

# MANAGEMENT SCIENCE IN THE MIRROR OF HUMAN ETHOLOGY – CONCEPTION OF RESEARCH –

*István Kunos*

Assistant Professor, Ph.D. Student  
*Department of Organizational Behavior*  
*University of Miskolc*

My research focuses on an interdisciplinary field, that requires sociological and scientific knowledge and methods as well. In my opinion, inspite of this twoness, investigation of Management Science in the mirror of Human Ethology rest on rational basis. Nowadays we better and better show interest in scientific research of human nature, behavior and society. We would like to find scientific answers to our problems related to our family, place of work and other communities.

I think that by way of introduction I have to say some words about Human Ethology. Ethology deals with the behavior of animals, while Human Ethology deals with the behavior of humans. Human Ethology is an evolutionary science. It takes it that learning, tradition and culture play an important role in human behavior, but the capability for culture is a result of an evolutionary process. Structures and dynamics of possible cultures are formed within the limits of genetic. Human Ethology takes the culture as a behavioral system with keep in view that components of culture are formed in learning activities, but as behavioral patterns they are suitable for ethological and evolutionary analysis. Analysation of species-specific, inherited behavioral patterns is one of the main task of Ethology and Human Ethology. The first reflections on Human Ethology was published by Konrad Lorenz, founder of Ethology. Ethology certainly found its way. The basic concepts stood up against challenge. As is usual in a fast developing discipline, focal points of interests shift. The evolutionary approach certainly continues to attract the attention of the other disciplines of human behavior. Human Ethology also profits from the numerous sociobiological contributors. Two international journals - Ethology and Sociobiology and Human Nature - publish regularly contributions, and the Human Ethology Newsletter is developing an important discussion format. There are however also matters of concern as regards methodology.

Konrad Lorenz emphasized again and again the importance of observation and description, but over the years we can observe a trend away from original observational data. William Charlesworth documented this in a recently published investigation in which he analysed. There is a clear trend away from empirical papers toward theoretical ones. Another point of concern is a "nothing-but-an-animal" presentation of the human being. When Desmond Morris started to characterize the human being as a "naked ape", it was meant to put the fact of our phylogenetic history into the focus of attention. It was meant to shock as a didactic measure, and as such was appropriate at that time. But if one were to conclude that such is the complete way biologists see the human being, one would be basically wrong. Konrad Lorenz emphasized repeatedly that no one is able to appreciate the

uniqueness of the specific human attributes as clearly as those who can perceive them against the background of the much more primitive actions and reactions, which we also share with the higher animals. Reason and the morality based upon it, the capacity to learn a language and to talk about present, past and future events, to pass on knowledge and thus to build up culture, and finally, our ability to set goals for ourselves on the basis of desires and empathy are indeed unique. And this provides us with new potentialities for survival as will be discussed at the end of this contribution.

In spite of this emphasis on the uniqueness of human nature, many biologists perpetuate this nothing-but-an-animal presentation, often by means of appalling illustrations depicting grimacing monkey and human faces, the message being that they are "all the same". This is not just a matter of taste, but harmful to our field since we need to communicate and cooperate more than ever with the humanities. Without understanding culture, we cannot understand the human being who is "naturally cultured". Humans are certainly outfitted with motivations, emotions, biases in perception and with innate motor patterns given as biological heritage. And part of this heritage we share with animals. However, as an old Chinese proverb states, all that is animal is in humans, but not all that is human is in animals.

What are the prospects of Human Ethology ? The investigation of our phylogenetic heritage programming our action and biasing our perception and cognition is still a tremendous task ahead of us. In particular the universal grammar of human social conduct, verbal and nonverbal alike, needs further exploration. Man is a cultural being by nature. He is genetically endowed with the capacity to acquire a language and speak, which allows him to tell others what to do and when, without the need to act as a model. Cumulative culture as a result has made human history a story of success. We have amongst others, however, created ourselves an environment which deviates from that which exerted its shaping influence through selection for most of our ancestral history and this confronts us with some problems. Our ancestors lived in small face-to-face communities with a simple technology, foraging as hunters and gatherers. Modern man lives in anonymous million societies, in urban environments outfitted with the means of technical civilisation. All in all, the development has to be considered as progress, since without societies of millions there were no universities, no large libraries, no concerts or opera houses, and no technical civilization with all the new options including the conquest of distance and space. Within our century, we proceeded from the first clumsy automobiles to space travel, from the mechanical age to the electronic age. We can hardly imagine what a species achieving this in such a short of time could achieve in another ten thousand or more years, if it were to solve its social and ecological problems.

Overpopulation and environmental destruction threaten the very basis of subsistence for future generations. We certainly need a new generation encompassing a survival ethos, carried by a feeling for moral responsibility for future generations. There are however in our phylogenetic heritage dispositions which we have to face, which in our present situation hamper the very development of such an ethos. One is our being programmed for the sprint in the present. Ever

since the first creatures of our planet competed for scarce resources, what alone counted was to win right now. This selected for opportunistic exploitation to the maximum of any opportunity. This was also of advantage to our ancestors until fairly recently. And we are well equipped for this type of competitiveness, since we use our strong aggressive dominance striving instrumentally in many ways, not just in the social context, but also to overcome any obstacles. We sink our teeth into problems, we attack them and subdue nature. This together with the fixation on the present seriously hampers the development of an ethos which takes into consideration the fate of future generations.

This trap of short-term thinking has to be avoided. In order to achieve self control, we need to learn about those traits which in certain situations of modern life prove maladaptive, and others which we can tap in order to adapt anew.

We need to learn about the range of modifiability for each of our behavioral characteristic. We must know about innate learning dispositions such as our indoctrinability, be they helpful or maladaptive, and if so in what situations. History and the study of the cultural manifestations of man in historical and prehistorical time provide a wealth of experiments to be studied.

My concrete task is to investigate Management Science in the mirror of Human Ethology. In this case, approaches focusing on human sociality, cooperation and team work have great significance.

During my research work I systematized the previously examined sub-fields in Ethology. I studied whether these topics are suitable for investigation from the viewpoint of Management Science as well. As a result of this "double-checking" method, three main fields and six sub-fields have been outlined :

1. Connections
  - 1.1. Contacts
  - 1.2. Typical Connections
2. Groups
  - 2.1. Group-structure
  - 2.2. Synchronization
3. Dominance
  - 3.1. Agression
  - 3.2. Dominance-alternation

The fields mentioned above are the objectives of my deep study. I do not give here full details of sub-fields to be investigated, because I would like to focus on the Conception of Research. So, the second step is a revealing investigation. In this phase I try to find out, that concrete behavioral patterns, successfully explored before in Ethology, whether exist in human organizations or not. If the answer yes, the next question is when, in what kind of situation and which way they are present. These results will be the basics of further research. Deep investigations can reveal conclusions, that could be successfully applied in Management Science for instance

creating a team or a company structure, decreasing of aggression between the colleagues, elaborating a friendly, harmonic environment and so on.

To sum up I hope that results of this research have some significance beyond conclusions can be drawn from separate investigation of Human Ethology and Management Science.

## **REFERENCES**

[1] Csányi, V.: The Human Nature (Vince, Budapest, 2000.)

[2] Lorenz, K.: "The Russian Manuscript" (Cartafilus, Budapest, 1998.)