Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

Journal homepage: http://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/ IJOMR/

A General Theory of Organizational Behavior: An Educational Perspective

*Valery V. Glushchenko**

Department of Smart Technologies, Project Activity Center, Moscow Polytechnic University, Moscow 107023, Russia Federation

*Correspondence E-mail: valery.v.glushchenko@gmail.com, glu-valery@yandex.ru

ABSTRACTS

the subject of the article is the general theory of organizational behavior; the object of the work is organizational behavior; the purpose of the article is to develop a methodology for managing organizational behavior; to achieve this goal, the following tasks are solved: studying the evolution of management methods in the process of changing technological orders; methodological provisions of the general theory of organizational behavior are developed; the structure and features of structural elements of organizational behavior are investigated; the influence of the organizational behavior management process on the effectiveness and risks of the organization's activities is studied; the scientific methods in the article are: philosophy and methodology of management; historical and logical analysis of management methods, organization theory, management psychology, theory of organizational behavior, expert methods; scientific novelty the work is related to the development of the methodology of the scientific theory of organizational behavior in the conditions of the tenth technological order (structure).

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Submitted/Received 14 Jul 2022
First revised 14 Aug 2022
Accepted 28 Aug 2022
First available online 30 Aug 2022
Publiction date 01 Sep 2022

Keyword:
Analysis,
Behavior,
Efficiency,
Functions,
Laws,
Management,
Methodology,
Neurotechnology,
Organization,
Risk,
Roles,
Technological order,
Theory,
Tools.

1. INTRODUCTION

The relevance of the article is determined by the fact that in 2022 (against the background of the formation of a new 10th technological order), new approaches to management are developing. At the same time, the formation of a new technological way of life is manifested not only in changing the technologies of organizations' activities but also in the formation of new management methods in the economy and society.

The development of the 10th technological order is accompanied by the emergence of new scientific directions in the field of management. We are talking about such new directions: Neuromarketing, neuro management, behavioral economics, neuroeconomics, neurogeopolitics, organizational behavior, management of social development of personnel, and others. The need for the development of new directions in management activities is related to the complexity of management objects and the increasing complexity of situations and processes in management and others.

In this situation, the absence of a scientific theory of organizational behavior can lead to an increase in risks in the processes of activity of subjects and the development of the national socio-economic system. The hypothesis of this article is the assumption that the development of a scientific theory of organizational behavior can contribute to improving efficiency and/or reducing the risks of organizational behavior management processes.

The purpose of the article is to develop the methodology of organizational behavior management. To achieve this goal, the following tasks are solved:

(i) Study of the processes of evolution of management methods in the process of changing technological orders (patterns);
(ii) Methodological provisions of the scientific theory of organizational behavior are being developed;
(iii) The structure and features of the structural elements of the theory of organizational behavior are investigated;
(iv) The influence of the organizational behavior management process on the effectiveness and risks of the organization's activities is studied.

The object of the work is organizational behavior in the conditions of the 10th technological order. The subject of the article is the scientific theory of organizational behavior in the conditions of the 10th technological order. The analysis of scientific publications on the topic of the article revealed the following. At the beginning of the 21st century, systems for managing the behavior of organizations are being formed (Gubko, 2020).

In many countries, methods of assessing the civil organizational behavior of the population are being formed (Sadik, 2020; Abisheva, 2019). Scientists create models of organizational behavior characteristic of certain social groups of the population (Mudrova & Guzikova, 2022). Experts believe that motivation can influence organizational behavior (Serebrovskaya, 2015). Organizational culture has a great influence on organizational behavior (Nikpour, 2018).

In 2022, mechanisms and tools for managing organizational behavior are being created. In this regard, there is a growing interest in the theoretical aspects of organizational behavior. Experts are investigating industry aspects and features of organizational behavior, for example, in medicine (Emanuel *et al*., 2018). Scientists are studying the place of behavioral economics in the economy of the 21st century (Eminova, 2021). Experts compare managerial and behavioral economics (Sazhina, 2019).

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxx
p- ISSN 2776-608X e- ISSN 2776-5970

Experts evaluate the contribution of behavioral economics to the theory of entrepreneurship and investigate the application of behavioral economics methods in business policy (Dodbryagina, 2021). Scientists believe that behavioral economics is at the intersection of psychology and economics. Analysts consider it important to observe the principle of rationality in behavioral economics (Ilyukhin *et al*., 2019). Scientists express the opinion that neuroeconomics is an interdisciplinary approach to the study of the economic behavior of subjects (Danilkina, 2019).

Neuroeconomics can be considered a way to obtain information about consumers. At the same time, it can be proved that there is a connection between neurogeopolitics and geopolitical organizational behavior (Glushchenko, 2021b). In 1936, a traveling salesman from the USA, Dale Carnegie, described his experience of influencing people's purchasing behavior. Scientists describe various behavioral aspects of the organization's activities (Ivancevich & Gibson, 2003).

The development of scientific foundations of organizational behavior occurs simultaneously with the formation of a new technological way (Glushchenko, 2021a). The analysis of publications on the topic of the article carried out in this article confirms the relevance of the topic of this article.

2. METHODS

This paper was prepared by collecting data from internet literature and paper from international journals.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Under the technological structure, it was proposed to understand the systemic unification of new types of technologies in the structure of the technological basis of organizations; a new world order; a new monetary and credit system; new business methods; new methods of managing organizations; new forms in science and education; new concepts in the management of organizations and others (Glushchenko & Glushchenko, 2018). In particular, the historical analysis allows us to talk about the emergence of new management methods in organizations with a change in technological structure. The results of such an analysis of the development of management methods as a function of changing the sequence number of the technological structure are reflected in **Table 1**.

It is predicted that in the field of organizational forms of business, the 10th technological order will be characterized by the following: synthesis of corporate and regional ecosystems; development of clustering in the economy; creation of technological platforms; organization of scientific and educational platforms; creation of nature-like technologies for conducting activities and others.

In the field of management methods in the period of the 10th technological order, it is expected: the transition from the process to the project model of organizations' activities; the development of matrix organizational structures; the development of remote work of personnel; increasing the role of organizational culture in ensuring the competitiveness of organizations; practical application of participatory management; application of the methodology of management of social development of personnel; active and regular use of neurotechnologies in management processes; management development group and personal organizational behavior and others.

As you know, scientists believe that the origins of the science of organizational behavior go back to an ancient period. Such ancient philosophers as Aristotle, Socrates, Chrysippus,

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxx
p- ISSN 2776-608X e- ISSN 2776-5970

Plato, and others also dealt with behavior problems. However, the emergence of a scientific approach in the field of organizational behavior became possible after the formation and development of the idea of evolutionism.

In 2022, organizational behavior appears as a combination and intersection of related scientific disciplines. These scientific disciplines deal with various aspects of organizational behavior. It is believed that in the current period, various behavioral sciences are being combined into a single scientific direction that has an interdisciplinary character (Ivancevich & Gibson, 2003).

Table 1. Historical analysis of the evolution of science and education, management methods in organizations in the process of changing technological orders.

No	Elements of Technological Orders / Name, Number, Period of Technological Orders	Organization of Science and Education	Organizational Structures of Business, Concepts of Organization Management, Work with Personnel
1.	The first technological order, the invention of the sail, was from 5500 BC to 2000 BC.	Education and scientific research in personal schools of famous philosophers, and scientists; creation of writing and registration of facts	Heuristic organizational structures; Egyptians' recognition of the need for planning, organization, and control
2.	The second technological order; Horse traction; Horse traction; 2000 BC – 4th century BC; 2000 BC. – IX century AD;	Scientific research and education in monasteries and schools of famous philosophers, scientists	Traditional organizational structures, Centralization, organization, control, labor stimulation,
3.	The third technological order; The invention of the saddle, the appearance of pack transport; 4th century BC – IX century AD;	Scientific research and education in monasteries and schools of famous philosophers, scientists	Traditional organizational structures; recognition of the principle of universality of management; approval of management as a special kind of art; unity of command, human relations
4.	The fourth technological order, Windmill, a water mill; Ix century-1770;	Research and education at universities	Traditional organizational structures, Definition of requirements for the manager, the theory of power, the study of the impact of automation
5.	The fifth technological order, Textile machines, 1770-1830;	Scientific research and education in academies of sciences, universities, factories, and manufactories	Traditional organizational structures economic theory, finance theory, the principle of labor specialization
6.	The sixth Technological Order, the invention of the steam engine; 1830-1880;	Scientific research and education in the academies of sciences, Universities, factories, and manufactories	Traditional organizational structures, theory of public services, analysis of employee motivation
7.	The sixth technological Order, The internal combustion engine and electric motor; 1880-1930;	Scientific research and education in the academies of sciences, Universities, technical schools, technological institutes	Functional organizational structures, scientific management, methods of statistics in management, personnel work

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxx
p- ISSN 2776-608X e- ISSN 2776-5970

Table 1 (continue). Historical analysis of the evolution of science and education, management methods in organizations in the process of changing technological orders.

No	Elements of Technological Orders / Name, Number, Period of Technological Orders	Organization of Science and Education	Organizational Structures of Business, Concepts of Organization Management, Work with Personnel
8.	Electronic computer, genetics; The eighth technological Order, 1930-1970;	Scientific research and education in the academies of Sciences, Universities, technological institutes, laboratories of corporations	Product organizational structures, Operational research, system analysis, marketing, personnel management,
9.	The ninth Technological order; development of microelectronics; 1970-2010;	Scientific research and education in Technological institutes, laboratories of corporations	Clusters, technology platforms; distributed management systems, participatory management, human resource management
10.	The 10th Technological order; nanotechnologies, neurotechnologies, It-technologies, resource -saving technologies, etc.; 2010-2040;	Project approach; research and education in ecosystems, technology platforms, and clusters, development of the project and smart education, mentoring in education	Ecosystems; organizational behavior, architecture, design, culture; neuromanagement, Neuromarketing, management of social development of personnel, mentoring

This suggests that organizational behavior as a scientific discipline is still in the process of its formation in 2022. Probably, to talk about organizational behavior as an independent scientific direction in management theory, a systematic unification (aggregation) of knowledge from various sciences into a single whole should take place in this area. As a result of such a systematic unification of knowledge, there is such a property of new scientific knowledge in the field of organizational behavior as emergence.

The emergence of knowledge is proposed to be understood as a property of the irreducibility of integrative knowledge in the field of organizational behavior to the properties of knowledge in other scientific fields. The emergence of such knowledge allows us to talk about a fundamentally new level of knowledge in the field of organizational behavior. Consequently, the creation of organizational behavior as a new scientific discipline will be characterized by a new quality of knowledge in this area. Accordingly, this new quality of knowledge in the field of organizational behavior will allow you to obtain more valuable practical results, increase: the effectiveness of organizational behavior management; loyalty of the organization's personnel; reduce risks in the organization's activities, and more.

The fact that organizational behavior as a scientific discipline is at the stage of its development is also indicated by the fact that many basic concepts in this area can be considered debatable. Consider the very concept of "organizational behavior". There is such a definition of this concept: behavior can be described as the ability of a person (or organization) to change their actions under the influence of external and internal factors (Ivancevich & Gibson, 2003).

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxx
p- ISSN 2776-608X e- ISSN 2776-5970

Linguistic analysis of this scientific definition suggests that the keywords of this definition are the words: "change" and "impact". However, it is known that a change under the influence of external or internal signals refers to the definition of the control process. Therefore, it can be concluded that the well-known work of foreign authors does not define the concept of "behavior", but it defines the concept of "management of organizational behavior"?

At the same time, foreign authors believe that in practice behavior has a great adaptive (adaptive) value. The adaptability property allows subjects of various processes to avoid negative environmental factors. In humans, behavior is characterized by control by the nervous system (Ivancevich & Gibson, 2003).

The definition of the concept of "organizational behavior" was given in work (Glushchenko, 2020a). This article was devoted to the joint development of organizational behavior (in the field of geopolitics) and such a new scientific direction as neurogeopolitics (Glushchenko, 2020b). In the process of further development of this scientific direction in this article, it is logical to use the results obtained in the field of managerial neuromarketing (Glushchenko & Glushchenko, 2018).

(i) Organizational behavior in this article will be understood as a certain sequence of decisions and actions of one (or a group) of socio-economic and/or geopolitical actors during a certain period and/or the preservation of a certain managerial situation. Organizational behavior is a set of decisions and actions of subjects in certain external and internal conditions and over time may have its own: external conditions (for example, the presence of restrictions);
(ii) internal conditions (for example, the availability of resources);
(iii) purpose, methods, and tools to achieve;
(iv) motives of behavior and individual actions;
(v) organization of behavior as its structure;
(vi) consequences of behavior;
(vii) the mentality of the subject;
(viii) values of the subject;
(ix) image of the subject, ethical norms of behavior.

From a cognitive point of view, the scientific direction called "organizational behavior" is a purposeful study of those factors that determine the appearance of a certain sequence of decisions and actions of a subject in the process of his economic or social activity. Then this knowledge is used in practice to achieve certain goals. In organizational behavior, it is important how exactly subjects interact with each other within a certain organization (world order; state; market; corporation, etc.).

From the point of view of the logic of the subject's behavior, it is possible to distinguish the spheres: rational (logical) behavior and irrational (at first glance not logical) behavior of the subject of activity. Behavioral Economics deals with rational behavior (Ilyukhin *et al*., 2019). Irrational behavior of economic subjects is considered in neuroeconomics (Danilkina, 2019).

The analysis shows that the possibility of joint study and/or integration of neuro-managerial and behavioral approaches in management is created by their common features: they (both of these approaches) are based on knowledge of the mentality and psychology of a person (or a group of persons); they are engaged (among other things) in the study of behavior in ordinary and emergencies, which form a "complete group of events in behavior"; these sciences reflect the possibility of management and behavior both in a normal situation and in a situation severe stress; these scientific disciplines take into account the need for management and certain behavior during conflicts; management decisions in them are

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxx
p- ISSN 2776-608X e- ISSN 2776-5970

associated with the possibility of registering indicators of the functioning of subjects, objects of management and behavior using technical means, and much more.

It should be noted that with a certain ratio of methods and tools of organizational behavior: rational behavioral and neuromanagement (outwardly, perhaps irrational) approaches have fundamental differences, and therefore cannot be considered identical methodologies. However, in their entirety, these two approaches cover the entire sphere of organizational behavior (using the terminology of probability theory, we can say that they cover (or create) a "complete group of events in behavior".

The term "complete group of events in behavior" means that such a group of events in behavior includes all kinds of actions within a certain type of behavior (rational, irrational; isotonic, non-isotonic behavior, and others). Isotonic behavior will be called behavior in which the subject of behavior reacts more strongly to a stronger managerial influence.

At the same time, it should be borne in mind that, as is known from philosophy, there are two stages in any process of organization development: the stage of evolutionary development and the stage of abrupt development (the law of the transition of quantity to a new quality).

From the point of view of the processes of development of the subject of managerial decision-making, it can be said that organizational behavior can be structurally divided into two parts:

(i) Organizational behavior within the framework of the evolutionary process;
(ii) Organizational behavior in a situation of a qualitative leap, a crisis in the development of the subject of management - neuromanagement.

In the conditions of a qualitative leap in the state of the subject of management, those decisions that seemed rational from the point of view of the process of evolution may turn out to be irrational in fundamentally new conditions. For example, if the company's management has decided to switch to using new technologies, then it is irrational to keep the old equipment. However, from the point of view of common sense, is it irrational to get rid of still working equipment? Does this mean that the concepts of "rational behavior" and "irrational behavior" are relative? For example, is it irrational to produce new products on old equipment?

Therefore, we can say that the conclusion about the degree of rationality of behavior can be made only after analyzing: the context of the decisions made; the goals of the decision made; the external and internal conditions of such behavior.

Does this mean that traditional administrative management (management) and neuromanagement are two sides of the same management process? Let's assume that rationality and irrationality are two different characteristics of the same management process. Here we can draw an analogy with the well-known law of Frederick Hertzberg. F. Hertzberg has established from his own experience that the process of increasing employee satisfaction and the process of increasing their dissatisfaction are two different processes. Therefore, the dissonance between the process of satisfying needs and the growth of dissatisfaction with the situation can create stress in the subject of behavior.

In this case, the simultaneous application of two methods (traditional management and neurotechnological approach) to the same organizational behavior (process and/or subject, object) can be considered a multivariate analysis. In this case, the multivariate analysis makes it possible to increase the accuracy and reliability of assessments of the type and characteristics of the subject's behavior. Thus, multivariate (traditional and neurotechnological) analysis can be a tool for improving the effectiveness of risk management in the organizational behavior of the studied subject.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxx
p- ISSN 2776-608X e- ISSN 2776-5970

Such an increase in the accuracy of assessments of the behavior of subjects becomes an extremely important factor in the conditions of the global systemic crisis, and the need for the development of anti-crisis management. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that anti-crisis management is often characterized by the increased stress of the subject of management. And management under conditions of increased stress and uncertainty can be attributed to the use of neurotechnologies in the management of an organization.

Under organizational behavior, we agree to understand the scientific direction dealing with the study of the sequence of actions and actions of the subjects of the management process, external and internal conditions of the actions of subjects, the reasons for making rational and/or paradoxical (irrational) managerial decisions, including managerial decisions made in the context of a geopolitical systemic crisis, stock market shocks, mass bankruptcies, etc.

For the development of methodological provisions of organizational behavior (as a new scientific discipline), it is applicable that, as is known, in the philosophy and methodology of science, the most effective, with maximum predictive capabilities, scientific support of practice has the form of a detailed scientific theory.

The scientific theory of organizational behavior can be a structural element of the general theory (science) of management. The theory of organizational behavior is formed as an integral system of theoretical and applied knowledge about objects, subjects, and tools for managing organizational behavior at various levels of hierarchy (global, state, corporate, corporate, and individual).

Organizational behavior (as a structural element of management theory) is focused on the study of sequences of actions of subjects: logical actions, decisions; seemingly illogical, gaming, crises, and actions; decisions of subjects of life processes under stress.

Organizational behavior is formed as an integral system of theoretical and applied knowledge about objects, subjects, tools of global management, risk management, and their impact on all aspects of human life.

The object of the scientific theory of organizational behavior (behavioral approach in management, economics, geopolitics) will be the behavior of the subjects of these processes; the results of the behavior of subjects; risks determined by behavior, and others.

The essence of organizational behavior (behavioral approach in management theory, economics, etc.) reveals their functions and roles.

The function of the philosophical justification of the theory of organizational behavior is to synthesize the most general and wise view of the ways and forms of organizational behavior to the greatest extent, corresponding to external and internal conditions, and the goals of such behavior. The ideology of organizational behavior reflects: firstly, the main idea of such organizational behavior, including a set of views on the emergence and progress of the main ideas (theories) of organizational behavior; secondly, the way of decomposition of power (the need for influence) on a specific type of organizational behavior.

In the theory of organizational behavior, its methodological function includes the synthesis of scientific foundations and methodology for studying the external and internal environment of the behavior of subjects and methods of decision-making in the process of a certain type of behavior.

In the science of organizational behavior, its cognitive function determines the processes of obtaining, systematizing, and studying the facts of reality characteristic of certain types of behavior and/or behavior that goes beyond certain limits.

In the general theory of organizational behavior, its regulatory (instrumental) function is of a practical nature and consists of the formation of practical recommendations for subjects

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxx
p- ISSN 2776-608X e- ISSN 2776-5970

of behavior, including in situations of illogical and/or paradoxical behavior of individual subjects of socio-economic or geopolitical relations.

In the science of organizational behavior, its predictive function is aimed at the formation of tools and methods for the formation of probabilistic characteristics of the type of behavior, individual actions (decisions), and the results of the behavior of subjects.

In the theory of organizational behavior, the legislative (normative) function of this scientific discipline is aimed at creating an effective system of law and/or individual norms of positive law. The criteria for the effectiveness of legal norms can be: the formation of effective behavior of subjects by such norms; reducing the likelihood of risks of the destructive behavior of subjects.

In the science of organizational behavior, the ideological (ideological and educational) function of this science covers the formation of certain global legal and civic ideals, values, and norms underlying compliance with the norms of law-abiding behavior of individuals and legal entities.

In the theory of organizational behavior, the preventive function of this theory is to identify the sources of risks and minimize the risks of the destructive behavior of subjects. Within the framework of this function of the theory of organizational behavior, constructive behavior can be called behavior aimed at achieving goals, taking into account existing legal and resource constraints. Destructive behavior can be called, which is aimed at several points:

(i) Disrupting the achievement of goals;
(ii) Destroying public institutions;
(iii) Generating new conflicts and other negative results.

In the science of organizational behavior, its socialization function is aimed at the formation and dissemination in the society of knowledge about organizational behavior and its consequences for subjects, the economy, and society.

The psychological function of the general theory of organizational behavior is aimed at creating conditions for the perception and presentation of organizational behavior as a real factor of the quality of being in modern conditions of an acute systemic crisis of globalization.

The roles of the general theory of organizational behavior should be recognized as improving the efficiency of socio-economic activities of subjects; reducing various types of risks in the activities of subjects.

The laws of the theory of organizational behavior reflect stable causal relationships between a certain type of behavior and the results of the socio-economic activity of the subject. The laws of the science of organizational behavior include the following statements: the behavior of the subject is influenced by a combination of external and internal factors; the type of behavior of the subject is determined by his mentality; mentality determines the content of the decision that the subject of behavior takes in specific external and internal conditions; due to the increasing level of complexity of the external and internal environment of the subjects of behavior.

The importance of organizational behavior will increase; the number of variants of socio-economic behavior will increase; in a situation of global crisis, the influence of neurotechnologies on organizational behavior will increase; the influence of the image of the subject of organizational behavior will grow; generalized characteristics of organizational behavior can be called image, efficiency and effectiveness of behavior; in the conditions of increasing complexity of the external and internal environment of socio-economic entities, the risks determined by their behavior will increase; the role of the scientific theory of organizational behavior in the system of management sciences will increase; due to the

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxx
p- ISSN 2776-608X e- ISSN 2776-5970

acceleration of scientific and technological progress, the role of innovative behavior will increase, the number of economic entities will increase, etc.

In the development of the science of organizational behavior, it should be taken into account that, as Z. believed. Brzezinski the source of geopolitical development in the 21st century will be innovation and business activity in innovation [24, pp. 32-42]. On this basis, routine (non-innovative) and innovative behavior can be distinguished in the structure of organizational behavior.

At the same time, taking into account changes in the level of technological development of countries, activity in the field of innovation, the geopolitical status, and the level of socio-economic development of countries may depend. Its states may be restructured, as well as associations of states.

Organizational behavior should take into account the nature of organizational behavior affects: the socio-economic results of such behavior (the social status of the subject of behavior, the amount of capital, income, expenses, etc.); the risks associated with the chosen line of behavior. It should be taken into account that there may be different types of relationships between different subjects, which are an external controlling factor of organizational behavior as a process over time. At the same time, different types of relations can be formed between the same subjects of relations:

(i) Partnership and cooperation relations within the framework of certain projects or activities;
(ii) Confrontational relations, for example, in the process of conflict resolution, for example, when resolving conflicts in court;
(iii) Competitive relations, for example, in innovation and other types of relations.

Such heterogeneity of simultaneously existing relations of subjects of behavior can be a source of irrational behavior and stress. It leads to the adoption of suboptimal decisions.

Let's agree to understand by hybrid competition of subjects of socio-economic relations the systemic opposition of such players to each other by various methods (marketing, financial, managerial, and others). Since such competition is a process, it is better to analyze the course of such competition and its results within the framework of a behavioral approach in management.

In the behavioral analysis of socio-economic processes, it is necessary to take into account the possibility of the existence of such competitive relations among subjects: latent (hidden) goals and interests of a tactical and strategic nature; covertly (latently) take part in not one of the competing coalitions of players.

Therefore, in organizational behavior, elements (sides) of such behavior can be identified related to indicators of evaluating the effectiveness of a certain style of behavior (economic behavior, risk behavior, product quality behavior, cost behavior, pricing behavior, and others).

Tools and methods of research of organizational behavior can be considered: collection and structuring of information; management psychology; heuristic synthesis; forecasting, planning, goal-setting, organization, motivation, control; management marketing, predictive analysis, etc.

When studying the geopolitical, social, and economic organizational behavior of specific subjects, it is necessary to take into account the possibility of developing network relations between the subjects of these relations in the 21st century. With this in mind, the new world order and socio-economic institutions can get a network type of development, a network character. This means that the subjects of such relations will interact with several subjects at once on various issues of their life. In the process of such relations, the value of dominance relations (vertical relations) may decrease and the value of partnership relations (horizontal

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxx
p- ISSN 2776-608X e- ISSN 2776-5970

relations) may increase. At the same time, the most developed subjects of relations can act as a kind of "mentors" concerning less developed partners.

The philosophy of organizational behavior research is the most general and wise view of the process and results of organizational behavior research. The philosophy of organizational behavior research finds its practical expression in the formation of the principles of such research.

The principles of organizational behavior research can be recognized as an advanced development of methodological foundations for the study of organizational behavior; predictive analysis of organizational behavior processes; situational and periodic monitoring of the degree of sufficiency of the practice of studying organizational behavior; rating assessment of the level of development of organizational behavior analysis. behavior in various fields of activity; objective, reliable, and accurate scientometric assessment of the status and contribution of various scientists.

The mechanism of formation of organizational behavior will be called a system of methods and tools with which organizational behavior is formed. The mechanism for managing organizational behavior will have its characteristics in various spheres: geopolitical, social, and interpersonal relations. The main elements of the mechanism of formation of organizational behavior include the mentality of the subject of behavior; psychological characteristics of the subject; organizational and general culture of the subject of behavior; the system of motivation of the subject of behavior and much more.

Let's look at these elements in more detail. The mentality is an internal psychophysical element of the mechanism of forming the behavior of the subject of organizational behavior.

In 2022, the term "mentality" has several interpretations, is not unambiguous, and is generally accepted. There is an opinion that this concept can come from the Latin – "way of thinking". With this approach, the mentality of an individual (or a group of persons) is described as a set of spiritual, moral, and cultural values that form the basis of the worldview and worldview of the subject of decision-making and organizational behavior.

Within the framework of a systematic approach, mentality can be understood as the aggregation (systemic unification) of many elements of the psyche and thought processes of the subject of behavior, a person (a decision-maker). With this approach, the mentality systematically combines (aggregates) such characteristics of the subject of behavior:

(i) The way of thinking of the decision-maker (LPR);
(ii) The degree of abstraction of thinking of this subject;
(iii) The way of thinking of the LPR; the way of thinking of the LPR;
(iv) The perception of the world from the LNR;
(v) The culture of thought processes of the LNR;
(vi) The culture of communication of the LNR and others.

Based on this, it can be assumed that in the theory of organizational behavior, mentality determines the nature and specifics of information processing in the process of making managerial decisions, and forms a certain type of organizational behavior of the subject. This allows us to talk about the mental basis of the organizational behavior of the subject of economic or social activity.

Differences in people's mentality lead to a contradiction in their interests and behavior. This can create a conflict situation in the organization. Such a conflict situation can take place between institutions and people. It should be borne in mind that during the period of technological changes, the subjects of the previous technological order (most often) may hinder the progress and expansion of the influence of the subjects of the new technological order.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxx
p- ISSN 2776-608X e- ISSN 2776-5970

As already noted, the mentality of the decision-maker has a complex structure. The mentality can be structured according to many factors. In the structure of the mentality, we can distinguish:

(i) Concerning the field of activity, one can distinguish several points: geopolitical mentality; national mentality; professional mentality; social mentality, technological mentality; economic mentality; the cultural mentality of a person;
(ii) Concerning innovation, it is possible to structure an innovative and routine mentality;
(iii) Following the nature of the relations generated in the social environment or economy, it is possible to divide the types of mentalities into the mentality of partnership and competition, completeness (aggressiveness);
(iv) In relation to positive law, one can distinguish among a legal or criminal, corruption mentality, and much more.

As the main functions of the mentality of the subject of organizational behavior (decision-maker) can be called:

(i) A method of fixing socio-economic information used in future decision-making;
(ii) Principles of structuring and presentation of information in decision-making;
(iii) Formation of the specifics of perception and emotional coloring of information;
(iv) Determination of the way and specifics of thinking of various groups of decision makers (employees);
(v) Descriptions of the relationship between the type of mentality and the type of organizational behavior;
(vi) The function of mental identification and mental multiplication (mental multiplication) of the method of organizational behavior of subjects with a similar mentality;
(vii) The function of a protective reaction to the ways of behavior of subjects with a different mentality, which, for example, can be ousted from the organization based on mental and behavioral differences, and much more.

The roles of mentality in organizational behavior can be called: the division of subjects of relations on a mental basis into "strangers" and "their own"; increasing the effectiveness of interpersonal communications between mentally close subjects of organizational behavior, which can become the basis for the formation of formal and informal coalitions; identification of the definition of the type of organizational behavior of the subject (decision-maker, employee) and much more.

In addition to the mental component of organizational behavior, psychological and emotional components of organizational behavior can be distinguished. The behavior of the subject can be influenced by such elements of the human psyche: sensation; perception; representation; imagination; thinking.

Among the external factors influencing the subjects of organizational behavior are the following factors: organizational culture; discipline; staff motivation system; employee image; employee performance indicators (KPIs) and others.

Organizational culture is a set of rules and behavioral stereotypes, staff values, and beliefs about how an organization and its employees should respond to external and internal threats and opportunities. There are several classifications of organizational culture functions. With a minimum number of functions under consideration, the following functions are distinguished: integrating, which ensures the integrity of the process of organizational behavior; the protective function of organizational culture in organizational behavior, which ensures the stability of the type of behavior of the subject, blocks the actions of subjects that are not characteristic of the typical behavior of the subject.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxx
p- ISSN 2776-608X e- ISSN 2776-5970

Discipline in organizational behavior is an external tool for regulating organizational behavior. Discipline is the duty of the subject of organizational behavior to behave in a certain way: in a way established by the internal rules of the organization; rules determined by the norms of natural and positive law. Discipline is supported by: punishment for unacceptable behavior of the subject; reward for loyal behavior of the subject.

The system of motives of the subject's behavior is a set of measures aimed at ensuring that the subject behaves in such a way as to benefit the employer organization of this subject. A system of increasing the loyalty of subjects of organizational behavior can be developed.

Behavior evaluation indicators (or employee performance evaluation indicators (KPI)) influence the behavior of subjects who seek to maximize their KPIs in the process of their behavior.

The behavior of the subject affects the image of the subject of such behavior. By the image of the subject in organizational behavior, we agree to understand: a purposefully formed image of the subject of organizational behavior to increase the accuracy and reliability of forecasting the behavior of a particular subject in the field of social and/or economic activity. At the same time, the process of interaction between the image of the subject of behavior and the characteristics of the behavior of this subject is two-sided: behavior forms an image; the image of the subject affects his behavior.

As part of the function of knowledge socialization in organizational behavior, it should be taken into account that in the context of globalization, a significant part of the processes of business behavior and/or social behavior have different components and different results in nature. This determines the importance of socialization of knowledge about organizational behavior, including in the interests of awareness by subjects of the behavior of the reasonableness of certain self-restrictions related to the nature and existence: economic consequences (results) of behavior; certain risk assessments of certain types of behavior.

At the same time, the development of organizational behavior and thinking can affect not only political and business circles, but also a wide range of organizations, and various segments of the population. Behavioral perception and thinking refer to the psychological function of organizational behavior. Behavioral perception of reality by a subject can be defined as a direct sensory reflection of reality in the consciousness of the subject of activity, the ability of this subject to perceive, distinguish and assimilate socio-economic phenomena of the global world.

Behavioral thinking manifests itself in the ability of the subject of behavior, life processes to reason, synthesize with the use of imagination a sequence (chain) of cause-and-effect relationships between decisions made, their professional activities, behavior, and ongoing or possible results, risks, and the nature of processes.

Socio-economic or geopolitical behavioral thinking is the process of displaying objective reality (reality) in such forms of mental activity as representations, judgments, and concepts.

The representation allows the subject of organizational behavior to display images of factors that are not currently perceived but can influence the process and/or the result of a certain way of behavior of this subject.

Imagination in organizational behavior allows the subject of this behavior to directly predict the process of implementing behavior and its results.

To illustrate the similarities and differences between traditional (administrative) managerial, and behavioral approaches in management, a comparative analysis can be performed. Such a comparative analysis shows the following:

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxx
p- ISSN 2776-608X e- ISSN 2776-5970

(i) The traditional (administrative) management approach does not take into account: the psychology of the subjects; the development of the process over time; risks and their impact on the management process, etc.;

(ii) The behavioral approach takes into account: the psychology of the subjects; the development of the socio-economic process over time; takes into account the risks of the management process and their impact on the result and more.

The differences between administrative and behavioral approaches can be illustrated by such a historical example. It is known that during the Second World War, the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition supported the USSR. To do this, caravans of sea vessels (convoys) were sent to the USSR, which delivered the necessary goods. Ships from these convoys often sank as a result of bombing by Hitler's aviation. The first vessels were not equipped with machine guns aimed at combating the air threat. Subsequently, large-caliber machine guns were placed on ships from convoys to fire at enemy aircraft. At the same time, to enhance the psychological impact on the German pilots, some bullets were tracers. When firing such ammunition, the pilots saw the direction of firing from machine guns. Shooting their planes posed a risk to the pilots. Therefore, after installing such machine guns on ships from convoys, the losses of ships sharply decreased.

The analysis within the framework of the administrative approach suggests that the installation of machine guns on ships was not effective. With the help of such machine guns, German planes were shot down extremely rarely.

However, within the framework of a behavioral approach, the installation of machine guns on ships can be recognized as effective. This is because the installation of such machine guns on ships dramatically reduced the number of sunk ships. This effect arose because the German pilots began to feel the danger of their position in the process of their attack on the ships. To reduce their risks, they began: to carry out bombing on ships from long distances; they began to reduce the targeting time on the ship. Taken together, this dramatically reduced the effectiveness of bombing, which reduced the losses of ships from Allied convoys.

In this example, such a comparative analysis allows us to conclude that the use of a behavioral approach allows us to obtain additional information and can be productive in the practice of management in a new technological way.

At the same time, it should be borne in mind that in the case of the establishment of networked world order, this model of organizational behavior may become the most common. The processes of multiplication in the sphere of organizational behavior and mental animation of such a behavior model will contribute to the spread of the network model of behavior.

4. CONCLUSION

The article describes the evolution of management methods as a function of the process of changing technological patterns. The paper develops the methodological foundations of the scientific theory of organizational behavior in the interests of increasing the effectiveness of the management system of geopolitical and/or socio-economic processes in the conditions of the 10th technological order. The paper presents a classification of types of organizational behavior. The article describes the functions and roles, and the laws of the general theory of organizational behavior. The paper substantiates the great importance of mentality in the process of formation of the subject of the method of organizational behavior. The article provides a comparative analysis and a historical example of the differences between administrative and behavioral schools in the field of management.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxx
p- ISSN 2776-608X e- ISSN 2776-5970

5. AUTHORS' NOTE

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article. Authors confirmed that the paper was free of plagiarism.

6. REFERENCES

Abisheva, J. (2019). Empirical study of the inter-level influence of organizational civil behavior of managers on organizational civil behavior of employees: Based on a sample of the Republic of Kazakhstan. *Internauka, 15*(97), 63-74.

Danilkina, D. S. (2019). Neuroeconomics: A new interdisciplinary approach to the study of economic behavior. *Philosophy of Economy, 3*(123), 188-199.

Emanuel, A. V., Kochetkova, A. I., Shvabsky, O. R., Ivanov, G. A., Averyanova, E. V., and Efimushkina, O. A. (2018). Management of organizational behavior in a medical institution. *Quality Management in Medicine, 1*, 116-120.

Eminova, A. E. (2021). The place of behavioral economics in modern economics. *Elmi xəbərlər. Sosial və humanitar elmlər bölməsi, 17*(2), 83-85.

Glushchenko, V. (2021b). Synthesis of effective ideas of innovative pro-jects during the development of the eighth technological order. *International Jour-nal of Engineering Science Technologies, 5*(5), 99-118.

Glushchenko, V. V. (2020). Neurogeopoliticology and geopolitical organizational behavior. *Kazakhstan Scientific Journal, 3*(4), 17.

Glushchenko, V. V. (2021a). The mission and essence of the theory of technological orders. *International Journal of Engineering Science Technologies, 5*(4), 65-82.

Glushchenko, V. V., and Glushchenko, I. I. (2018). The development of methodology and practical directions of managerial neuromarketing. *Science and Practice Journal, 4*(3), 182-192.

Gubko, M. V. (2020). Building complex mechanisms of organizational behavior management. *Management Problems, 3*, 14-25.

Ilyukhin, A. A., Ponomareva, S. I., and Ilyukhina, S. V. (2019). The principle of rationality in behavioral economics. *Journal of Economic Theory, 16*(2), 214-224.

Ivancevich, J. M., and Gibson, J. L. (2003). Organizations: behavior, structure, processes. *Language, 18*, 574.

Mudrova, E. B., and Guzikova, L. A. (2022). Organizational behaviour model in management students: The dark triad traits. *Управленец, 13*(2), 57-69.

Nikpour, A. G. (2018). Cross-cultural analysis in the context of the issue of the influence of values on organizational behavior and principles of economic behavior. *Modern Science: Actual Problems of Theory and Practice. Series: Economics and Law, 3*, 110-115.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxx
p- ISSN 2776-608X e- ISSN 2776-5970

Sadik, A. M. S. (2020). Assessment of organizational civic behavior in the context of organizational commitment: by the example of public service institutions in Hefei, China. *Public Administration Issues*, *6*, 51-66.

Sazhina, M. A. (2019). Managerial economics and behavioral economics: General and special. *Economic Sciences, 179*, 12-19.

Serebrovskaya N. T. (2015). Motivated behavior as an important psychological component of organizational behavior of personnel. *NovaInfo.Ru*, *1*(37), 218-222.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxx
p- ISSN 2776-608X e- ISSN 2776-5970