can also lead to a sizable amount of burnout among employees. This model exerts a great deal of control over human behaviors and treats employees as part of the machine. For many companies, Classical Management Theory fell out of favor in the past 60 years as more modern theories emphasized the humanity of the workforce.

In short, during the classical period, which was closely related to the industrial revolution as well as the rise of large-scale enterprises, management thought was focused more on production through the standardization, and the division of labor.

The Scientific Management Period. This was the period when each part of an individual's work is analyzed 'scientifically' to devise the most efficient method for a given enterprise. Then, the most suitable person to take on the job is likewise 'scientifically' selected (Gulzar, 2015). The individual is trained to do the job according to the plan. According to F. W. Taylor, the main proponent of scientific management, everyone had the ability to be 'first-class' at a particular job (Taylor, n.d.). And it was management's role to find out which job suited each employee and then train them until they become first-class.

F. W. Taylor came up with this theory at the end of the 19th century. He believed that using the scientific method will get the best results out of workers in the office. The first step is

to use the scientific method to determine the best way to perform a specific task. Next, assign workers to tasks that match their abilities and train them to maximize their output. One must monitor the workers constantly to ensure they are using the most efficient methods. Finally, managers should spend their time training and planning for future work.

Parts of the Scientific Management Theory are still in use today. Managers offer help and advice when needed, and they always look towards the future. However, now workers get more say about how they think their job should be done and are usually not hired to perform just one specific task. The Scientific Management Theory was best suited to large companies at the turn of the century, not small modern offices.

Under the management of 'initiative and incentive' practically the whole problem is 'up to the workman' while under the scientific management, fully one-half of the problem is 'up to the management'. The main object of management should be to secure the maximum prosperity for the employer, coupled with the maximum prosperity for each employee. F. W. Taylor believed that all workers spent little of their time putting in full efforts. To overcome this, he strives to analyze every job in a scientific way to determine how much work could and should be done in a day. For him, every single act of every workman can be reduced to a science.

Taylor's effort to scientifically increase the performance of the workers was regarded by many as inhumane since his methods were extremely hard and sometimes had the opposite effect. The way that Taylor wrote about unskilled workers was often disdainful and insensitive.

The Social Man Management Period. The great crash of 1929, also known as the Black Tuesday, ushered in the great depression, caused the increase of unemployment from 1.5 million to 13 million. Despite government efforts to create jobs, business continued to fail, incomes dropped, people lost even their homes as family savings were wiped out causing the national morale to hit an all-time low rating. Consequently, many people were forced to do things way below the normal healthy human standards. Thus, the Social Man Era was an era of economic misfortunes, massive social maladies due to industrial dislocations, and political shifts, which heralded a transformation in traditional relationships. Accordingly, the social era person is one who strives to escape from bad economic conditions, conflict and social ills, and alterations in political milieu.

In the midst of all this, Elton Mayo (1890-1949 CE) proposed the concept of Social Man. He managed to postulate man as a social animal through his involvement in the Hawthorne Studies. Man is a social animal by the fact that he lives with other human beings in the context of a society. Living in a society with others regulates his basic behavioral pattern. Then, Mary Parker Follett (1868-1933) on her part believed that management refers to the art of getting things done through people. She encourages that managers have direct contact with people so as to avoid unnecessary misunderstandings. She was famous for her thoughts on group thinking and conflict resolution.

The social man differs from the economic man. On the one hand, economic man is inclined to be concerned primarily with producing goods and services, and with quantitative

problems. He expresses values in financial terms. He is mainly driven by work and discipline in the tradition of the Puritan Ethic and in the environment of competition. Lastly, the economic man pursues his self-interest in the laissez-faire way. In contrast, the social man is more concerned with how goods and services are distributed among people, and with qualitative matters. He tends to measure more readily in human terms. The driving force behind social man is self-realization in an environment of cooperation. Social Man involves himself in the problems of his fellow men.

The Modern Management Period. Classical Management Theory somehow claims that employees are only motivated by money. As a direct response to this, Modern Management Theory recognizes that workers are complex and have many reasons for wanting to succeed in their job. The proponents of Modern Management Theory believe that rapidly changing technology is a double-edged sword. It can both cause and solve many problems in the workplace.

The strength of Modern Management Theory lies in the fact that it recognizes and respects the changes that come with technology. There is potential danger in the use of technology, but when used properly, it could usher in positive changes in the workplace. For example, when people were forced to stay at home due to the danger posed by COVID 19 virus, many human transactions, like in business and education, continue to flow with the aid of enhanced digital communication.

Major Branches

The Classical School. The classical school of management thought was promulgated by Frederick Winslow Taylor, Henry L. Gantt (1861-1919 CE), Frank and Lillian Gilbreth (1868-1924 CE, 1878-1972CE), and Charles Bedaux (1887-1944 CE). This school of thought comprises of scientific management and administrative management. The scientific management involves the use of scientific approach in achieving maximum output, minimum input, and elimination of waste and reduction of inefficiency. In contrast, Jules Henry Fayol (1841-1925 CE) and Max Weber (1864- 1920 CE) advocated administrative management that deals with the use of management principles in structuring and management of an organization.

The Neo-Classical School. The need for group dynamics, complex human motivation and styles of leadership was stressed during the radical social and cultural changes that occurred in 1920s and 1930s. The human relations school of management thought emerged to address these issues. The prominent figures in this field include: Elton Mayo, Mary Parker Follett, Chester Barnard (1886-1961 CE), Abraham Maslow (1908-1970 CE), Douglas McGregor (1906-1964 CE), Rensis Likert (1903-1981 CE), Frederick Herzberg (1923-2000 CE), David McClelland (1917-1998 CE), and Chris Argyris (1923-2013 CE).

This period of evolution of management thought is an improvement of the classical theory. In other words, it modified and improved upon the classical theory. For instance, Classical theory focused more on the area of job content, including the management of physical

resources, while neo-classical theory gave more profound emphasis on employee relationships in the workplace.

The Contemporary School. In the 1980s, the convergence of economies resulted to the growth and increase in competitive level in the global economy. As organizations strive to address newer management issues, this shifted the focus from traditional management theories to scientific theories (Hussain et al., 2019). In turn, this shift in perspective led to the emergence of several management thoughts or approaches, such as: systems approach, quantitative approach, qualitative approach, contingency approach, information technology approach, and bail-out and recovery approaches.

Contemporary management started with Peter Drucker (1909-2005 CE), who proposed the concept of Management by Objective. His work was different from the classical and behavioral methods of the past since contemporary management involves planning, leading, organizing and controlling operations to realize corporate goals. The building up of skills in making decisions, monitoring information and supervising personnel are essential for success. In these modern times, challenges include managing a diverse workforce, sustaining a competitive edge, behaving ethically and using accessible technologies.

These changes in the work environment resulted to three management theories, namely: quantitative theory, systems theory, and contingency theory. The Quantitative Approach uses statistical models, paradigms, and computer analysis to address management choices. It addressed the need in management to integrate people, equipment, and systems during the World War II. The Systems Approach claims that an organization is a system composed of interdependent parts functioning as one for some purpose. Therefore, each division is part of an overall system, which is under the influence of several variables, such as: inputs, transformation process, outputs, feedback, and the environment. Contingency Theory believes that organizational performance is dependent on its environment. In other words, organizational performance depends largely in how organization interacts with the environment.

3. Methodology

Basically, evolution pertains to a chronological growth and development. In which case, thought evolution focuses more specifically on the nuances in the advancement of ideas, theories, and concepts with their corresponding understanding. Therefore, the fitting research methodology is a combination of both historical and hermeneutical research approaches, which is set alongside a thematic and theoretical approach since the researcher relies heavily on the writings of published articles and other secondary data.

Historical research methodology is a qualitative technique of recapturing the distinctions, characters, and thoughts of past events that helped fashioned the present. It primarily aims to recreate the past, through existing records and their interconnections (Torou et al., 2009). Whereas hermeneutics is a science of interpretation or the science of “explaining and understanding” (Rasool, 2018). It also concerns both the usage of language and the process of

using language. Thus, hermeneutics is likewise considered as an art of understanding (Agrey, 2014). It tends to question not only how meaning is constituted but also, and more importantly, how one should seek to find the right meaning in any particular case (Davies, 2009).

Historical-hermeneutical research method, therefore, focuses on grasping the meaning of past happenings to understand the facts and clarify their causes. Such understanding will enable people to determine the effects of past actions to the present and future events (Paterson & Higgs, 2015). Basically, this research method is highly useful in the search for meaning, beliefs, and values from past events through looking for wholes and relationships with other wholes (Higgs, 2001, p.49). Understanding the past empowers one to see patterns that might otherwise be invisible in the present and thus gain decisive perspective to manage current and future difficulties.

This research paper proceeds by laying down first the general historical developments of both Philosophy and Management. And then, the pivotal understanding gained thereof shall be used to trace the interrelatedness of both disciplines. This is done by contrasting and comparing their main tenets and functions, and finally point out the way they mutually serve and benefit from each other.

4. Discussion

Philosophy and Management or Management and Philosophy, both articulations would render similar results. There is not much of a difference between the two. It's just a plain parallel approach to both disciplines (Adeoti et al., 2013). However, the act of tracing the parallel growth of both disciplines would enable one to study some of the world's leading thinkers, which in turn affords one to the benefit of understanding more profoundly how life and the business world works. In short, much of what is acquired in philosophy can be applied in practically any endeavor since philosophy touches on so many fields of study, and its systems are usable in any subject matter (*The Evolution of Management Thought*, 2002).

In general, here are some of the practical uses of philosophy:

First: General Problem Solving. The study of philosophy sharpens one's problem-solving acumen. It helps a person analyze concepts, definitions, arguments, and problems. Organizing ideas and issues, dealing with questions of worth, and extracting what is essential from assortment of information comes easy for one trained in philosophy. Moreover, Philosophy also helps people to synthesize a variety of views or perspectives into a unified whole.

Second: Communication Skills. Philosophy also uniquely improves a person's capacity to fluently express and effectively communicate ideas. It enhances one's skills in presenting ideas through well-constructed, and systematic arguments. In short, it enables people to articulate what is distinctive about their views; enhances their ability to explain difficult material; and helps them eliminate ambiguities and vagueness from their writing and speech.

Third: Persuasive Powers. Philosophy offers training in the formulation of clear statements, solid arguments, and fitting examples. Philosophy, therefore, hones in the person the

ability to be convincing. It equips people to construct and defend their own views, appreciate rival positions, and point out forcefully the reason why they consider their own views preferable to alternatives. Other than reading and writing in philosophy, these skills are developed also in and outside the classroom through the philosophical dialogue.

Fourth: Writing Skills. In the study of philosophy, one is required to read challenging texts and then put into writing one's own ideas and views of what has been read in an orderly and logical way. Structure and technique, then, are emphasized in philosophical writing. Originality is also encouraged, and philosophers are generally urged to use their imagination and develop their own ideas.

Fifth: Understanding Other Disciplines. This is one of the main strengths of philosophy. For this reason, philosophy is linked closely to many if not all disciplines. Philosophy finds home in other sciences as evidence by the following coinages: Philosophy of Science, Philosophy of Literature, Philosophy of History, Philosophy of Management, etc. Since all fields of knowledge employ reasoning and must set standards of evidence, philosophy proves essential in assessing the various standards of evidence used by other disciplines. All the above points do suggest that people trained in philosophy in just about every field. Philosophers are not only into teaching, they are also into medicine, law, computer science, management, publishing, sales, criminal justice, public relations, and many other fields.

In addition to all these, there is one further use of philosophy to take note, one that pertains to entire life. The use of philosophical insights goes far beyond its contribution to one's livelihood since it broadens the range of things that one can understand and enjoy. Philosophy provides self-knowledge, foresight, and a sense of direction in life. It affords distinct pleasures of insight to reading and conversation, which can lead to self-discovery, expansion of consciousness, and self-renewal. In all of this, it nurtures individuality and self-esteem. Thus, its value to individual life can be innumerable, and its benefits for common life as a citizen can be endless.

Based on the literature gathered on both disciplines, it is quite obvious that in terms of use or actual practice, management has been present alongside with philosophy. But in terms of growth and maturity as a science or a specific study, philosophy is way ahead than management. That is why, the parallelism between philosophy and management differs in the level of theory and in the level of practice. In practice, philosophy and management have been working side by side since the time of the Greek philosophers and even earlier. But as established disciplines, they correlate more seriously and penetratingly work hand in hand quite relatively new, more distinctly during the classical management era.

What follows now are the points of divergence and the points of convergence between philosophy and management (Navoda & Zoysa, n.d.). The points of divergence, on the one hand, explain why despite the overwhelming benefits that philosophy offers to management practitioners, still some people have difficulty availing those benefits. The points of

convergence, on the other hand, refer to the solid correlations between philosophy and management.

4.1. Points of Divergence

There are two points of divergence between Philosophy and Management. The first one has something to do with language barrier, while the other one has something to do with layers of understanding.

Language Barrier

Just like other sciences, philosophy has its own unique set of vocabularies. The fact that philosophy has been articulated in several languages, starting with the Greek language, moving on to Latin and later still to hundreds and thousands of other languages, some of them are already considered ‘dead’ languages, further thickens the language barrier, so called. The word ‘being’, for instance, can mean different things depending on whether the letter used at the beginning was a capital letter ‘B’ or small letter ‘b’. ‘Being’ in capital ‘B’ would refer to God as the creator, whereas ‘being’ in small ‘b’ would refer to the rest of creation or the lesser beings. Furthermore, the words ‘essence’ and ‘existence’ are pretty common words nowadays. But when used as a philosophical term, especially when viewed from their original Latin root words ‘esse’ and ‘existere’, almost instantly they become complicated words pregnant with meaning!

Of course, this phenomenon is not something unique to Philosophy. Other disciplines have their share of technical words also proper to their line of expertise. But this is especially palpable and significantly problematic in Philosophy since as a discipline it primarily deals, not with concrete things, but with abstract concepts to be expressed and communicated in words.

At this point, it is safe to say that in every philosophy class, it would be very helpful to introduce first the essential terms that are used in the discussion. This is to avoid compounding confusion among those joining the discussion, especially to those who are not familiar yet with basic philosophical terms.

Layers of Understanding

In addition to the technical aspect of philosophical terms, another source of difficulty in grasping the intended meaning in a philosophical discourse is the layers of meaning possibly present in a single term. For instance, when Friedrich Nietzsche declared that “God is dead”, what does he mean by such statement? More specifically, what does he mean by the terms ‘God’ and ‘dead’? Both are familiar words at the surface meaning, but underneath them are hidden meanings and significations.

Thus, for one whose concept of God is a personal God, the declaration of Nietzsche is deadly hilarious and so ridiculously meaningless. But for those who picked up Nietzsche’s idea of God as the foundation of reason, and therefore by declaring that ‘God is dead’, he was actually trying to shaken the very foundation of reason, which has become the determinant

source of social progress and advancement at that time, one may begin to make sense out of what Nietzsche was trying to convey.

To overcome this difficulty, one has to acquire the skill of distinguishing sharply and precisely the various possible meanings and implications of a given concept. Good philosophy professors are those who can provide students concrete signs and indicators to follow in identifying the hidden significance of a given abstract concept or phenomenon.

4.2. Points of Convergence

There are two points of convergence between Philosophy and Management. The first one is expressed in the phrase Philosophy in Management, while the other one is expressed in the phrase Philosophy of Management.

Philosophy *in* Management

In a nutshell, Philosophy in Management is an attempt to establish the way philosophy helps corporate people understand and account for managerial practices. Applying philosophical theories and questions to contemporary business matters has demonstrated to be inspirational and fruitful. Anyone who wants to thrive in a commercial venture, public administration, and politics must be capable in seeing quickly through complex issues.

Moreover, the manager should be able also to readily come up with resounding arguments for or against a given proposal, screen pertinent information from irrelevant ones, check the reliability and soundness of policy papers, decide which problems are critical and clarify the issues that are still unclear. These skills of rigorous analysis, critical examination and sound judgement are the basics of philosophy. No discipline sharpens one's ability for unswerving, and methodical thought better than philosophy. This is one pivotal role that philosophy plays in management.

For instance, a sound management program aims to develop business professionals who are aware and alive to their social responsibilities to the community as well as to the needs of investors, shareholders and employers. One must develop a deeper understanding of the role and interrelationship between strategic management, human resource management and operations management. Developing this kind of program requires one with critical thinking and problem-solving skills, which are needed in the competitive world of business. This is where philosophy sets in. Indeed, philosophy helps management in handling notions like intentionality, practical reason, ethics, and truth, among so many others concepts. In the expression "creative thinking", the crucial word is not creativity, but thinking. Philosophy helps one rediscover the art of thinking.

Furthermore, creativity requires the capability to liberate ourselves from predictable ways of thinking. One is encouraged to "think outside the box". But once outside the box, what comes next? One has to construct a new box or anew intellectual framework that would enable a person manage his new environment. Only in doing so can a person produce truly game-changing ideas.

This is what Mary Parker Follett did to management. As a political philosopher, she saw exactly what was happening to the society in her time (Melé, 2006). People were living in sub-human conditions due to the economic depression. Sensitive to this reality, she introduced the concept of ‘whole man’. Man is not simply a part, much more a machine part or an industrial tool for massive production, which is a far cry from the truth that man is not only a body but more so a soul (Armada, 2018, p. 194). Instead, human resource is the most important and significant resource since people working together mean ‘whole men’ working within groups. She then moved for the promotion of man’s welfare and well-being. One significant move she did along this line was to come up with practical and helpful guides for conflict resolution. This is philosophy in management, which led some to declare Mary Parker Follett as the ‘Mother of Modern Management.’ Indeed, in developing people’s full potentials and in the process befriending them is of much greater value than gold (Armada, 2013, p. 112).

Philosophy of Management

Yet, a philosophy of management aims at going even further (Balsas & Silva, 2018). In this case, management does not simply avail of philosophical skills for their enabling and empowering interventions but really allowing philosophy to tinker into the core being of management – its governing personal mind-set and corporate guiding principles.

Philosophy of management is slowly emerging. However, most of these efforts simply tend to focus on the use of philosophy and philosophers in management trainings. A more ambitious project would be developing a philosophy of management itself, which requires the uncovering of what is behind managerial practices, beyond practical requirements. It goes deeper into the character and lifestyle of the manager or the leader.

Put simply, management philosophy refers to set of beliefs or rules employed by managers to help them make decisions (Charles Ingraham, et al, n.d.). It looks simple enough, but as a philosophy, it means that there is always another layer to it. The extra layer refers to the meaning or reason as to why one would choose to use those rules. This is important because it provides a leader a powerful sense of purpose and motivation. A good management philosophy gives direction and cohesion to the leader and to the organization at large.

Sometimes, individuals are promoted to a management position without ever receiving managerial training. Unfortunately, without training, managers will often struggle to find success in their new roles. Trial and error method of management can be fatal and costly. So, what can one do to ensure he is doing the best possible job as a manager? One of the best ways to ensure a person to be a strong, efficient, and a loyal manager is to develop a management philosophy and follow it to the best of his ability. Articulating in writing a management philosophy is a great way to remind oneself, day in and day out, of one’s work ethics. It reminds oneself of personal set goals and priorities. All human beings need to be grounded in who they are as leaders. Philosophy of Management serves as moral compass about how one will lead and inspire his team.

The more consistently one applies these principles, the greater likelihood one will build a team that will thrive and perform beyond normal expectations.

In Servant Leadership Model, one finds an example of a management style where philosophy becomes one with management. This is because servant leadership style is not a mere management technique but a way of life (Chiniara & Bentein, 2016). Servant Leadership refers to a leader who insists on satisfying the needs of his followers to the point of sacrificing his own personal benefit (Rezaei et al., 2011). Servant Leadership is indeed a common concept. But it is difficult to live by since it is characterized by a focus on followers' growth and empowerment, and on leaders' altruism, empathy, sense of ethics and community stewardship (Pawar et al., 2020). Servant leadership is unique in that the leader is viewed as a 'servant' attending to followers' needs. This is philosophy and management mutually impacting and enriching each other at its best.

5. Conclusion

How did Philosophy and Management thoughts evolve in time? In tracing the history of both disciplines, the author identifies the major stages in their developments as guide. Philosophy has four: Ancient, Medieval, Modern and Contemporary. Management has four also, which includes the Early classical stage to the Classical, Behavioral and Modern stages.

The ensuing discussion clearly points out that every manager is a philosopher. Meaning to say, philosophy is at the center of management studies. It pervades all of what people think, feel, do in reality or even in mere imagination. In an age where management research is increasingly judged by its social impact, it is critical that scholarly works are built on a strong intellectual foundation. Philosophy is that foundation.

It pays to have a succinct overview of the field of management philosophy as well as a roadmap for those who wish to explore the terrain further. All knowledge inquiry invokes philosophy and philosophical thinking, and that the artificial separation between philosophy and management is fallacious. Just as philosophy is everywhere, so is management issues. And for better or for worse, they go hand in hand.

The study of philosophy develops a person's ability to solve problems, to communicate, to organize ideas and issues, to assess pros and cons, and to simplify complex data. These capacities are transferable skills from philosophy to non-philosophy areas. For this reason, people trained in philosophy are prepared to do many kinds of management tasks.

Nevertheless, it has to be noted that for philosophy and management to mutually impact and enrich each other, it would be helpful if the persons involved in the process are being oriented first to the crucial philosophical terms and ways of thinking. Other than the technical terms specific to philosophy, one has to wrestle also with the possible layers of meaning in a single given concept.

References:

- Adeoti, O., George, O., & Adegboye, M. (2013). Management thought and philosophy. In Global Advanced Research Journal of Social Science (GARJSS (Vol. 2, Issue 9). <http://garj.org/garjss/index.htm>
- Adib, H. Mohammad, 2015. *Filsafat Ilmu*, Edisi 3. Pustaka Pelajat, Yogyakarta
- Agogbua, S. N., & Abugbum, H. (2017). Evolution of Management Thought: A Continuous or Discontinuous Process. In European Journal of Business and Management www.iiste.org ISSN (Vol. 9, Issue 35). Online. www.iiste.org
- Agrey, L. G. (2014). Philosophical Hermeneutics: A Tradition with Promise. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 2(2), 188–192. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2014.020211>
- Armada, Riyanto CM, 2013, *Menjadi-Mencintai: Berfilsafat Teologis Sakari-hari*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: P T Kanisius.
- _____, 2014, *Katolisitas DIALOGICAL: Ajaran Sosial Katolik*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: P T Kanisius.
- _____, et al, (eds.), 2015, *Kearifan Lokal PANCASILA: Butir-Butir Filsafat Keindonesiaan*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: P T Kanisius.
- _____, 2018. *RELASIONALITAS: Filsafat Fundasi Interpretasi Aku, Teks, Liyan, dan Fenomen*, Yogyakarta, Indonesia: P T Kanisius.
- Asseng, S., Berger, J. D., Milroy, S. P., Moeller, C., Berger, J., & Milroy, S. (2006). Initial soil water: myth and management.
- Augustin, M. 2015, “Weight in Greek Atomism,” *Philosophia*, 45: 76–99.
- Balsas, Á., & Silva, J. B. da. (2018). Presentation – Philosophy of Management. *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia*, 74(2–3), 363–366. https://doi.org/10.17990/rpf/2018_74_2_0363
- Bateman TS, Zeithaml CP (1993). *Management: function and strategy* (2nd Edition). Burr Ridge, Illinois: Irwin.
- Charles Ingraham Sandy Ross Mohamed Mohamad, B. H. (n.d.). *MANAGEMENT PHILOSOPHY*.
- Chia, R. (1995). From modern to postmodern organizational analysis. *Organization studies*, 16(4), 579-604.
- Clegg, S. (1990). *Modern organizations: Organization studies in the postmodern world*: Sage.

Cooper, R., & Burrell, G. (1988). Modernism, postmodernism and organizational analysis: An introduction. *Organization studies*, 9(1), 91-112.

Cornelli, G, 2016, “A review of Aristotle’s Claim Regarding Pythagoreans Fundamental Beliefs: All is Number?” *Prometeus: Filosofia Unisinos*, 17(1): 50–57.

Cowan, R. S. (1976). The " Industrial Revolution" in the home: household technology and social change in the 20th century. *Technology and Culture*, 1-23.

Curd, P., 2020, “Presocratic Natural Philosophy,” in L. Taub (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek and Roman Science*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 15–38.

Davies, O. (2009). Hermeneutics. In *The Oxford Handbook of Systematic Theology*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199245765.003.0028> De Vries, J. (1994). The industrial revolution and the industrious revolution. *Journal of Economic History*, 54(2), 249-270.

Drucker Peter, F. (1954). *The practice of management*: Harper & Brothers, New York, NY.

_____, (1998). Management’s new paradigms. *Forbes Magazine*, 10, 98.

Fayol, H. (1930), *Industrial and General Administration* (Translated by Coubrough, J.A.), Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, London.

Freedman, D. H. (1992). Is management still a science? *Harvard Business Review*, 70(6), 26-&.

Freeman, C., & Louçã, F. (2002). As time goes by: from the industrial revolutions to the information revolution. *OUP Catalogue*.

Gulzar, A. (2015). Impact of Industrial Revolution on Management Thought. *Sukkur IBA Journal of Management and Business*, 2(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.30537/sijmb.v2i1.85>

Hartley NT (2006). ‘Management history: an umbrella model’. *J. Manage. Hist.*, 12 (3):278-292. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17511340610670188>.

Hussain, N., Haque, A. U., & Baloch, A. (2019). Management Theories: The Contribution of Contemporary Management Theorists in Tackling Contemporary Management Challenges. *Journal of Yaşar University*, 14, 156–169. <https://doi.org/10.19168/jyasar.635061>

Jensen, M. C. (1993). The modern industrial revolution, exit, and the failure of internal control systems. *the Journal of Finance*, 48(3), 831-880.

- Jones, C. I. (2001). Was an industrial revolution inevitable? Economic growth over the very long run. *Advances in Macroeconomics*, 1(2).
- Jones, G. R., George, J. M., & Hill, C. W. (2003). *Contemporary management*: McGraw-Hill/Irwin New York.
- Koontz H, O'Donnel C, Weihrich H (1980). *Management (Seventh Edition)*, International Student Edition, Auckland, Bogota, McGraw-Hill International Book Company.
- Kreitner R (1995). *Management*. 6th Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Kwok, A.C.F. (2014), *The Evolution of Management Theories: A Literature Review*, Nang Yang Business Journal, Hong Kong
- Laks, A., 2018, *The Concept of Presocratic Philosophy: Its Origin, Development and Significance*, G. Most, trans., Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Translation of Laks 2006.)
- Mansfeld, J., 2018, *Studies in Early Greek Philosophy: A Collection of Papers and One Review*, Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Mc Farland DE (1979). *Management Principles and Practice*, New York Publishing, Macmillan Company.
- McKirahan, R., 2011, *Philosophy Before Socrates*, 2nd edition, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co.
- Melé, D. (2006). *ETHICS IN MANAGEMENT: EXPLORING THE CONTRIBUTION OF MARY PARKER FOLLETT*. Nicholson, J. (2011). *The Industrial Revolution and Beyond. The Gifts of Athena: Historical Origins of the Knowledge Economy*, 78.
- Navoda, H., & Zoysa, D. (n.d.). *A Conceptual Analysis and Historical Overview of Philosophy Professional Ethics and Customer Relationship Management (CRM) View project A Conceptual Analysis and Historical Overview of Philosophy*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301301526>
- Nkemdilim, O. M. I. (2020). *Management Thoughts and Philosophy Classified in Theme Framework*. *The International Journal of Business & Management*, 8(4). <https://doi.org/10.24940/theijbm/2020/v8/i4/bm2004-028>

Palmer, J., 2018, “Contradiction and *Aporia* in Early Greek Philosophy,” in V. Politis and G. Karamanolis (eds.), *The Aporetic Tradition in Ancient Philosophy*, London and New York: Routledge, 9–28.

_____, 2019, “Presocratic Interest in the Persistence of Soul upon Death,” in J. Sisko, (ed.), *Philosophy of Mind in Antiquity* (Volume I), London and New York: Routledge, 1–22.

Paterson, M., & Higgs, J. (2015). Using Hermeneutics as a Qualitative Research Approach in Professional Practice. *The Qualitative Report*. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2005.1853> Payne SC, Youngcourt SS, Watrous KM (2006). ‘Portrayals of F. W. Taylor across textbooks. *J. Manage. Hist.*, 12 (4):385-407. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17511340610692752>.

Pawar, A., Sudan, K., & Sunarsi, D. (2020). Organizational Servant Leadership: A Systematic Literature Review for Implications in Business. *International Journal of Educational Administration, Management, and Leadership*, 1(2), 63–76.

Pinto, R., 2017, “*Nous*, Motion, and Teleology in Anaxagoras,” *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, 52: 1–32.

Porth SJ, McCall J (2001). ‘Contemporary management theories and Catholic social teaching: similarities and differences’, *Revi.Bus.*, 22 (3):8-21.

Rasool, S. (2018). What is Hermeneutics (Vol. 6, Issue 1). www.ijcrt.org

Sassi, M. M. (ed.), 2018, *The Beginnings of Philosophy in Greece*, M. Assuni (trans.), Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Senge, P.M. (1990), *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of Learning Organization*, Random House, London.

Taylor, F. W. (2013). *Scientific management*: Routledge.

Torou, E., Katifori, A., Vassilakis, C., Lepouras, G., Elena, T., Akrivi, K., Costas, V., Georgios, L., & Constantin, H. (2009). *Capturing the historical research methodology: an experimental approach CrossCult H2020 Project View project CrossCult View project CAPTURING THE HISTORICAL RESEARCH METHODOLOGY: AN EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228328281>

Trépanier, S., 2017, “From Hades to the Stars: Empedocles on the Cosmic Habitats of Soul,” *Classical Antiquity*, 36(1): 130–182.

_____, 2017, “Empedocles *On Nature* 1.273–287: Place, the Elements, and Still No ‘We’,” *Mnemosyne*, 70(4): 562–584.

Vasallo, C. (ed.) 2019, *Presocratics and Papyrological Tradition*, Berlin and Boston, De Gruyter.

Vegetti, M., 1999, “Culpability, Responsibility, Cause: Philosophy, Historiography, and Medicine in the Fifth Century,” in Long, 1999: 271–89.

Von Tunzelmann, G. N. (1995). *Technology and Industrial Progress: the foundations of economic growth*: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Wren D. A. (2005), *The Evolution of Management Thought*, Portland, Ronald Press Co.

Yoo JW, Lemak DJ, Choi Y (2006). ‘Principles of management and competitive strategies: using Fayol to implement Porter’. *Journal of Management History*, 12 (4):352-368. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17511340610692734>.