Managerial Thinking in a New Reality

D.V. Kuzin[a], I.P. Ponomarev[a]
[a, b] Economic Faculty, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
[a] https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5223-0719; [b] https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1613-5933

ABSTRACT

The passing year 2020 has turned over a lot in society, economics and business, human behavior and consciousness. Within a brief period, due to the pandemic situation, we found ourselves in a new reality. Still, we are trying to understand the changes that occurred and how to manage different processes effectively. But even more important is where all these processes will bring us. This very difficult period in human development took place in a completely different economy of impressions, information, knowledge and intelligence. In the framework of the large scale, overwhelming, and promising (however, somewhat controversial) Industry 4.0, we see the development and digital transformation that changed management and managerial thinking. The new fight for human consciousness has extended; methods and techniques of neuro-management, neuro-marketing, and artificial intelligence are widely used. The consciousness became the object of influence and manipulation, the key topic in business and politics. This article focuses on several problems of new quality of management thinking. It suggests and explains the essence and the necessity of *hyper thinking* as one of the most suitable and valuable approaches to understand and analyze the new contemporary reality as well as the ongoing processes and education.

Keywords: management; paradigm of management; reality; hyper thinking; formats of thinking; matrix approach; digital thinking; new normality

INTRODUCTION

At present, a number of important points can be made about the continuing rapid changes, global shifts and threats, which challenge human intelligence on a scale comparable to that of the Renaissance. The future of an entire civilization and the role of the human being in it depends on managers' acceptance of different levels of these challenges. There are two extreme scenarios: either humanity takes the intellectual initiative of computers, turned into "homo digital", and will be immersed in feelings, emotions and feelings, or retains its intellectual potential, understanding of its purpose and will continue to develop and improve.

Traditional thinking is human, and governance — is no exception, because we have a certain standard set of tools and technologies that we are used to working with and that produce and produce results. But in a changing world, not only instruments and technologies need to be changed, but also attitudes, principles and much more. Otherwise, the level of misunderstanding will increase further, paralysing effective action.

Each historical period corresponds to certain governance paradigm, i.e. a matured, recognized and dominant type of managerial thinking, expressed in ideas, views, concepts and principles, ways of setting up and solving problems, tools and methods, norms and rules of implementation of various processes, behaviour in the business community, etc.

In the field of management, researchers have long simply described management approaches, developed theories and concepts and defined their applications, methodology of use, and specialized tools for analysis and decision-making. Increased attention was paid to their limitations, areas of concern. Finally, since the 1990s, the concept of management thinking has become well established — systemic, situational, scenario, process, advanced, strategic, global, ethical, creative, designer, value and socially oriented. These aspects of management theory have been the subject of special studies. In reality — the more intellect and horizon decision makers, the more they learn different types of thinking and find hidden connections.

We are now experiencing a paradigm shift in management, driven by a very different world: business, the pace and content of change, the way of life and behaviour of people, other problems, needs, technologies and tools to address these problems and needs. Moreover, if it took many decades before the paradigm shift, it's now happening very quickly — perceptions of the management of the turn of the 20th-21st centuries and current ones are already very different. All of this requires a very substantial rethinking, a new vision of the world and of modern society, politics and business [1].

When talking about a paradigm shift in management, different authors offer their own interpretations of this transformation process — new "management genome" M2.0 (Hamel) [2], "agile-management" M3.0 (Appelo) [3], "radical management" (Denning) [4], "conscious management" (Mackey and Sisodia) [5], "free management" (Nobles and Staley) [6], "value-based governance" (Dolan and Garcia) [7] and etc. The development of an understanding of a company as an object of management with an appropriate management focus can also be included — from resource (Marshall, 1919) and institutional (Coase, 1937), to information (Aoki, 1986), cognitive (Kohut, Zander, 1992) and intellectual (Kleiner, 2020) [8]. But the essence of all these concepts is the same — is primarily change in the established type of management thinking that has prevailed in both public administration, business and expert communities, which was taught in universities and business schools until recently in a certain manner. In fact, there have been multiple shifts in organizations, competition, knowledge and intelligence, behaviour and relationships, values and understanding of social responsibility. It is stressed that

New challenges to thinking

Information overload	Ready-to-use solutions	Усложнение мира
Synergies between approaches and methods	**What is it thinking?**	Mind attacks
Understanding another and others	Autonomous and independent	Discontinuity of thinking and action

Source: compiled by the authors.

conventional notions of rationality, standards and norms, universality, measurability, efficiency, predictability must be rethought.

WHY DO WE NEED HYPER-THINKING?

Thinking — is the "lens" through which people look at the world, understand and transform it. Reality cannot be explained simply — it's always an ambiguous and multi-level process of personal perception, reflection, learning, comparison, experience and, indeed, — projection of our thinking. So far, there is no single science of thought — it's dealt with by specialists from many different fields, but so far thinking and consciousness remain one of the most fundamental and unknowned riddles, if only because we try to "think about how we think, understand and transform our thinking.

"This goes beyond conventional formal logic, moving from one-dimensional, linear thinking to radial, parallel, and further into dialectic and matrix thinking. Various methods, such as "cards", "hats", "metaforming", "squares 2×2", "frames" and other techniques discovered in the past 20th century were important milestones along this way".

"The key difference between *hyper-thinking* as an approach is that it is not based on mimicking the brain and displaying this "model" on paper or currently popular neuronetworks, but on the principles of the world around us — a huge quantum computer that we're all inside. The design of this world exists as a projection of the real and perceptible part of it in our consciousness, and therefore the world that we perceive and that is our thinking. This approach is therefore based on the principles on which the world is built: separability, parallelism, interconnectedness, boundlessness, openness, contradiction and multidimensionality. The new approach seeks to broaden the understanding of human capabilities and the boundaries of reality, and most importantly, to overcome the linearity of thinking and the simple dichotomy of many concepts. Hyperthinking as a method using frames and matrixes "3×3" offers an original, simple, easy-to-use and easy-to-use tool for working with information and contingency analysis, changing perspective and connecting social intelligence" [9].

This method can be used to structure problems, find solutions, overcome constraints and contradictions, and implement actions. The new way of thinking has a meta-level, which allows to integrate other methods, as well as to use as a constructor to create their intellectual tools and to improve their skills.

What serious thinking challenges we face (*table 1*)? How does hyper-thinking help us respond to these challenges?

The volume of information is growing exponentially. A large number of sources are beginning to overload, and the flow of different and contradictory information raises questions about their credibility. At

Таблица 2 / Table 2

Новые вызовы управлению сложностью / New Challenges to complexity management

Speed	Scale	Diversity
Multidimensionality	Ambiguity	Irrationality
Chaoticness	Risk	Uncertainty
Accident	Nonlinearity	Unpredictability

Источник / Source: составлено авторами / compiled by the authors.

the same time, access to information requires the ability to deal effectively with it: search, select, analyze, evaluate and synthesize new. Psychologists have long spoken about the necessity of "digital hygiene". Overload and uncertainty mean that the brain stops critically evaluating information and starts to automatically absorb one part of the information and block the other part of the information. Hyperthinking through frames and matrices helps to select and structure the most valuable information.

According to the well-known psychologist Andrey Kurpatov, "we await digital dementia" [10] thanks to clever gadgets who already think instead of us and have learned to anticipate our desires. At the background of *ready-made* and *well-packaged solutions*, we need hyper-thinking to understand and define depth levels of ready-made solutions; to understand what's inside, what the mechanism is, and how it works. If necessary — to know what preceded these decisions and the consequences to be faced in the future.

The increasing *complexity* of societal and economic processes, which take place in addition to, and often against, the will of decision-makers, but which must be managed effectively, will require of us greater intellectual strength and resources (*table 2*). Therefore, in the new environment, new methods and ways of thinking are needed that both simplify/clarify the understanding of reality and, conversely, bring solutions to the required level of content and complexity.

Creativity is one of the main competencies of an employee in the modern world. Creative atmosphere becomes a competitive advantage of the company and allows to attract young, talented and intellectual people. In a world of distance and intangible economy the need for creative solutions is growing. But it seems that creativity alone is not enough. For a long time, there have been calls about what Funky- and Crazy-ideas are needed, which can "drive mad", break templates and create unprecedented impressions. A synergistic approach is needed. New levels of creativity can then open up that creative people are not even aware of, as they remain within the confines of their professional practices [11, 12]. The matrix method brings together our knowledge from different fields: physiology, psychology, linguistics, philosophy, mathematics, systems theory, metaphysics and even mystics, which goes beyond what is known and what is possible.

Another challenge is *attacks on thinking*. This is a long-standing process. Thus, 40 years ago guru of marketing Jack Trout gave the beginning of "military operation" on the minds of potential clients [13]. The process is now far greater in scope and strength. The matrix method puts a barrier in the way of systems and practices that aggressively influence the behaviour of individuals who break their belief systems, allowing them to operate with their values and principles and not be influenced especially by "virus" ideas.

The acceleration of the pace of life, the increase in the number of contacts and the

reduction of communication time (especially in a remote format) raise the *problem of understanding each other and, more broadly — of understanding the other*. The matrix method proposes alternative channels of interaction not only at the word level but also at the level of drawings, stories, joint actions to improve this understanding. The key — is to provide more space for the expression of thought and the preservation of its depth. Thus, when discussing new ideas, one can distinguish between what is clear and what is not, what is agreed and what is disputed. The matrix allows for setting different topics for discussion, identifying points of agreement and contradictions, using differences of opinion to seek common interests and solutions.

The information we receive in the era of consumption becomes increasingly easy, as if already "chewed" and recycled, requiring no analysis and mental tension, which atrophies many useful for independent thinking brain function. At the same time "intellectual laziness" develops, when a person does not want to search for a new solution, to reflect on what is happening, to act, and is content with the choice offered to him. The matrix method preserves *to think for themselves*, helps to separate out the emotional reactions to ideas and thoughts, and thereby preserve the ability to independent thinking and action.

Another challenge to thinking is that it *distances itself from action*. This is the weakness of most thinking methods, which still focus on solving different problems, puzzles that rely mainly on formal logic, but the solution remains on paper. Thus, thinking does not find expression in real action, development remains on paper, and the ability to act is reduced and replaced by quasi-thinking.

CHANGING FORMATS OF THINKING

People tend to simplify and reduce uncertainty and are used to operating in "managed formats" — categories, images, algorithms, ideas, approaches, technologies, tools, models, structures, strategies, etc. So, people create a certain order and control what happens. These different formats — like products, objects, organizations or types of businesses, stereotypes and prejudices, paradigms — in fact only a vague image of reality, the creation of our mind (perception, interpretation), allowing to comprehend things and processes only up to a certain level and for a certain time. ПThey should therefore be periodically reviewed, reassessed and reviewed, especially since the complex structure of the world and the nature of contemporary contradictory and often uncertain processes make it impossible for us to rely on just one format (concept, methodology, model or strategy), a requires either a combination of existing formats or the development of new formats [14]. Thinking in other formats is — metaphorically speaking "jumping out of your box". And here, in order to form a new view, the ability to find suitable analogies from different fields — biology, linguistics, history, behavioral psychology, sports, art, etc.— could be the key to business.

In the rapid stream of change (the above and other challenges) and in our incomplete understanding, there is one important fact: normal people being, by nature, is not inherently volatile and does not always keep up with these changes, although of course it changes and adapts to them to varying degrees. In other words, all of these changes are difficult to manage, and the risks of error and bad behaviour are multiplied. As a result, we are confronted with the following:

a) there are a growing number of inefficient people who think they are effective (including leaders and managers), who do not respond to the challenges of the time, who are unable to identify and solve problems, who are confused in different ways about why, what and how they are doing, and who are substituting concepts, problems and tasks, objectives and means, etc.;

б) the number of ineffective institutions and organizations unable to develop themselves and survive such changes is growing;

в) a gap emerges between the essence of change and human perception (and response), which creates multiple barriers to thinking and effective action.

The first barriers are related to the so-called paradigm effect. Our perception of the world is largely determined by our paradigm, which is becoming a kind of psychological filter. What is obvious to the adherents of one paradigm can be hidden from the adherents of another [15]. The result — is a denial of a new possibility because you don't know what to do and how to do it.

The second barriers are connected with the fact that we inevitably cling to past experience and success (the «halo effect») [16], for actions that produced results, not always being aware of their transient and temporary character, unaware of why and how that success was achieved. "Knowledge must be based on past experience only if the past is a guide to the future. But when change emerges as a consequence of a whole new force, we are unprepared to perceive it" [17].

The third barriers are purely psychological in character: own ego, fear of change and the unknown, fear of acknowledging the limitations of our views and related negative emotions, addictions, following patterns of behaviour, etc.

The fourth barriers are related to automaticity and environmental stereotypes, to the perception of everyday life as a given, to the simplification of control objects, and to the use of standard problem-solving tools. These are common mental models — the belief that our intentions justify what we do and continue to do [18].

The fifth barriers arise from the conventional way of thinking about analysis. Most people do not know the whole, but fragmentation, the desire to divide everything into parts, to study and analyze individual objects, processes, etc. It is a long-standing tradition of scientific knowledge, but it has its essential limitations, because the whole — is not just the sum of the parts. Another aspect of this type of thinking is a linear understanding of what is going on when the cause and effect are agreed, there is a temporal and spatial sequence of actions, developments, events or organizations when it is assumed that the result will correspond to the deposit, etc. But in modern life, it's not like that.

The sixth barriers is about trying to solve problems, not problems, since we often see what we think is obvious or understandable, but do not (or do not want to see) the underlying causes of what is happening. Moreover, as J. Gharajedagh rightly notes, "we fail more often, not because we are unable to solve the problem, but because we are trying to solve the wrong problem" [19].

The seventh barrier arises from ignoring the multidimensionality of human. If people have more than one set of needs, then the imbalance between them, or worse, the loss of at least one of the ingredients, reduces our ability to effectively analyse and act, the "internal fire" is extinguishing us, as one of the prominent modern management theorists Steven Covey put it.

All together they're driving us, in the words of Canadian explorer Andre Kukla, into "mental traps", the exit of which consists in the rearrangement of consciousness according to the following scheme — doubt in knowledge, search for new knowledge, explore possibilities, use divergence and convergence of ideas, constantly reassess them, search for another unknown [20]. All of this is thinking in new formats that ultimately leads to benefits and success.

DIGITAL THINKING AND MANAGEMENT

The laws of the digital world have changed the format of doing business, allowing

Cloud management

There's no manager, and the function is	Management as a service	Instructional program
Allocation of tasks to plans	Communication and support	Motivation and activation
Dimension, analysis and accounting	Decision problems	Authority and access

Source: [9].

exponential growth through replication, scaling, modularization, and formalization of business processes where everyone decides competences, skills and how quickly they can be acquired. Here, too, many challenges present new opportunities and require a change in management thinking.

Thus, the scale, dynamism, accessibility, visibility, etc. of information has created completely different markets and competition, other consumers, changed their behaviour and knowledge about them, multiplied the speed of decision-making. "Soft as a service", where important functions are technical support, training and program development, ensuring a given level of efficiency, becomes daily and necessary. Logistics costs have been drastically reduced. The list of these changes can be continued.

This will have an impact on management — as well as major changes. The biggest challenge is the advent of so-called digital management, where the IT-system takes over more than data storage and analysis, communication support and motivation, learning and control of human behavior in the organization, but also the main tasks of the manager: targeting, coordination of interests, conflict resolution etc. "Cloud management" appears.

The development patterns of the non-living show that every object in its development goes through several stages: appearance; improvement of properties and characteristics; expansion of function;

specialization; disappearance (when object is no longer present and function remains). Projecting this pattern on management, which has now passed all stages — from the first to the fourth, we have managers for all occasions. This state of affairs shows that the situation is "ripe" and the time comes for the fifth stage — the disappearance of managers in the traditional sense, but with the preservation of the management function. . To some extent it has already started to be realized in "flat" organizational structures, in self-managed (Agile) teams and so-called "turquoise organizations", where management is "dispersed" on all employees. Will the next step be to eliminate managers as a class while preserving their functions and tasks? It seems to be an open question, but much of this transformation is already being seen.

An example of such cloud management is online learning, which has individual planning, coordination, motivating reminders, outcome evaluations. It is safe to say that cloud management of the learning process has already taken place. It remains to shift the bridges to other areas of activity. The programme itself can measure past performance, manage complexity of tasks, prioritize on the basis of the achievements of other staff members, encourage staff to share experiences and interact with each other. Currently, communication issues are solved in corporate information systems. Forums, chat rooms, interest groups become the repository

Таблица 4 / Table 4

Элементы новой нормальности / Elements of new normality

New values	Social cohesion and interaction	Ethics and social responsibility
Virtual (combined) business and employment	Customer sssessment, sustainability, safety	New technologies, knowledge, intelligence, competencies
Restriction of freedoms and individual rights	Effects on consciousness and behaviour	Degree and levels of control

Источник / Source: составлено авторами / compiled by the authors.

of collective knowledge and can be accessed in any gadget. Today, more complex tasks are on the agenda, such as anticipating problems on weak signals and finding solutions to them. Solutions (especially structured programmable) will be developed with less human involvement each time. Perhaps the most difficult — is to have an algorithm that assigns authority and clearance to staff to perform complex and demanding tasks. This may be one of the problems that will be solved by the person for the time being, but there is also no need for recommendations of artificial intelligence (performance assessments or measurement of the social capital of the candidate).

Having put all the elements of the matrix together (*table 3*), one can be assured that such a system will be independent of wearable devices, quickly scaled, allow the organization to go into virtual/remote format, create working groups called ad-hoc (on occasion). We may not even notice, because cloud management will talk to us through voice assistants, whom we will consider managers. But these are all algorithms, and where will the "*human*" side of the enterprise stay?

THINKING IN A FORMAT "NEW NORMALITY"

The coronavirus pandemic revived the debate about the need for "new normality", which became the object of intense intellectual struggle. If the pandemic were to end quickly enough, it would be unlikely that this battle of ideas would be so intense. But it looks like it's gonna be a long one. Since the problem is very multifaceted, here author's focus on it only in terms of the changes in thinking addressed in the article. At the same time "normality" is understood and interpreted in very different ways (*table 4*). For some — it's a return to a normal life without restrictions and fear, to the normal conduct of business, to the recovery of the economy and to ties after a sensitive crisis and recession [21]. In fact — it's a return to the «old normality» at which the market is able to settle everything itself, and it is characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon mentality. But it is those countries that have shown the least preparedness and vulnerability during a pandemic and the least effectiveness of their health systems. There seems to be no return to such "normality".

Others think otherwise and say that it is impossible to return to the state of society and economy that existed before the pandemic, because the world has changed, that there has been a lot of loss, that some knowledge and experience have been accumulated, that some lessons have been learned, that the means to combat the pandemic have been developed, power relations have changed. But there are still many problems to be solved, with far from obvious consequences. It certainly requires thinking in other formats, other methods of analysis, evaluation, regulation, foresight, etc.

But then from this there arise at least three different views on "new normality", translating

the intellectual struggle in fact into a war for the future world order and mechanisms of governance at different levels. By and large, this war of influence is already under way, and the pandemic has become only its trigger.

One position is that "new normality" (both image and ideal) — it's a world with a different system of values where the status and role of the humanistic and socially oriented economy, health, science and education and employment in these sectors are higher; where there is greater connectivity and social cohesion within and between countries in the face of global threats, greater equity, openness and ethics; where the interaction of state, business and civil society is stronger; where simple things get added value — clean water, air, food, energy, ecology, etc. In a broader sense — it's the continuation of a long debate about the preponderance of the economy, whether — for consumption or for the exchange of benefits and, more narrowly — a business appointment for shareholders only or for all interested persons [5].

Another — more business-oriented — is the further development of new business — virtual, intellectual, digital, individualized and energy-efficient with new technologies, business models and processes, new jobs, knowledge and competencies, and the displacement of departing professions, with new culture and ethics, new leaders, new attitudes to risk, safety, workers, consumers, etc. As a trend — is the beginning of the forced "decarbonization of the world economy" — reducing dependence on hydrocarbons and switching to new energy sources, corresponding production and consumption, changing the structure of markets and industries. These are objective processes that are being developed, understood and studied.

The third position is much more politicized and complicated because it is about power and the future of people — on influence and force, on freedom, on privacy, on personal space, on the ability and technology to control consciousness and mass behaviour and the level of control. It could be called "new abnormality" because, in fact, it is thinking in the form of normality for the elected, who want to drive the world into the framework and rules they have built up and to further influence our consciousness through controlled media, culture and education, more actively impose patterns of consumption and behaviour, sow fear and impose unjustified restrictions. This "great reboot" is actually a world-changing for the benefit of the strongest players.[1] Such "normality" carries great risks and dangers and hardly meets the aspirations of humankind. But it is also a certain type of thinking of key decision-makers, and its manifestations are already visible, especially in the realm of big politics and the actions of the largest IT-business.[2]

In the contemporary world, the struggle has gone to the intellectual level. Therefore, in order to understand "new normality" in all variety, to gain a place in competition, to participate in creating and sharing public goods, it is necessary to have a developed intellect, to win, to overplay and to advance with force, accuracy and speed of thought.

CONCLUSION

We continue to reflect on new problems and challenges along the way, but under new conditions. The changed reality requires new formats of interaction between people, between humans and machines, it requires shifts in the paradigm of management thinking. The answer to the dynamics of change will be a

---

[1] The book by Klaus Schwab "Covid 19: Great Reset" can be considered as the manifesto of this new world [22]. A number of the globalist organizations reports have also contained similar ideas, for example, the Rockefeller Foundation Report 2010 [23].

[2] With the four largest IT-companies stagnating and declining significantly in a number of industries during the March to November 2020 pandemic, they reported that capitalization increased from 15% (Google) to 70% (Amazon), sales — increased by 19% on average, and Amazon's profits increased — by 197%, Google — 59%, Facebook — 29%.

transition from *"thinking for action"* to *"action's thinking"*. How the roles of manager will change, what will be left to the person and what will be taken over by artificial intelligence will reveal the next decade. Next questions remain still relevant: how can we keep an individual's intellectual leadership? how do you make your own conclusions, take responsibility? how do you learn from your own mistakes, how do you engage people in agenda discussions, how do you develop the necessary competencies and how do you harness the power of digital technology? what happens to empathy and spiritual intelligence? a new revolution in management has begun, but how will it end?

REFERENCES

1. Kuzin D.V. Modern management concepts: A paradigm shift. Moscow: Knorus; 2021. 342 p. (In Russ.).

2. Hamel G., Breen B. The future of management. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press; 2007. 288 p. (Russ. ed.: Hamel G., Breen B. Budushchee menedzhmenta. Moscow: BestBusinessBooks; 2013. 280 p.).

3. Appelo J. Management 3.0: Leading agile developers, developing agile leaders. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Addison-Wesley Professional; 2011. 464 p. (Russ. ed.: Appelo J. Agile menedzhment. Liderstvo i upravlenie komandami. Moscow: Alpina Publisher; 2018. 534 p.).

4. Denning S. The leader's guide to radical management. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass; 2010. 336 p.

5. Mackey J., Sisodia R. Conscious capitalism: Liberating the heroic spirit of business. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press; 2014. 368 p. (Russ. ed.: Mackey J., Sisodia R. Soznatel'nyi kapitalizm. Kompanii, kotorye prinosyat pol'zu klientam, sotrudnikam i obshchestvu. Moscow: Mann, Ivanov and Ferber; 2015. 336 p.).

6. Nobles B., Staley P. Freedom-based management: Building a culture that enables and encourages fully empowered employees to produce awesome business success. URL: http://www.42projects.org/docs/FreedomBasedManagement.pdf.

7. Dolan S.L., Garcia S. Managing by values: A corporate guide to living, being alive, and making living in the 21st century. Basingstoke; N.Y.: Palgrave Macmillan; 2006. 268 p. (Russ. ed.: Dolan S., Garcia S. Upravlenie na osnove tsennostei. Korporativnoe rukovodstvo po vyzhivaniyu, uspeshnoi zhiznedeyatel'nosti i umeniyu zarabatyvat' den'gi v XXI veke. Moscow: Pretext; 2008. 320 p.).

8. Kleiner G. Intelligent economy of the digital age. The digital age: Steps of evolution. *Ekonomika i matematicheskie metody = Economics and Mathematical Methods.* 2020;56(1):18–33. (In Russ.). DOI: 10.31857/S 042473880008562–7

9. Ponomarev I.P. Hyperthinking: Complexity management. Ekaterinburg: Izdatel'skie sistemy; 2017. 190 p. (In Russ.).

10. Kurpatov A.V. Mind palace. Kill the idiot in you! St. Petersburg: Kapital; 2018. 416 p. (In Russ.).

11. Nordström K., Ridderstråle J. Funky business: Talent makes capital dance. Englewood Cliffs: Pearson Publ.; 2002. 288 p. (Russ. ed.: Nordström K., Ridderstråle J. Biznes v stile fank. Kapital plyashet pod dudku talanta. St. Petersburg: Stockholm School of Economics in St. Petersburg; 2008. 280 p.).

12. Kristiansen P., Rasmussen R. Building a better business using the Lego Serious Play method. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; 2014. 240 p. (Russ. ed.: Kristiansen P., Rasmussen R. Konstruirovanie uluchshenii biznesa s pomoshch'yu metoda "Lego Serious Play". Moscow; 2016).

13. Ries A., Trout J. Positioning: The battle for your mind. New York, London: McGraw-Hill Education; 2001. 272 p. (Russ. ed.: Trout J., Ries A. Pozitsionirovanie. Bitva za umy. St. Petersburg: Piter; 2019. 336 p.).

14. De Brabandere L., Iny A. Thinking in the new boxes: A new paradigm for business creativity. New York: Random House, Inc.; 2013. 352 p. (Russ. ed.: De Brabandere L., Iny A. Dumai v drugikh formatakh. Moscow: Eksmo; 2020. 384 p.).

15. Barker J.A. Paradigms: The business of discovering the future. New York: HarperBusiness; 1993. 240 p. (Russ. ed.: Barker J. Operezhayushchee myshlenie. Kak uvidet' novyi trend ran'she drugikh. Moscow: Alpina Publisher;

2014. 188 p.).

16. Rosenzweig Ph. The halo effect: …and the eight other business delusions that deceive managers. New York: Simon & Schuster; 2007. 256 p. (Russ. ed.: Rosenzweig Ph. Effekt oreola… i drugie vosem' illyuzii, vvodyashchikh menedzherov v zabluzhdenie. Moscow: BestBusinessBooks; 2008. 256 p.).

17. Senge P. M., Scharmer C. O., Jaworski J., Flowers B. S. Presence: Human purpose and the field of the future. London; Boston, MA: Nicholas Brealey Publishing; 2005. 304 p. (Russ. ed.: Senge, P., Scharmer, O., Jaworski J., Flowers B. S. Preobrazhenie. Potentsial cheloveka i gorizonty budushchego. Moscow: Olymp-Business; 2008. 304 p.).

18. O'Connor J., McDermott I. The art of systems thinking: Essential skills for creativity and problem solving. San Francisco, CA: Thorsons Publ.; 1997. 288 p. (Russ. ed.: O'Connor J., McDermott I. Iskusstvo sistemnogo myshleniya: Neobkhodimye znaniya o sistemakh i tvorcheskom podkhode k resheniyu problem. Moscow: Alpina Publisher; 2017. 254 p.).

19. Gharajedaghi J. System thinking: Managing chaos and complexity. A platform for designing business architecture. Amsterdam, Boston: Elsevier Science; 2006. 334 p. (Russ. ed.: Gharajedaghi J. Sistemnoe myshlenie. Kak upravlyat' khaosom i slozhnymi protsessami. Platforma dlya modelirovaniya arkhitektury biznesa. Minsk: Grevtsov Books; 2010. 480 p.).

20. Kukla A. Mental traps: Stupid things that sane people do to mess up their minds. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.; 2007. 153 p. (Russ. ed.: Kukla A. Mental'nye lovushki: Gluposti, kotorye delayut razumnye lyudi, chtoby isportit' sebe zhizn'. Moscow: Alpina Publisher; 2020. 146 p.).

21. Brammer St., Branicki L., Linnenluecke M. COVID-19, societalization, and the future of business in society. *Academy of Management Perspectives*. 2020;34(4). DOI: 10.5465/amp.2019.0053

22. Schwab K., Malleret T. COVID-19: The great reset. Geneva: World Economic Forum; 2020. 280 p.

23. Scenarios for the future of technology and international development. New York: The Rockefeller Foundation; 2010. 53 p.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Dmitry V. Kuzin — Doctor of Economics, Head of Management of Organization Chair, Economic Faculty, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia; Vice President of the European Council for Business Education (ECBE), Moscow, Russia
dvkuzin@inbox.ru

Igor P. Ponomarev — PhD, Senior Teacher, Economic Faculty, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
ponip@mail.ru