

Educational management and paradigmatic management in education from the 20th Century to the 21ST Century**Gestão educativa e gestão paradigmática na educação do Século XX ao Século XXI**

DOI:10.34117/bjdv6n11-554

Recebimento dos originais:08/10/2020

Aceitação para publicação:25/11/2020

Zionel Santana

PhD in Philosophy from UGF / RJ

Professor in the Master's Program in Management, Planning and Teaching at the University of Vale do Rio Verde - UninCor / Três Corações / MG

E-mail: zionelsantana52@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The aim of this article is to approximate the conceptual delimitation in Heloíse Lück (2006) from paradigmatic management to Thomas Kuhn's (2007) paradigm idea. The conceptual delimitation of paradigmatic management is present in the collection of notebooks by Heloísa Lück (2006) in its variations. In Kuhn (2007), the paradigm idea was developed in his work the Structure of the Scientific Revolution (1970). In a second moment, we approach Lück's conceptual delimitation (2006) about managing Follett's idea (1997). The type of research used in the production of this text was bibliographic according to Köche (2015) that starts from the appropriation of concepts and concepts present in the literature. In this way, the hypothetical-deductive method was adopted (MARCONI; LAKATOS 2009) based on the problem raised about the approximation of the management idea and the paradigm idea. The result of the research points to the strangeness between the conceptual delimitation of paradigmatic management in Kuhn (2007) and Follett (1997). The working hypothesis in this research starts from the assumption that the delimitation of Lück's (2006) idea of management would bring possible different interpretations about the management of teaching in Brazilian education.

Keywords: Management, School, Decentralization, Educational.**RESUMO**

O objectivo deste artigo é aproximar a delimitação conceptual em Heloíse Lück (2006) desde a gestão paradigmática à ideia do paradigma de Thomas Kuhn (2007). A delimitação conceptual da gestão paradigmática está presente na colecção de cadernos de apontamentos de Heloísa Lück (2006) nas suas variações. Em Kuhn (2007), a ideia do paradigma foi desenvolvida no seu trabalho a Estrutura da Revolução Científica (1970). Num segundo momento, abordamos a delimitação conceptual de Lück (2006) sobre a gestão da ideia da Follett (1997). O tipo de investigação utilizada na produção deste texto foi bibliográfica segundo Köche (2015) que parte da apropriação de conceitos e conceitos presentes na literatura. Desta forma, foi adoptado o método hipotético-dedutivo (MARCONI; LAKATOS 2009) com base no problema levantado sobre a aproximação da ideia de gestão e a ideia de paradigma. O resultado da investigação aponta para a estranheza entre a delimitação conceptual da gestão paradigmática em Kuhn (2007) e Follett (1997). A hipótese de trabalho nesta pesquisa parte do pressuposto de que a delimitação da ideia de gestão de Lück (2006) traria possíveis interpretações diferentes sobre a gestão do ensino na educação brasileira.

Palavras-chave: Gestão, Escola, Descentralização, Educação.

1 INTRODUCTION

The idea developed by Thomas Kuhn (2007) leads us to a reflection on the statement of Heloísa Lück (2006) in her collection of notebooks on Educational Management: a paradigmatic issue. Lück (2006) approaches the idea of a paradigm, which does not refer to its conceptual matrix. In this way, we raise the question of which conceptual matrix she would be talking about. Thus, we bring Lück's (2006) paradigm idea closer to Thomas Kuhn's (2007) paradigm idea in his work: the Structure of the Scientific Revolution (2007). Lück (2006) makes a direct association between the concept of paradigm and the idea of educational management.

The text here, at first undertakes to clarify the limitations in this regard. Because it puts under suspicion that management may not be a paradigm among the Social Sciences or even among the Applied Sciences. This way, Lück (2006) could not solipsistically intertwine the idea of paradigm with the idea of education.

[...] that the concept of management in view of its paradigmatic character does not refer to this or that segment, but to the education system as a whole, both horizontally and vertically, and, therefore, does not constitute a function limited to those who hold the larger job title / function of a work unit. (LÜCK, 2006, p. 37).

In Kuhn's (2007) conception, the paradigm is shared with a community of researchers, or a group of scientists who adopt it as possible answers to the problems faced in their daily work. In Lück's (2006) statement, we see the use of the idea of management as a paradigm dissociated from a research group and fellow scientists who should share the same idea, even if divergent in some aspects.

First, management and the paradigm are different conceptions. Management is the result of reflections from the Science of Administration, accepted in the community of scientists. The Paradigm may or may not be produced by a scientist or a research community that serves to solve the “puzzle”, which is gradually being shared and accepted by scientists and research communities (KUHN, 2007). There is no direct relationship between management and the paradigm. In this way, we have the challenge of understanding Kuhn's (2007) idea about paradigm to approach Lück's (2006) paradigmatic management idea.

In the second part of the text, we have the understanding of management from Mary P. Follett (1997), and having these concepts, we will approach Lück's (2006) conception of management. It is hoped to clarify the objective results on the possible association, or not, of the luckian idea of paradigmatic management applied to the Education System in Brazil.

2 CONSTITUTION OF THE IDEA OF PARADIGM

"A paradigm is what the members of a community share and, conversely, a scientific community consists of men who share a paradigm". (KUHN, 2007, p. 221). The paradigm may arise initially from

a researcher who, from a new perspective, finds answers to old problems. The discovery of this new paradigm can be shared with more researchers, or the research community.

For Kuhn (2007) with the emergence of a new paradigm, it does not mean abandoning the object of observation or the phenomenon. But, rather, a look in another perspective on the same phenomenon / object that gives rise to new questions. Thus, Kuhn (2007) demonstrates that a paradigm ends up directing scientists' eyes to old problems and anomalies, so that they find possible answers that have not yet been thought of.

Usually, we are conditioned by the paradigm to see what is possible to see within the framework of the paradigm itself. Which, in a way, limits the researcher and his community to observe the phenomenon, and to present him with possible responses that remain limited to the field of vision.

Scientific revolutions, in a way, are the result of the emergence of new paradigms that provoke new perspectives on the phenomena, contributing to the changes. Thus, Kuhn understands that the Revolution is "[...] the formulation of 'puzzle' and solutions where possible must be simple, endowed with internal consistency and plausible, that is, compatible with other theories disseminated at the moment." (KUHN, 2007, p. 232).

However, this does not guarantee that the new paradigm will prepare a researcher for new research, but it does guarantee new conditions for perceiving new possibilities (KUHN, 2007, p. 97). This allows the scientist to test other models to find new ways for research. These new models are shared between researchers and other communities, - there is no rule where paradigms are restricted to researchers and their community only. We can observe in the history of Sciences the demonstration that the paradigm tends to be adopted by different researchers and communities, when this model responds better to the problems faced than the framework of the old paradigm.

The education paradigm in which Lück (2006) refers to educational management in his series of notebooks, does not have its origin in education. Management "[...] is based on good, well-resolved management procedures and overcomes them through actions of a broader sense, greater commitment from people with social processes" (LÜCK, 2006, p. 111). And also:

[...] the educational management, carried out in a broad and comprehensive manner, of the education system, [...]. This is because management has established unity, direction, impetus, consistency and coherence to educational action, based on the paradigm, ideas and strategies adopted for this purpose. However, it is important to keep in mind that management is a middle ground, not an end in itself. (LÜCK, 2011, p. 18).

The new paradigm is not a look at the answers already given, "of good procedures", "well resolved". The arrangements provided by the previous paradigm were valid and remain so, if the perspective, still outside the old paradigm (KUHN, 2007).

The emergence of a new paradigm points us to those problems to which the old paradigm has no answers, and at the same time, directs us to think about the anomalies of the phenomenon. That is,

there is a reformulation of the “puzzle”. The perception of new problems is only possible from a new paradigm that allows a new reach. In this way, Lück's (2006) understanding of paradigmatic educational management is closer to a reformist view of education, as he tries, even with a lot of effort, to present a view that he thinks is good in school administration with a new guise-, “ good management procedures well resolved ”, “ ideas ”, “ strategies ”, and “ a middle area ”.

The risk of introducing a reformist idea into the education system based on the interpretation of LDB No. 9394/96, on educational management, we can fall into a conservative, evaluative and non-innovative reading. Management is not a paradigm as stated by Lück (2006), it is very yet another paradigmatic reflex. And, it is not in your sphere to change a fragmented reality to a unit. The Lückian statements are correct as far as her observations are concerned, she notes the effects of the mechanistic paradigm on management. Such influences are what conditioned the understanding of the dual and fragmented reality. If so, the role of management would also be to unify fragmented reality for a long time. The possible conclusion is that there was no awareness of the fragmented reality that manifested itself. It remained trapped within the framework of the mechanistic paradigm. The fragmentation of reality is the result of paradigmatic effects. Therefore, the administrator of an organization could only understand the world in this fragmented way. This conception changes as a new paradigm is installed.

One way of conceptualizing management is to see it as a process of competence and energy of collectively organized people so that, through their active and competent participation, they promote the achievement, as fully as possible, of the objectives of their work unit, in this case educational goals. (LÜCK, 2013, p. 21).

The emphasis is on people and their performance roles, reinforced in school administration, which tends to be repeated in the people involved in the new process. It is observed that Lück's (2006) definition of management overburdens the human with the same burden as school administration, already pointed out as the failure of the administrative process. This thought demonstrates an internal contradiction, with the following of a new paradigm that has its origin in psychology and physiology according to Follett (1997).

For Kuhn (2007) the new paradigm points us to the anomalies of a phenomenon, and guides us to possible responses, not yet thought out. The question is, what anomalies did Lück (2006) find in School Administration? In the research community, what possible answers does it present to us? These are challenges that still remain, not only Lück (2006), but to all researchers and the scientific community that has the Teaching / Education System as a phenomenon for their observation.

Usually, elements / responses of the old paradigm do not accompany the new paradigm, “[...] when we change the paradigms, the world itself changes with it” (KUHN, 2007, p. 147). One of the elements common to the new paradigm is the development of instruments that able to guide the new look on the phenomenon.

When Galileo followed Copernicus and Kepler's intuitions, he realized that his assumptions were anomalies of the planetary system (KUHN, 2007). That is, the geocentric paradigm did not answer your questions. Galileo could only see what they were already announcing with the paradigm shift. Heliocentrism made it possible to understand anomalies and put together the “puzzle”.

This theory was able to explain the problems formulated by Copernicus and Kepler for the time. The “puzzle” was put together in another perspective. This paradigm served many scientists as a framework for thinking about the observation phenomena of different sciences and provided great advances in the scientific community.

Copernicus and Kepler's intuition were not answered by the old geocentric paradigm, nor were anomalies liable to be answered. Therefore, when adopting the heliocentric theory model, Galileo's gaze changed on the same phenomenon, on the universe and the movement of the stars. In this way, it was plausible to answer problems that would not be possible from the old paradigm (KUHN, 2007). Therefore, the only thing present in the new paradigm of the old paradigm is only the phenomenon in another perspective. This understanding by Lück (2006) in presenting answers from the old paradigm to the new educational reality is not possible. There is in Lück (2006) the attempt to save the administration with the idea of management, and at the same time, to maintain the paradigmatic elements of the old administration in the management. Management is a reflection of a new paradigm that has its own characteristics. It is revolutionary and is neither saving nor reformist. Paradigms tend to revolution and not reform. (KUHN, 2007).

The paradigm has the function of guiding researchers and the scientific community towards new discoveries. This is not the role of management in being a paradigm and very much in being saving. It seems to us that his role is more modest. Another aspect presented by Kuhn (2007) in the paradigm shift is the appearance of the crisis. The author assumes that the crisis is a reflection of a system of knowledge accumulated in a given paradigmatic period, which was disorganized from the new paradigm. This is; the “puzzle” has been messed up and needs to be realigned. Perhaps, the confusion at this moment, is due to the crisis that was established in education and in disorganized educational knowledge. Therefore, there is the seduction in trying to align the “puzzle” within an ideal that no longer exists. The reorganization of the “puzzle” is no longer based on the old paradigm. We are betrayed by the mechanistic ideology in which he still believes it is possible to take advantage of what he has in store. We believe that a paradigmatic dialectic would be possible. Every new paradigm itself is a negation of the old paradigm and, at the same time, a self-affirmation. Every paradigm is born as a thesis. Dialectics has already happened in the process of its emergence. Therefore, a paradigm is not passive of a dialectical practice. We can see this reality in heliocentrism. What was the dialectic of this paradigm? None! Heliocentrism is the denial of geocentrism and, at the same time, self-affirmation. Management is the paradigmatic reflex, it appears as a negation of the set of

knowledge constituted by administration and at the same time it is a set of self-affirming knowledge. There is an internal reorganization of the knowledge system that enabled the contexts of phenomena in a more detailed way, in another perspective, in which the same thing would not be possible with the old paradigm.

When the paradigm appears, a new process is born as possible responses to the crisis and models of a new organization of the “puzzle” (KUHN, 2007). It is what justifies the appearance of the paradigm, its function is also to solve problems and anomalies. This need for the paradigm is the result of countless unsuccessful attempts to respond to problems and anomalies. The idea of evolution is implicit in this historical process.

3 THE MECHANISTIC MODEL PRESENT IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

If we look at the education system we will see that it is a "puzzle" reorganized from the Taylorist, Fordist and Fayolist framework that responded well until the 90s (LOURENÇO FILHO; BERGSTRÖM, 2007). The education system adopted the school administration anchored in the mechanistic paradigm that had its origin in physics. School administration was not a paradigm, but a result of the shared acceptance by the community of scientists in the administration of the new paradigm. As we have seen before, the paradigm can be shared with different scientists and different communities of researchers. Mechanism did not originate in the administration, other communities also started to adopt it as possible responses to new problems and anomalies. Therefore, this line of argument raises some questions: School Administration was not a paradigm in its application in the education system from the 30's until the 90's, what are the luckian arguments to justify that the management be paradigmatic from the 21st century? We also argue that management is not a paradigm, but paradigmatic reflexes. Furthermore, we understand that the management research community has shared a new paradigm and that it has solved management problems and anomalies. Still, we can continue in this line of argument, that they adopted a new framework and were capable of a new reformulation of the “puzzle”, they found answers that were still imaginable to the problems and anomalies in the management of their time.

What is the new paradigm adopted by the management research community that changed the view about the company and its production process? The pursuit of this idea leads us to a dialogue with Lück on educational management. In what paradigm is it anchored? Is it the same as administration when it presents management as a possible answer to anomalies in the educational production process? What is understandable is that the education / teaching system also adopts the same paradigm shared by the administration, it is enough to understand education as a system and the school as an organization. Management is intertwined with the paradigm, but do not get confused.

Delimitation of the management idea

The understanding of paradigmatic management is the keynote of Lück's thought (2006) “the concept of management is slowly replaced by the concept of administration in opposition between fragmentation for the unit as a whole and individualization for the collective ”(LÜCK, 2006, p. 69).

This idea of management, as we have seen before, could not be associated with understanding the paradigm, we have also seen that management is much more a reflection of the adopted paradigm. The author conceives management as a substitution for administration, perhaps it is not a substitution, but a transition that has not yet completed its entire process. It is not an abandonment of management at the expense of management, which we cannot understand this internal argument of the conceptual explanation. “[...], the possibility of calling the set of ideas and practices pure and simply related to a modernized administration as management, updated in its operational aspects, maintaining the old perspective of control over things, people and actions, [...].” (LÜCK, 2013, p.23).

This positioning reinforces the idea previously presented that management is closer to reform than revolution. The revolution is more appropriate to the paradigm, than individualization. The idea of individualization and fragmentation of reality is another indication of the internal conceptual management contradictions presented by Lück (2006). In this way, the author still works with the concept of dualism present in the old paradigm.

Before entering into the discussion of the concept of management in Follett (1997), we can also perceive Lück's (2006) understanding of management in the argumentative developments.

“Management, therefore, is what allows overcoming the limitation of fragmentation and decontextualization and constitutes, from the comprehensive and interactive perspective, the overall vision and orientation, from which to develop articulated and more consistent actions” (LÜCK, 2006, p. 43). Perhaps, attributing the idea of management so much generic responsibility makes this concept not produce the expected practical effects. This is understandable to the extent that the author associates management with the paradigm. In Kuhn (2007), one of the purposes of the paradigm is to guide scientists from new instruments in observing the phenomenon from another perspective, this does not seem to be the function of management, it does not have this scope. It is more restricted to an organization regardless of its size and nature.

We can thus understand that overcoming a fragmented and decontextualized conception, will only be possible as the abandonment of the old paradigm for the new paradigm, the change is a transgressive characteristic of the paradigm. It is what is expected of management. The abandonment of the old paradigm leads scientists to see the phenomena in a very different point of view than research does not reveal. The perception about the company is no longer the same, because the paradigm has changed. The question that remains for us now is to know what has changed?

In a business productive process, with the mechanistic paradigm, the relationships between subjects and objects were conceived hierarchically, punctuating the subordination. Understanding in the mechanical model that everything consists of gear, where the parts of lesser value are constantly replaced in the process of the productive movement of the force. The mechanistic paradigm with its characteristics of Scientific Administration was structured in a rigid gear arrangement of mechanical parts. (LOURENÇO FILHO; BERGSTRÖM, 2007). He emphasized efficiency through systematic assessments, thus believing in the organization's progress. This paradigm is found in the theories of management by Taylor, Ford and Fayol, which emphasize tasks, structures and control.

Follett's (1997) conception of psychology and physiology was responsible for the paradigm shift, which reflected on how to understand an organization. The understanding that reality was dual, constituted by a subject and the object of the paradigmatic Cartesian heritage. It was established the vision of the phenomena among the idealists that color in the subject all the emphasis, that the truth was the only possible existence in the primacy of the subject over the object. On the other hand, the defenders believed that the only truth was the object experience. Hence, it was born in the frame of interpreting the phenomena between subjectivity and objectivity, from rationalism to idealism and fragmentation.

Follett (1997) understood that this mechanistic dual framework guided scientists and researchers' communities to interpret the phenomena. Which, in a way, conditioned the results of research and knowledge. This can be understood in the theories that prevailed from the 19th to the 20th century, in which everything is in opposition, between subjects and objects. Practices present in political, economic, social and organizational theories.

One of the foundations of liberal economic theory denounced in the thought of K. Marx, that dual view of capitalism in which proletariat, capitalist, poor and rich configured a strong opposition all the time, between the oppressed and the oppressors, the people and the government, blacks and whites, men and women.

This example tries to shape reality, as we have already seen, this was shared with several scientific communities and a group of researchers. When we refer to the management research community, it is natural and understandable that this paradigm has strong influences on how they understood a particular organization. The result of adopting this paradigm contributes to the emergence of theoretical lines within the administration; Taylorism, Fordism and Fayolism. (LOURENÇO FILHO; BERGSTRÖM, 2007).

Management based on the mechanistic model will understand the organization as a dual relationship, between subjects and objects. For, the subjects always had primacy over reality. The relationship between subjects becomes object. That is, the objectification of the other. In an illustration in which the director of an organization targets workers, he understands them as parts of a big cog.

The idea of subordination, submission is naturally accepted in an organization that follows a theory based on this paradigm. This idea enabled the understanding that the director assumed the role of a subject who determined how a productive reality should be, without the concern of relating to objects, (workers and environment), as it is seen as a passive element of the relationship subjectivating of the director.

The concern was focused on tasks and structures based on rational, bureaucratic and measurable methods to obtain economic results. This model adopted in this period was linked to a vision that the 'puzzle' was already assembled and even more so, that economic problems, such as producing to meet our needs in terms of profitability, came up against the crucial issues of the market, in the use of scarce natural resources and unlimited needs. What, and how much to produce, how to produce and for whom to produce, this "puzzle" was assembled from the mechanistic paradigm present in Taylor, Ford and Fayol.

4 DECONSTITUTING THE MANAGEMENT IDEA TO THE MANAGEMENT IDEA

The entry of psychology and physiology with the possibility of a new approach to the economic phenomenon is now accepted in competition with the old paradigm. Follett (1997) interprets this possibility in the research of Edwin Bissell Holt (1914), in his circular formula. Follett's (1997) understanding of Holt's formula (1914) is that integration is the result of the relationships of two activities. This understanding is based on the assumption that that dual frame between subjects and objects no longer makes sense. For, both subjects and objects influence each other. This, in the understanding of Follett (1997), she calls integrative and interactive force, are adjectives possible to be attributed by Holt in a procedural relationship between subjects, objects and environment.

The interaction between subjects, objects and the environment is no longer passive but procedural.

That metaphysical understanding of the linearity of subjects and objects, no longer makes any sense. Holt's (1914) research according to Follett (1997) contributed to the emergence of a new paradigm of activities between subjects and objects. It ceases to be understood linearly, dual and moves to the understanding of an integrated system that consequently incubates a non-dualistic moral inauguration. The resulting experiences between subjects and objects are successful as long as the relationship is integrative. Now, it is not possible from this formula to objectify reality. This understanding is only possible with the framework developed by psychology and physiology.

The previous paradigm did not conceive of assembling the "puzzle" in symbiosis with the external elements. It is precisely there, the great contribution of psychology and physiology, when they perceive the influence of external elements in the systemic behavioral process (FOLLETT, 1997, p. 39). This framework allows us to have a broader perspective on the anomalies between subjects and objects. We left that understanding of stages, or steps to be overcome in mistakes and successes of the

old paradigm, to understand the systemic procedural evolution. This falls in the following interpretation: evolution is not an overcoming or abandoning one stage to reach the next stage, but the idea that all circularly evolve. In the biological field, the evolution of a living organism happens circularly in a system integrated. The evolution of a cell in a given tissue contributes to the evolution of the organism as a whole, and the evolution of each organ in the organism contributes to the evolution of the whole. Note that there is a function in the evolution of the cell in relation to the organism as a whole. Which leads us to understand analogously the evolution of a society, a company and the evolution of a subject in his group that contributes at the same time to the evolution of society as a whole.

The evolution of the subject depends on the evolution of the group - which depends on the evolution of society. The evolution of a social institution contributes to the evolution of society, which is current, all are in function of the evolution for the whole.

Follett's (1997) understanding of management follows this intuitive line. This intuition is perceptible based on the idea of Holt's circular formula (1914) that demonstrates that behavior is in the relationship proportional to the environment, "reality is in the relationship, in mutual activity. That is, there is no relationship outside the system. Therefore, in a relational situation, the subject and the object are equally important." (FOLLETT, 1997, p. 38).

If one of Follett's (1997) strong arguments is anchored in Holt (1914), it is that there is an interaction between subjects, objects and environment, this means understanding that reality can only be embraced from this relational formula, which evolves in value as that intensify the meetings (FOLLETT, 1997, p. 38). We cannot ignore here that conflicts also intensify in this relationship.

For Follett (1997), physiologists and psychologists, when pointing out the relationship between muscle contractions and stimuli, point us to the circular reflex. For it is a functional relationship between muscles, stimuli and sense organs. The new element pointed out by Follett (1997) is that the stimulus is no longer understood in the old paradigm, in the mechanistic framework that understood behavior as a relationship between subjects and objects, simply, stimulus and response. The subject needed to be provoked to react to the stimulus by a passive object. From the new paradigm, the subject and the object are stimulated at the same time. Therefore, stimulus and response are not separate, they happen simultaneously. Subjects and objects are both stimulus and response. The receiver is the sender, and the sender is the receiver. This is Follett's (1997) understanding, are two joint activities within an always open system.

In this way, the paradigmatic understanding of physiology and psychology is that it is no longer possible to set up the "puzzle" or solve anomalies with the old framework of acting on subjects and acting on objects (KUHN, 2007). The new framework proposed by physiologists is that between subjects and objects they promote interpenetrative meetings of activities. Therefore, with this

physiological and psychological paradigm, it is possible to assemble the “puzzle” in a new perspective that part of the nature of respect is the change it makes in the approach it caused. Therefore, that mechanistic understanding of the understanding that the relationship between subjects and objects produced positive and negative results, we can now understand that it is no longer a plausible reality. With the new paradigm, there is no result, but process moments that produce effects (FOLLETT, 1997, p. 42).

5 MANAGEMENT AS A FUNCTION

Management was strongly influenced by the idea of behavioral psychology, which believed that to get results from workers it was enough to stimulate them. We see this present in Taylor, Ford and Fayol. This behaviorist idea conceived that the muscles resided the knowledge and the source of the strength to reach objectives and ends.

Follett's (1997) perception is that psychology alone had this understanding until it approached physiology. “In psychology and physiology, we also find certain conclusions that lead us to think that experience at all levels can be considered an interrelation in which the activity, the relationship alters the landscapes of the relationship itself and also the relationship itself. ” (FOLLETT, 1997, p. 54).

Hence, a thought focused on pictures, results and feedback from information with constant stimuli. If we can stimulate the subject to obtain desired results, then we can control them and also control the source of stimulus. We can isolate both the subject and the stimulus and direct it towards ends. In Follett (1997) this is the idea of a directive administration.

The idea of management originally brings the reflexes of the psychology and physiology paradigm in which behavior is no longer possible to control from immediate stimuli (FOLLETT, 1997, p. 57) intensified, or not, in controlled doses. This is not the idea of management in Follett (1997). For her, management is a function, a discipline and cannot be treated as a toolbox as a technical procedure and methods and practices, with some companies trying to fit it in search of increasing financial and economic results. Now, while management worked with goals and objectives for purposes, management works with purpose, that is, a telos in that Aristotelian understanding that all nature tends rationally to a good, to a purpose, all nature goes against its fulfillment. What defines it as an asset.

Intervention at the end of nature, according to Aristotle, is an irrational, violent and unjust practice. In his political conception, for example, the idea of corruption is the loss of the telos of the nature of politics. Corruption is the deterioration of the purpose of the nature of politics.

If management is the understanding that the organization has a purpose, a telos, then what should its realization be? It is no longer in management that conception that an economic organization has its end in profit, or in results. This view is typically from the old paradigm that has influenced economic organizations since the physiocrats.

An economic organization has a purpose that goes beyond this reductionist economic vision. For Follett (1997) an organization is "a company as a social institution, not just a financial or production vehicle, it is a prelude to a variety of contemporary management issues." (KARTER, 1997, p. XIII).

In administration, the director of the organization encouraged workers to aspire to the company's objectives, and at the same time, he set goals to achieve the desired results. It was not a choice of the workers to achieve the goals, they did not even participate in the elaboration of the objectives and goals of the company. The implicit idea here is to subordinate to the company's objectives and passively accept its end. Such practice he developed a political and social conscience, much less a critical conscience, they were simply operators, pieces indented in synchronized movements for results.

The purpose is built together, the purpose of a society is the result of a collective construction that is established in a relationship of citizenship. Therefore, a sense of belonging to the community is inherent in this process. A nation's leader cannot constitute a nation's purpose alone, and impose on other members of the community. The purpose is a consortium construction. Thus, in an economic organization, its purpose is also a democratic construction. Employees must participate in the constitution of the company's purpose, such involvement presupposes from the beginning a responsible awareness of performance and commitment.

With this turnaround in the idea of administration to the idea of management, we managed to move forward on some important points; starting with the common objectives and goals in administrative practice that showed a harmonious union between director and workers. (Which was in fact an illusion). They lived on appearances and contradictions in the administrative system made up by the results that overshadowed the fragmented and dual reality.

In management, this reality was changed with the substitution of objectives and goals for the purpose, which around it made it possible to integrate the power relations of conflicting interests in an organization. For the purpose goes beyond the organization, and transcends conflicting individual interests. Here, the new "puzzle", which needed to be assembled from the new paradigm. The constitution of the purpose of an economic, political, social, educational organization. Because they involve everyone in the process due to shared results responsibly. Those involved in the process must know what they are working for, because involvement is essential in the process. (FOLLETT, 1997, p. 60).

If an economic organization has a purpose, it is also acceptable that people have their purpose, and that it also goes beyond existential and labor circumstances. This variable was conceived as anomalies by the administration. The new paradigm no longer sees them as anomalies, but possibilities to be thought about and that requires creative and necessary responses.

When observing a school, we realize that educational practices still remain tied to the 20th century, as the learning environments are closed. Such practices also correspond to that conception of the old mechanistic paradigm, of control over the learner and his learning. Where, the stimulus is released gradually as results are expected.

Allow or promote the excursion of learners out of the classroom, or even from the school in open environments, to become a stimulus to reward the results already achieved, that is, they are exaggerated stimuli for the learners of what they have already exhausted as a possibility to learn indoors. The technologies have the function of forcing the fall of this model already overcome. With technologies, the stimuli are no longer under the control of the teachers and the performance that was a reward for the results achieved, loses its enchantment. Therefore, virtual environments are more pleasurable than the practice of teachers, who by far no longer compete with media stimuli.

5. 1 MANAGEMENT AS A PROCESS

Management as a process understanding presupposes that will and choice are inherent elements, and because it is the result of rational acts, it generates a relationship of responsibility, everyone involved in the process is co-responsible for the results that are shared. Thus, in management the purpose is not an imposition, but a conscious and responsible choice. In the view of Follett (1997) it is natural that management is democratic and participatory, it is in its nature. It is a moral behavior that, in a way, generates obligations and duties. "Choice has a place in the process." (FOLLETT, 1997, p. 62).

The choice has that Kantian idea that it associates with the will that we naturally tend to choose the good, because the good is rational. (Basis of understanding your moral duty argument). Will is fruit in the first moment of reason, and in the second moment, the result of free will. Perhaps, here, it can alleviate the conflict of interests between subjects, objects and the environment in which our will can always lean towards universality, recovering the strength of the arguments of men of good will. It is natural for Kant (1985) that our reason wants to solve problems far from inclinations, our emotions and our instincts.

In this way, we can think that in a process the environment is unstable and that subjects and objects are influenced and reflected at all times. Therefore, the integration follows the same direction. Follett's (1997) idea of integration is much more than accommodation and adaptation to the moving environment. Subjects and objects and reality in management are redefining their choices at all times, and reevaluating their purposes without falling into a performative contradiction. This is the possible difference between the results of the administration for the management. While management takes into account the need to adapt to the objectives, goals and ends in order to achieve expected results, however, it produces a relationship between subjects and the economic organization understood as a

cog. The malfunction of the gear needs adaptation and readjustment of the parts, hence its replacement. This is the mechanistic model of administration. For Follet (1997, p. 64) "we do not adapt our activities to the purposes for which they are intended or to the principles on which they are based." The mechanistic model adopted by the administration does not take this "puzzle", subjects, objects and environment into account. Consequently, the administrator with the mechanistic paradigm has developed a possible conscience, producing by researchers and the scientific communities of management that controlling, ordering would lead to successful production, tools are created that assist the administration of companies by these cadres.

It is only possible to integrate free subjects into a management process. The internal and external conditioning interfere in the behavior of the subjects of an organization. The act of rational choice is what ensures the realignment of the process to the purpose of the organization without distancing itself from labor relations in an organization.

Moral behavior tends to have a greater reach than ethical behavior in organizations. Ethics since Aristotle, still serves as a guide or reflection on our actions than how I should do to be happy. Ethics needs an internalization of values, that is, it presupposes a belief. In addition, subjectivity and the private field are restricted. And it can easily be manipulated for interests and fall into relativism.

In the Kantian conception (1985), morality tends towards objectivity, since it understands that morality would be the actions of subjects positivized in rational and not subjective principles and evaluative. While in Aristotle the subjects' concern was what I must do to be happy, morality leads us to reflect on what I can do. What I can do is prescribed in laws that apply to everyone on the principle of universality and the validity of the law. In this way, my will and my choice are expected to coincide with the laws.

We cannot disassociate an economic, educational, political organization from a social understanding. The purpose of organizations and institutions must converge for good and morals. As we understand a modern society with its complexities, the integration of subjects will not only be an object of concern for sociology, but for all segments of society.

6 CONSTITUTION OF RESEARCH AND METHOD

The research used in the production of this text was bibliographic. According to Köche (2015, p, 122) "In bibliographic research, the researcher will raise the knowledge available in the area, identifying the theories produced by analyzing them and evaluating their contribution to help understand or explain the problem that is the object of the investigation". Therefore, part of the appropriation of concepts and concepts in the literature. Specifically, Lück (2006), Kuhn (2007) and Follett (1997). In this way, the hypothetical-deductive method was adopted (MARCONI; LAKATOS, 2009) from the problem raised about the approximation of the management idea and the paradigm

idea. In the conception of Marconi and Lakatos (2009) the hypothetical-deductive method starts from an issue that raises doubts-, which presupposes provisional proposals based on theories and working hypotheses. Thus, it intends to point out possible paths different from those already presented in the studied theories.

7 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The conception of what management will be in Follett (1997), initially understood it as a process in function for. Management can be defined as understanding processes, as it implies that the will and choice of individuals are constituents. Because, individuals get involved in the process, take responsibility and share results. Therefore, we understand that it would be contradictory if Follett (1997) traditionally maintained the focus on isolated elements (managers, teachers, education professionals and the community), as maintained by Lück (2006). Management based on this vision reveals the dual fragmentation already existing in the idea of management. For Lück's (2006) attempt to ensure that the idea of management anchored in the mechanistic paradigm, does not allow to overcome the very limitation of fragmentation and decontextualization of the educational reality. This Luckian movement remains, still stuck to the old mechanistic paradigm when it tries to resolve the weaknesses of school administration, when it tries to overcome the anomalies of the 21st century education system from the agglutination of fragmentation.

Education is not a limitation to be overcome with modal rearrangements. It will not be an orientation of subjects and objects in an organization that will bring about structural change. For the idea of guiding education based on Lück's (2006) gestational conception, still brings with it the elements of administration in the directive sense. In this way, those mechanistic elements still remain: objectives, goals, control and results. Thus, Lück (2006) resurrects the idea of disharmony of gears that, from an orientation, can solve the problem of a school organization. Now, the orientation presupposes the resumption of a course that we fail to follow and even more, the orientated ones have no conscience that they are out of the course, nor where this course is to be found. This idea reinforces the passivity of the subjects present in Lück's (2006) idea of management.

Lück (2006) when attributing to the management the saga to break with the idea of a fragmented educational reality. He does not realize that the fragmented educational reality was not produced by the administration, but by the old mechanistic paradigm. (LOURENÇO FILHO; BERGSTRÖM, 2007). Thus, we run the risk of entering into a contradiction when we reproduce the myth of Sisyphus' work. Management theories are tied to the mechanistic paradigm that they tried unsuccessfully to overcome the fragmented educational reality. It is not in the nature of management to overcome the old mechanistic paradigm or to articulate with fragmented educational reality.

Therefore, the idea of a fragmented educational reality is not supported. Good we know that reality has never been fragmented, and that subjects and objects have never been in opposition, much less, epistemologically separated. Therefore, theories of administration and management have a more modest role in this context. It is not to be a paradigm, but to solve problems arising in the teaching-learning process. Management is much more a function of a process with subjects, objects and open environments in constant circulating movement.

REFERENCES

GRAHAM, Pauline (org). Mary Parker Follett: profeta do gerenciamento. Tradução Eliana Chiochet de Abreu Lima. Rio de Janeiro: Qualitymark, 1997.

KANT, Immanuel. Resposta à Pergunta: Que é “Esclarecimento”? In: Immanuel Kant Textos Seletos. Edição bilíngue. Tradução de Floriano de Souza Fernandes. 2. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1985. p. 100-117.

KÖCHE, José Carlos. Fundamentos de metodologia científica: teoria da ciência e iniciação à pesquisa. 34. Ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2015.

KUHN, Thomas. S. A estrutura das revoluções científicas. Tradução Beatriz Viana Boeira; Nelson Boeira. Perspectiva: São Paulo, 2007.

LOURENÇO FILHO, Manoel Bergström. Organização e Administração Escolar: curso básico. 8. ed. Brasília: Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira, 2007. 321p. – (Coleção Lourenço Filho, ISSN 1519-3225 ; 8). Disponível em:<file:///D:/Gestão%20educacional/Organização%20e%20administração%20escolar%20curso%20básico.pdf.> Acesso em 06. Ago. 2019.

LÜCK, Heloísa. Gestão educacional: uma questão paradigmática. 2. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2006. (Vol. I).

LÜCK, Heloísa. Gestão da cultura e do clima organizacional da escola. 2. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2011. (Vol. V).

LÜCK, Heloísa. Concepções e processos democráticos de gestão educacional. 9. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2013. (Vol. II).

LÜCK, Heloísa. Gestão do processo de aprendizagem pelo professor. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2014. (Vol. III).

MARCONI, Marina de Andrade; LAKATOS, Maria Lakatos. Fundamentos de metodologia científica. 6. ed. São Paulo, 2009.