Micro order

Order - suggests a straightening out so as to eliminate confusion.

Order can be easily found in physics or mathematics or any other science where basics are precisely defined, but it becomes much harder task to identify any order in a science where basics are blurry. History suggests that there were greater number scientists discovering laws of nature as oppose to laws of social behavior. It is probably coming from a notion that people tend to discover more obvious stuff in stead of theoretical. If we look at the way of living at the beginning of science we can surely say that it was more rural type of living than urban. It means simple fact that people did not interact with one another as much as we do in modern life and therefore science of nature was more obvious and had more practical use than just some theoretical study of hypothetical society that did not even exist at that time in the way we mean and study today. Modern economy has changed the way we live, interact with one another and behave under certain circumstances. It has even changed the way in which science is being practiced. In the past only wealthy people could afford to practice science, they were discovering things without any bios or any expectations from their discoveries, they were doing it just to satisfy their curiosity. Now days science became a profession and we see more and more individuals who are in to science for only financial satisfaction. Big corporations as well as small business mainly interested in that science, outcome of which can improve their performance in achieving certain goals. Scientists are being told that do and what to study. Modern technology together with economical forces has changed our way of living. Sophisticated tools and chemicals yield to higher crops from the same soil. We are becoming less concerned with quality of the food we consume and only think of a price we pay. Farming is expensive in a sense where we can buy food from overseas for less. This is one of the main factors that forced farmers to move and settle in cities. Recent statistical data suggests that 60 % of the entire population will be living in cities by the year of 2030 oppose to 14% in 1950. These changes force us to find science that will be dealing with human behavior and/or interactions among the society, science that will help us understand what makes us choose one place over another. This might help us solve many questions in our life that have reputations of being unsolved. Throughout this essay I will be raising questions that I think have the greatest importance and will try to answer them in the best way possible.

There is one generic rule that will help solve many questions from the very beginning when start exploring properties of different things. For example when in physics teacher start talking about velocity, the very first sentence is definition. I think that definition is essential to any science and social science should not be any different. If so then what is Micro order and where doe it exist.

Order is a set of rules that will end confusion. We can observe elements of order everywhere we look. A street sign helping people find their ways around, a set of laws defining math, the periodic table of Mendeleyev helping scientist end chaos in chemistry at least on the lower level. Everything that serves its purpose is a part of the order. If this is true than what is it that creates opposite to any order or chaos, is it stuff that does not match existing rules or is it stuff that does not serve its purpose or maybe just combination of both?

I would like to look at the organization that I am familiar with, York University. The main purpose of York University as well as any other university is to provide knowledge to people who qualify to be students. The process that filters individuals by certain parameters such as GPA from other schools or personal achievements is an example of the order that serves its purpose of filtering within York University.

What would it be if York did not have these rules and would accept individuals on a first come first served basis just like in McDonalds does. This still would be an example of an order but designed for different purpose. What would York look like and what would McDonalds look like if they switched their rules of admittance. Would it create a chaos at York and perfect order in McDonalds? It shows that set of rules must be applied then and only then when it serves its purpose other wise it creates chaos. We all understand that when we have a set of rules everything is so much easier.

What makes us creating order when disorder is so much easier?

Who would not agree with me if I said that is so much easier to use one garbage can and throw everything in there in stead of having number of different containers for disposal separation? What is it that makes us obeying rules, is it severe punishment for not obeying, is it conciseness that makes us behave in a certain way that we think serves its best for needs of community and environment, or is it just because we are expected to separate garbage and we usually do what we are asked to do? We obviously do not enforce rules of garbage separation, and not always concerned with the needs of community or environment on larger scale so it would not be logical to assume that we would be concerned with garbage separation, or is it because we do what we are expected to do. I believe that last hypostasis describes our behavior in the best way. We tend to do what are being told sometimes even with out understanding why we are being told so. For example we were all told that we have to read books, by the time we were told so first time we probably had no idea what it was for, or we were told what courses we have to take in order to graduate from a certain school.

Who is the part of an order?

As I defined before order is a set of relevant rules what must be obeyed. But question is; who are these individuals that must obey this set of rules. By looking at the York University we can segregate people in different groups guided by degree of their involvement to York’s life. For example students from other schools would not have to obey rues of York University unless they are interacting or planning on interacting with York. They might be students who just visit York’s library to study for their own classes or these who are current students. Another example would be that in order to get into faculty of science at York prospective students have to take Calculus and English OAC level in order to meet academic requirements. They are not really at York yet and their admittance is uncertain but they already have started obeying rules. Another group of people that is at York is obviously professors. They are one the most important group of people, they teach students. How many times we hear students saying that this professor is good, he knows what he is doing and makes classes interesting, or simply he is following the book and therefore it make so much easier to study for exam, or we hear this professor is horrible, he is confusing, whatever he says does not make any sense. We discourage ourselves from attending classes and try studying from the book or witch to a different section. The third group of people I would define as support. They help students interact with professors on a certain level.

My opinion is that in order to create a perfect order at York University administration has to introduce a set of prescience rules that will be defining all possible interactions between and/or among all groups without any ambiguity leaving room freedom or for creativity. Look at the first law of Newton, it shows that there is no room for ambiguity in the nature. “For any action there is an opposite reaction.” We can say that this is very obvious statement and it can not really help us understand society and its behavior.

I was born in Ukraine and came to Canada at the age of nineteen. I went to school and University at Ukraine. The system that was adopted for educational purposes is very different. For example it York University there is a choice between program you can graduate from, you can go to Administrative studies and graduate with bachelor in administrative studies or go to computer science or something else. In order to graduate from BAS all students have to take certain coerces. For example we have to choose among 20 offered courses in social science and choose one. It seems to be logical to have system designed in the way that would allow students to choose courses they are mainly interested in since it is just a general education level and does not really affect skills required for being an accountant. There is no rule that precisely defines the course but the there is one that deals with it on more generic level. As an example of a contrast in Ukrainian university I had no freedom in choosing courses. I was told exactly what to take and how many courses at a time. Which system is the better one? People will argue that since it is all general education and has little or no affect on skills essential for chosen major it does not really matter what to take. Or it might happen what a student decided to go to a law school and works towards the highest grade score possible and therefore chooses the easiest course available or courses where level of proficiency is the highest. Obviously freedom that this system gives mainly benefits these students who know exactly what their goals are and /or these who can decide on their own how to achieve these defined goals. But in the same time this system confuses these who have not decided yet what their goals are, and attend York just because this is something what is expected from them by someone else for example parents. Is it chaos or is it order? Probably what would be more of an order if admittance to York depended upon whether individuals have decided what to work towards or not. If York had only these who know exactly what they are doing this system would work in the best way. As mentioned before Ukrainians have adopted system that tells you what to do and makes chose for you. It definitely benefits these who have not decided that they want or these who know that they want but do not the way who to get there.