
Contemporary Organizational Paradigm

Syamsuddin Maldun¹

¹ Bosowa University Makassar; Indonesia

correspondence e-mail*, syamsuddin.maldun@universitasbosowa.ac.id

Submitted:

Revised: 2023/12/01

Accepted: 2023/12/21

Published: 2023/12/26

Abstract

Contemporary perspectives on organizational theory include organizational institutionalism, convention analysis, network analysis, knowledge studies, discourse studies, and practice studies. These perspectives offer new ways of understanding and analyzing contemporary organizational life, making them valuable resources for junior researchers and graduate students. Additionally, the evolution of organizational studies has led to the emergence of new approaches such as resource dependence, population ecology, structural contingency, new institutional economics, and new institutionalism. These approaches provide important theoretical references for the evolution and systematization of contemporary organizational studies, enhancing our understanding of how to analyze organizations. The increasing productivity and complexity of the organizational environment also influence the evolution of organizational theory, leading to the adoption of new complexity paradigms with nonlinear behavior as the current main paradigm. Overall, contemporary organizational theory encompasses a range of perspectives and approaches that contribute to a deeper understanding of organizations and their dynamics

Keywords

Paradigm, Globalization, Organization, Contemporary



© 2023 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

INTRODUCTION

Organizational theory is not an easy concept. Unless you're naturally drawn to the abstract, you might find this subject dry, disconnected from practical matters, and perhaps a bit boring. Even if you're interested in abstractions, it can be tiresome to tackle as many abstractions as organizational theory demands at once. So why do people enroll to study this complex and difficult subject?

There are many answers to this question. For some, studying organizational theory is motivated by curiosity. They want to know what it feels like to think like an organization, to delve deep into the process of organizing far enough to uncover the intricate organizational patterns that make organizations understandable. Others are motivated by the allure of expanding their minds in new ways. For example, organizational theory draws on science, humanities, and arts, thus presenting intellectual challenges in interdisciplinary thinking. Some people turn to organizational theory with hopes of enhancing their chances of becoming successful executives in business, government, or non-profit organizations.

Humans intend to describe themselves into networks of collective patterns. "Modern

humans have learned to accommodate themselves in an increasingly organized world. The tendency toward more explicit and conscious relationships is very great and extensive; it is marked by depth and breadth." Seidenberg's comment summarizes the influence of organizations in various forms of human activity.

Some reasons for the busy activities of organizations are found in major transitions that revolutionize our society, shifting it from rural-based cultures to technology, industry, and urban-based cultures. From this shift arises a way of life characterized by the closeness and interdependence of societies. Closeness and interdependence, as conditions of social life, harbor threats of interhuman conflicts, fluctuating antisocial behaviors, instability of interhuman relationships, and uncertainty about the nature of social structures and their accompanying roles.

Of course, threats to social integrity still exist to some extent in all societies, from primitive to modern. However, these threats become serious when the harmony of a society occurs due to the preservation of highly complex and balanced forms of human collaboration. The civilization we produce depends on the maintenance of this precarious balance. Therefore, disruptive forces that disturb this fragile form of collaboration must be prohibited or minimized.

An organization is a social unit of a group of people who interact according to a certain pattern so that each member of the organization has their own function and task, as a unity with a specific goal and clear boundaries, thus it can be clearly separated from its environment.¹

An organization is a system of mutual influence among people in a group who cooperate to achieve certain goals.² According to Herbert and Gullett (1996), organization is the process by which the structure of an organization is created and enforced. This process includes the provision of specific activities needed to achieve all organizational goals. The grouping of these activities is related to a logical arrangement, and the tasks of the activity groups for a position or person in charge. According to Barnard (Sutarto, 2009), an organization is a cooperative activity system between two or more people.

An organization is the grouping of people into cooperative activities to achieve predetermined goals, while organizing is the activity of people in grouping, arranging, and organizing various kinds of work that need to be carried out to achieve educational goals within.³ An organization assigns people to job functions that need to be done to facilitate cooperative activities in achieving goals. Meanwhile, organizing is the arrangement and grouping of various jobs based on job type, sequence of job nature and function, time, and speed.⁴

Organizational studies are an examination of individual and group dynamics and organizational context, as well as the nature of the organization itself. Whenever people interact within organizations, many factors come into play. Organizational studies seek to understand and model these factors. As with all social sciences, organizational behavior seeks to control, predict, and

¹ Lubis, Hari. S.B. dan Martani Husaini. 1987. *Teori Organisasi (Suatu Pendekatan Makro)*. Jakarta: Pusat Antar Universitas Ilmu-ilmu Sosial Universitas Indonesia .

² Sutarto, 2009, *Dasar-Dasar Organisasi*. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada Iniversity Press.

³ Fayol, Henry. 2016. *General And Industrial Management*. Diterjemahkan Oleh Constance Storrs, London: Ravenoi Books.

⁴ Griffin.2013. *Perilaku Organisasi Manajemen*. Jakarta : Salmeha Empat. Hanggraeni, Dewi.

explain. However, there is some controversy over the ethical impact of focusing on worker behavior. Therefore, organizational behavior (and its related field, industrial psychology) is sometimes accused of becoming a scientific tool for those in power. Despite these accusations, Organizational Behavior can play a crucial role in organizational development and job success.

Organizational theory serves to explain the activities and dynamics of organizational cooperation and provides guidance in decision-making based on predictions of the consequences of these decisions. According to Lubis and Husaini (1987), organizational theory is a set of knowledge that discusses the mechanism of cooperation between two or more people systematically to achieve predetermined goals. Organizational theory is a theory for studying cooperation in every individual. The essence of individuals in groups to achieve goals along with the ways pursued using theories that can explain behavior, especially motivation, of individuals in the cooperation process.

METHOD

The analysis method used is descriptive-qualitative. The data collection method involves literature studies from various sources including journals, books, online and offline articles, and several other academic sources. The analysis is based on the perspectives of Purwatiningsih, Aris Puji (2018) in "Histori Filantropi: Tinjauan Teori Postmodern" and Önday, Özgür. (2016) in "Classical to Modern Organization Theory", Article: Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 15-59, March (2016).⁵ The qualitative descriptive research method is carried out through Data Collection, Data Reduction, Data Display, and Conclusion Drawing.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Nature of Organization

Humans, as social beings, cannot fulfill their needs individually. Since ancient times, humans have fulfilled their living needs through cooperation. Activities in meeting life needs and other needs are done in groups. Meeting desires and needs through group work/cooperation through these relationships can be said to embody organizational values.

Rationalization towards organization with a series of instructions and studies on motion-time will lead to increased productivity. One of the most significant events before the 20th century related to the development of organizational theory is the industrial revolution. Organizational theories that developed from the early 19th century are classified into classical organizational theory or also called traditional theory or machine theory. It further evolved into bureaucratic theory and administrative theory. Neoclassical theory then emphasizes the importance of psychological and social aspects of employees as individuals or work groups. This modern organizational theory is then known as "system analysis" or "open theory," which views the organization as a unity of various interdependent elements.

⁵ Önday, Özgür. 2016. *Classical To Modern Organization Theory*. Article: Vol.4, No.2, pp.15-59, March (2016) <https://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/Classical-to-Modern-Organization-Theory1.pdf>. Accessed 7 January 2024.

Classical Theory focuses on the analysis and description of organizations while Modern Theory emphasizes integration and design to provide a more comprehensive view. Classical Theory discusses coordination, scalar, and vertical concepts while Modern Theory is more dynamic, highly complex, multilevel, multidimensional, and considers many variables.

Simply put, since ancient times, humans have been cooperating, gathering, and grouping, consisting of several members to achieve common desires or goals. In modern times, the need for cooperation and grouping is as important as the need for food, clothing, and shelter as basic human needs. In every aspect of our lives in society, nothing is exempt from group activities.

Although this study traces its roots from the thoughts of Max Weber and previous experts, organizational studies are considered to have begun as an academic discipline simultaneously with the emergence of scientific management in the 1890s, with Taylorism representing the peak of this movement. Proponents of scientific management argued that rationalization towards organization with a series of instructions and studies on motion-time would lead to increased productivity.

The fact that cooperation and grouping become the need and desire of every individual in their life. Thus, organizations are very important for human life and civilization in fulfilling their needs and desires. Organization is one means to achieve organizational goals through the implementation of management functions carried out by an organizational leader created within the organization. According to Boone and Katz (Kuspriatni, 2009), an organization is defined as a structured process where people interact to achieve goals. From the above definition, it can be concluded that an organization includes three main elements: (1) Human interaction; (2) Activities aimed at goals, and (3) The organizational structure itself.

Organizational Paradigms

The term "paradigm" generally refers to the worldview or technical problem-solving approach adopted by scientists. The term "paradigm" was first introduced by Thomas Kuhn through his book "The Structure of Scientific Revolution".

When first introduced, this term was not clearly explained by Thomas Kuhn. At that time, the paradigm was only described as a key terminology used in the model of scientific development. It was only later that the term "paradigm" was clearly defined by Robert Friedrichs, who was the first to articulate the paradigm clearly.

Essentially, this term is closely related to the fundamental principles that will determine various human perspectives on the world as part of the bricoluer system (modern design referring to the process of creating something new from old materials). A paradigm generally includes three main elements: methodological elements, epistemological elements, and ontological elements. By using these three elements, humans use paradigms to gain various knowledge about the world and various phenomena that occur within it.

In developing thinking skills, one must have a paradigm within oneself. This is because it is part of the pattern of intellectual discipline. Where the paradigm is a model in the theory of science understood as a framework of thought. The function of the paradigm is to serve as the basis for someone to interact with their environment. This aligns with the purpose of the paradigm itself,

which is to shape the framework of thinking to analyze and engage with various things and with others.

On the other hand, a paradigm can be understood as a mechanism for how someone perceives something that will influence their thinking. In research, paradigm theory can help scientists to work within a broader theoretical framework.

There are many perspectives (paradigms) in viewing organizations. There are traditional/classical perspectives that are highly objective and mechanistic, critical perspectives that are highly subjective, and perspectives that fall in between the two (transitional). These different perspectives ultimately influence how communication within the organization is perceived. Theories in the classical stream view communication as a function of supervision or control by management over employees. Meanwhile, in the transitional stream, communication within the organization is seen as a process involving both executives and employees. While in the critical stream, the communication process within the organization is inseparable from the culture within that organization.

The development of theories about organizations parallels the development in worldviews (paradigms). Starting from classical organizational theories (positivist/objective paradigm), transitional streams that oppose the views of the classical stream, and theories that embrace subjectivity.

Each author of the three referenced books, namely Goldhaber; Daniels, Spiker, and Papa; and Pace and Faules (1997), have their own views in categorizing organizational theories. Although there are some similarities among them, there are also some differences. For example, Pace & Faules and Daniel, Spiker & Papa place Chester Barnard's Theory of Authority under the transitional theory group (transition from classical to subjective). Meanwhile, Goldhaber (1993) places this theory under the classical paradigm.

Although their perspectives differ from one another, what is of concern here is that by knowing under which paradigm each organizational theory falls, it will help when observing organizations and the communication that occurs within them.

Classical Paradigm

Daniels, Spiker, and Papa (1997) refer to this classical stream as Scientific and Classical Management. The theories within this paradigm view organizations as resembling machines, driven by plans and control from management. Scientific and classical management theories represent early attempts to address organizational complexity in the 20th century.⁶

Common elements in scientific and classical stream theories include: (a) Organizations are run by management authority. Employees are tools to implement management plans. The implication is that organizational communication serves as a tool for organizational control and coordination of organizational processes. (b) Scientific and classical theories believe that people behave according to rational and economic models. The primary motivation for work is money. Social and political motivations in organizational behavior are considered irrelevant or detrimental to organizational effectiveness. Rational organizational structure and function systems will reduce

⁶ Daniels, Tom D, Spiker, Barry K, Papa, Michael J. 1997. *Perspective On Organizational Communication 4th Ed.* USA: McGraw-Hill.

the adverse effects of group conflicts, personal competition, grudges, power struggles, and egoism, and (c) Each theorist advances a recipe for designing organizations to resemble machines. In this regard, there are three highly influential theories during the early 1900s:

Scientific Management by Frederick Taylor

Taylor's primary focus was on scientific study and design of work processes (detailed techniques in production work). The principles he put forward referred to work efficiency issues and also offered recommendations regarding organizational structure and processes. Taylor's four ideas are: (a) There is one best way to do a job, for example: time and motion studies can streamline steps and the amount of time needed to complete tasks efficiently. Experiments can determine physical work conditions that will increase productivity. (b) Personnel should be selected scientifically. One should select and assign others according to their skills or potential for skill development. (c) Workers should be rewarded with incentives that match what they produce. Wages based on the number of hours worked are inappropriate, not because of differences in individual productivity but because economic needs are an important factor that motivates someone to work, and (d) Jobs should be divided so that managers plan the work and workers follow the plan. In his scheme, Taylor depicted that each aspect is overseen by different "functional foremen." Taylor believed that the main problem in organizational effectiveness involved management's inability to obtain fulfillment from workers. According to him, everyone would yield profits under scientific management.

General Management by Henry Fayol

Different from Taylor, who focused on production work techniques, Fayol emphasized more on the fundamental principles of organizational structure and management practices.

He put forward Fourteen (14) principles fundamental to organizational design and structure, namely: (a) Division of work. Each member has only one job. (b) Authority and responsibility. Authority includes the right to give orders and the power to demand fulfillment. The authority of organizational officials depends on their position, and personal authority depends on their ability and experience. (c) Discipline, depending on good leadership, cleanliness, and fair rules, as well as sanctions applied wisely. (d) Unity of command. Employees receive orders from one person and only have one superior for each action. (e) Unity of direction. A group of activities with the same goal must have "one head and one plan." (f) Subordination of individual interests. (g) Wage payment. Employees must be paid fairly, satisfying both them and the organization. (h) Centralization. Whether decision-making is centralized (limited to higher-level management) or decentralized (aimed at subordinates) depends on organizational conditions. (i) Scalar chain. The authority system is arranged like a hierarchy with clear lines of command from one level to another, but the system must be willing to shift from the chain of command when needed. (j) Order. There is a place for every employee, and every employee must be in their place. (k) Equity. Personnel are treated with kindness and fairness. (l) Stability in position. Assuming that employees who have the ability to do a job will still have time to learn and succeed in doing it. (m) Initiative. The ability to propose and implement a plan is a valuable organizational resource, and (n) Esprit de corps (feelings

of loyalty and mutual respect). Management should strive to promote a sense of unity, harmony, and cohesion.

Bureaucratic Theory by Max Weber

Max Weber took issues from Henry Fayol's perspective. Weber distinguished between inherent authority (traditional power, which may not be legitimate) and legitimate authority (acquired, respected, based on norms, rational, and legal). It is this legal authority that then becomes the basis for what Weber termed "bureaucracy."

According to Weber, bureaucracy is the ideal concept for modern organizations. In complex organizations, speed, accuracy, certainty, and continuity are required. All of these can be achieved if the organization is designed as much as possible like a machine. In this regard, there are 6 basic characteristics of the ideal concept of modern organization: (a) Clear hierarchical authority system, (b) Division of labor based on specialization, (c) Comprehensive rule system covering rights, responsibilities, and personnel obligations, (d) Perfect procedures for work performance, (e) Impersonality (not individuality) in human organizational relationships, and (f) Selection and promotion of personnel based on technical competence.

Bureaucracy as an organization, according to Goldhaber (1993), has the following characteristics: (a) Continuity depends on adherence to regulations, (b) Areas of expertise where workers share and work towards specific goals under established leadership, (c) Hierarchy principles, (d) Rules, both norms and technical principles, (e) Administrative separation between employees and owners of production tools, (f) Separation of private ownership and organizational equipment, (g) Resources free from external control, (h) A structure where no single administrator can monopolize personnel positions, and (i) All administrative actions, rules, principles, etc., are stated in writing.

Similarities of the Three Theories

The equation between the three scientific management theories (Taylor, Fayol, and Weber) is as follows: (a) All three theories view that organizations are driven by management authority. (b) They perceive employees as tools to execute management plans. (c) There is a division of labor tailored to the skills of each individual. (d) Attention is paid to personnel rights (salary, incentives, etc.).

The differences among the three theories

The differences among the three scientific management theories (Taylor, Fayol, and Weber) are; First, in Taylor's concept, employees receive orders from superiors and are then supervised by different individuals (functional foremen). Meanwhile, in Fayol and Weber's concepts, they emphasize the idea of unity of command (one superior for each action). The unity of command emphasized by Fayol and Weber is related to the need for rapid, accurate, certain, and continuous dissemination of information. Whereas in Taylor's concept, ambiguity, perceptual errors, etc., can occur because the giver of orders and the supervisor are two different individuals.

Fayol is flexible regarding decision-making within the organization. It can be centralized or decentralized, depending on the organizational conditions. This is different from the concept offered by Weber, where he advocates for a constant rule certainty. Second, if Fayol offers attention to advance unity, harmony (*esprit de corps*), then Weber emphasizes impersonality more.

The traditional/classical theories' perspective on organizations is that organizations are driven by management authority, and employees are merely tools to execute management plans. This all implies the communication process within the organization. The communication process that occurs within the organization is seen only as a tool for coordination and control by the organization. Communication activities related to planning and decision-making are centered around the upper echelons of the organization. Only Fayol's concept is flexible regarding decision-making issues.

The downward communication flow is related to the delivery of messages in the form of task delegation/work orders. Meanwhile, the upward communication flow concerns reporting results or issues in work, from employees to superiors.

Goldhaber (1993) refers to this classical area as The Classical School. Attention to classical organization theory is almost entirely about organizational design and structure, not about the people. The main tool used is the Organization Chart.

Neoclassical paradigm

Humans throughout their lives are never separated from organizational life. It can be said that as long as humans exist, organizations exist in accordance with the development of their time.

In this era of globalization, the existence of organizations is increasingly important, as the influence of globalization visualizes rapidly changing conditions. Organizations must be able to anticipate the changes that occur, as failure will occur, even resulting in closure.

It seems that organizational life in this era of globalization is increasingly difficult because the challenges are becoming more severe. Tenacity, hard work, and organizational resilience are highly needed to face this era of globalization.

In its development, organizations have experienced an expansion of meaning, with a transition period from classical to neoclassical, and up to the present modern era. Classical theory emerged first as the only organizational theory, then neoclassical theory emerged as a development of classical and modern theories, and finally postmodern theory emerged.

In neoclassical organizational theory, it is simply known as the human relations movement. Neoclassical theory was developed based on classical theory. This theory emphasizes the importance of the psychological and social aspects of employees as individuals and as part of their work groups.

The development of neoclassical theory began with inspiration from experiments conducted at Hawthorne and from the writings of Hugo Munsterberg. These experiments were conducted from 1924 to 1932, marking the beginning of the development of human relations theory and crystallizing neoclassical theory.

Ultimately, the Hawthorne experiments showed how cohesive group work activities significantly affect organizational operations. This theory reflects greater attention to social relationships in the workplace and emphasizes group harmony as the primary goal of the organization.

Management thinking is more focused on human-to-human relationships and on all existing organizations. In other words, neoclassical theory defines an organization as a group of people who

are interconnected to achieve a common goal.

In neoclassical theory, organizations emphasize the importance of the psychological and social aspects of employees as individuals who collaborate to achieve specific goals.

This theory emerged due to dissatisfaction with the classical approach, which did not fully produce production efficiency and harmonious work in organizations. Organizers still face difficulties because employees do not always follow the behavior patterns that match the organization's criteria. Organizers are encouraged to be more cooperative with employees, improve the social environment in the workplace, and strengthen the individual image of workers.

To achieve maximum results in increasing productivity, an organizer needs to understand the social and psychological aspects that encourage employees to cooperate optimally in improving productivity, so that the predetermined goals can be achieved.

In Neoclassical Theory, the necessity of the following aspects has been proposed: (a) Participation, involving everyone in the decision-making process. (b) Job enlargement as opposed to specialization patterns, and (c) Bottom-up management that provides opportunities for juniors to participate in top management decision-making.

From the description and elaboration of the understanding and emergence of neoclassical theory, the characteristics of neoclassical theory itself can be understood, namely: (a) Neoclassical Organizational Theory approaches organizations as groups of people with common goals. (b) Neoclassical Organizational Theory evolves through improvements in Classical Organizational Theory based on the Hawthorne experiments, which view organizations as open systems where technical and human segments are closely related, and employee attitudes are important factors for increasing productivity. (c) Improvements include aspects of job distribution, scalar and functional processes, organizational structure, and span of control, and (d) Neoclassical Organizational Theory understands the existence of "informal" organizations that arise due to location factors, types of jobs, interests, and specific issues (vested).

Modern Organizational Paradigm

This system proposes that organizations are not closed systems with stable environments, but rather open systems that must adapt to changes occurring in their environment. Organizations and their environments are interrelated or interdependent in the process of forming viable organizations within society. Modern theory is a multidisciplinary combination of various fields of scientific disciplines.

The paradigm of modern organization and management has been developed since the 1950s. With the advancement of technology and the increasing complexity of activities, a system concept is required. The classical organizational paradigm focuses more on a structural approach within the organization. In contrast, the modern paradigm views organizations as open systems that have a basis in conceptual analysis, empirical data, and possess synthetic and integral characteristics. Organizations consist of relationships between each part within a system. Organizations comprise three elements: (a) Macro elements, (b) Process elements that are macro in nature, and (c) Behavioral elements of organizational members that are micro in nature.

The advantages of Modern Organization are often encountered in daily activities, including capital budgeting, inventory management, product planning, queuing methods, scheduling, and

transportation. However, the disadvantage of Modern Organization is the difficulty in understanding the complex organizational calculation system.

In this regard, the difference between classical and modern paradigms lies in the Classical Paradigm's focus on the results of organizational analysis and description. Whereas the Modern paradigm emphasizes integration and design. Furthermore, Classical Theory discusses concepts of coordination, scalar concepts (vector space elements), and vertical concepts. In contrast, Modern theory is more dynamic, complex, multidimensional, multilevel, and involves more variables.

Post Modern Organizational Paradigm

Discussing organizational theory usually entails a thorough explanation of the dialectical relationship from one paradigm to the next. From classical theory, neoclassical, modern, to the inconclusiveness of postmodern organizational theory. Explaining postmodern theory in organizational theory indeed poses its own challenges; without careful examination, the deconstructive essence might only unveil narrative layers but inherently risks falling into biased relativism.

Nevertheless, organizational theory is categorized within the realm of social sciences, which logically entails being influenced by the zeitgeist and the changes constantly occurring in the social sciences. Its substance lies not in merely enriching the realm of social sciences but rather in determining the stance and position of organizational theory in viewing these changes, thereby avoiding a myopic perspective in the scholarly examination of organizational theory.

Among the roster of postmodern figures, Foucault, a French philosopher, emerges prominently, with his analyses occasionally explored within the context of organizational theory. Extending organizational theory into the postmodern realm requires courage and opposes orthodoxy that seems inclined towards self-absolutization. Elevating postmodernism within the organizational domain will implicate multiculturalism and heterogenization because postmodernism inherently teaches to constantly question and doubt before believing and acting. Postmodernism interprets organizational theory as a product of social construction. The paradigm shifts that have occurred thus far are also repercussions of social constructions; hence, past doctrines will be judged relatively.

The most distinctive feature of postmodernism is its critique of modern reasoning such as foundationalism, universalism, and objectivism. Modern thinking always seeks unity or homology, while postmodernism presents heterology.

According to postmodernism, the grand narratives of modernism only suppress the diversity of reality. Human experiences or realities' uniqueness is simplified; instead of being acknowledged, they are standardized into a single definition. Therefore, postmodernism provides space for marginalized groups or those suppressed by the grand narratives of modernism. Hence, postmodern social theory is counter-hegemonic to these grand narratives.

One of the intriguing scholars in this regard is Foucault, despite being heavily criticized, especially by Marxist intellectuals who regard him as a traitor; he continues to advance his unique ideas. His prolific contributions involve making theories and practices of social change more sensitive to power relations and domination, as well as fostering awareness of power relations

interwoven in every aspect of life and personal life. This contradicts the general belief in social sciences, which tends to overlook power in the world of knowledge and assumes that knowledge is neutral, objective, and innocent. This is discussed in the context of organizational theory, where, in critical readings, the author believes there has been no in-depth examination of the veiled power dynamics in established organizational theories. Indeed, his thinking always challenges the established norms because he strives to unveil the invisible veils.

Foucault contributes critical theories of development and modernization with a distinctive postmodern style. His thoughts on controlling discourse creation and the operation of power in knowledge greatly assist academics and social activists in uncovering hidden aspects of development theory and practice. Not only that, anything that has always been accepted without question by the masses, Foucault and Foucauldians will reverse that reality, deconstruct it until nothing remains.

Regarding the relationship between subject and object, Foucault is one of the philosophers who celebrates the death of the subject; hence, he is often referred to as a post-structuralist figure. Humanism is killed by post-structuralism, including Foucault. Hence, from here on, philosophy that has been dealing with humanism has come to an end. The logical implication of Foucault's anti-humanism is that humans are also ultimately influenced by power, not vice versa. At the extreme point, the subject actually nullifies freedom and subjectivity, which then Foucault offers a new freedom, namely freedom that is able to control the power and will on the subject it produces.

The substance of Foucault's postmodern organizational paradigm allows us to glean scientific wisdom because of its ability to see microscopic realities, showing that there are other things unread, unseen, and unheard of that immediately provide opportunities for emancipation. Theoretically, there are other things that need to be studied besides the main issues aside from organizational effectiveness and efficiency. In terms of power relations, there is always a hidden dominance that influences human knowledge, thus humans are no longer accurately called subjects, which in this case means public organization workers can be dragged into de-subjectivation. The weakness of postmodernism is its inconclusiveness because inherently postmodernism only revolves around deconstruction. However, at least there is wisdom that academics, governments, and stakeholders closely related to public organizations can take, to no longer be clueless in facing the conditions of postmodernity.

Contemporary Organizational Realities

Since the inception of scientific management, organizations have been managed by linear structures and rigid scientific understanding. For several decades, scientific models have dominated organizational techniques and reality prediction methods. Essentially, these traditional organizational perspectives have been challenged by organizational theories detecting the linearity governing every aspect of organizational work direction. Scientific management theory is not adequately conceptualized in organizational philosophy and practice; however, with the rapid changes and instability occurring, attention to this has increased. Amidst the importance of linear methodologies and revolutionary developments in organizational theory, this paper aims to study the essence of organizational theory from historical and contemporary perspectives that can

contribute to organizations amidst a set of opportunities and constraints, and to what extent this theory reflects contemporary organizational realities. Additionally, in realizing the dynamic complex features of organizational structures, organizational concepts and regulations are analyzed along with the convergence and divergence of debated organizational processes to be initially applied within organizations. Furthermore, new organizational perspectives are also discussed, thereby necessitating the challenging need to continuously manage organizations with flexibility and innovation.

Since the creation of organizational bureaucracy, organizational theory has emerged under the influence of several scientific approaches, including the Newtonian paradigm. However, in the early 20th century, organizational science set new standards in organizational management, reflecting the dynamic nature of organizational systems. In particular, organizational reality has been pushed into unknown territory alongside a series of unprecedented global trends. According to Tetenbaum (1998), significant transformations in manufacturing and service industries, the emergence of new technologies, and increased cross-border interactions have led to great complexity in shaping organizational structures. Undeniably, this emerging complexity has prompted organizations to deeply examine how change is sweeping through and reforming the future, as traditional systematic approaches need to be revised and reexamined by writers. In this regard, according to Gray (2007), as humans, we lack the ability to shape the entire system we live in, so we strive as best we can to anticipate its boundaries. Despite all the social and technological changes that have occurred, one can see oneself as a significant part of complex interactions, trying to create and maintain a balance between order and instability.⁷ Of course, this realization questions the maturity of management literature built on implicit stability assumptions and predictable predictions. Indeed, this literature review highlights how contemporary organizational realities are conceptualized in the era of organizational dynamism.

In essence, this work contributes to knowledge in various ways. This literature review discusses the role of the evolution of organizational theory in relation to current organizational methodologies across organizations. Additionally, it provides clearer insights to researchers and practitioners regarding existing studies in this field, which delve deeply and demonstrate the organizational need for urgent transition towards the most appropriate new organizational orientation reflecting current organizational realities.

The idea of "organization" has always been represented as two contradictions. Organization, in its strict definition, represents uncertainty and confusion, on the other hand, it views organization as a symbol of management and linearity. The mechanistic view of organizations has always been presented as a management recipe through academic research. However, contemporary management is not an easy endeavor, as it is far more complex and chaotic than what is implied by simple recommendations. For example, Rarick's view (2008) that the application of research findings and organizational practices of the past through contemporary organizational work only demonstrates critical failure, as its validity cannot be applied from one organization to another.⁸

⁷ Gray, W. 2007. *Integrated Models Of Cognitive System*. Oxford University Press.

⁸ Rarick, C. 2008. *Confucius On Management: Understanding Chinese Cultural Values And Managerial*

According to Thompson (1967), organizations are dynamic organisms directed by nonlinear relationships. Thompson argues that organizations are a set of interdependent parts that together form a unity, each giving and receiving something from the whole. In reality, contemporary organizations are in the realm of non-linearity, where the importance of the indirect origins of organizational actions is emphasized by many researchers and practitioners today.⁹ According to Mintzberg and Waters (1964), preoccupation with decision-making poses a threat to mental intentions at the individual level and concretely, actions at the organizational level. Additionally, Pettigrew (1990) acknowledges that linearity cannot guide decisions, where each decision is the result of many rounds and directions.¹⁰ This, and at the micro level of organizations, is reflected through the contradictory frames of reference of organizational actors, including their changing values and preferences that intervene in various phases of choice, action, and evaluation processes. Consequently, non-linearity occupies a broader place in the relationship between action takers and the nature of their actions. For example, the strategy formulation process appears systematic, organized, and planned; however, deep down, it is mixed with intuition, opportunities, and other dynamic internal and external variables. In this context, Mintzberg and Waters (1985) emphasize the importance of dynamic internal interactions in the strategy formulation process. Pinfield (1986) also demonstrates that structured and anarchic organizational processes complement each other, where strategies and solutions are generated through decisions arising from the dialectical interaction of forces within and outside the organization.¹¹

CONCLUSION

There are various perspectives on organizations, each with its own merits and drawbacks. No single viewpoint is inherently superior or inferior to another. It is conceivable that without the classical scientific management perspective, subsequent perspectives such as neoclassical, modern, and postmodern might not have arisen.

Looking forward, the era of globalization necessitates an examination of millennial organizational theory, which underscores qualities such as intellectual prowess, integrity, honesty, and forward-thinking vision aligned with contemporary progress. Future leadership faces a pivotal challenge; millennial leaders must adeptly navigate evolving landscapes, having been raised in a swiftly advancing technological milieu. This is significant as millennials will ultimately shape the sustainability of societies and nations.

As millennials gradually assume leadership roles, instilling values of patriotism, loyalty, and perseverance from a young age becomes paramount. Providing exemplary leadership models is crucial. Furthermore, contemporary millennial leadership emphasizes empathy and a strong commitment to assisting others, irrespective of ethnicity, religion, race, or nationality.

Practices. Journal of International Management Studies, 4(8), 3-6.

⁹ Thompson, J. 1967. *Organizations In Action*. McGraw-hill

¹⁰ Pettigrew, A. 1990. *Studying Strategic Choice And Strategic Change. A Comment On Mintzberg And Waters: "Does Decision Get In The Way?"*. Organization Studies, 11(1), 6-11.

¹¹ Rarick, C. 2008. *Confucius On Management: Understanding Chinese Cultural Values And Managerial Practices*. Journal of International Management Studies, 4(8), 3-6.

REFERENCES

- Babloyantz, A. 1991. *Self-Organization, Emerging Properties, And Learning*. Plenum Press.
- Brown, S. & Eisenhardt, K. 1998. *Competing on the Edge, Strategy as Structured Chaos*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Chikere, C. and Nwoka, J. 2015. *The Systems Theory Of Management In Modern Day Organizations - A Study Of Aldgate Congress Resort Limited Port Harcourt*. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publication*, 5 (9),1-7.
- Daniels, Tom D, Spiker, Barry K, Papa, Michael J. 1997. *Perspective On Organizational Communication 4th Ed*. USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Denning, S. 2011. *Lest We Forget: Why We Had A Financial Crisis*. *Forbes*, 3(11), 2-5. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/stevedenning/2011/11/22/5086/>
- Dolan, S. L., & Garcia, S. 2002. *Managing By Values: Cultural Redesign For Strategic Organizational Change At The Dawn Of The 21st Century*. *Journal of Management development*, 21(2), 101–117. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710210417411>
- Dolan, S., Garcia, S. and Auerbach, A. 2003. *Understanding And Managing Chaos In Organisations*. *International Journal of Management*,6 (3), 23-27.
- Fakih, Mansour. 2002. *Runtuhnya Teori Pembangunan Dan Globalisasi*. Jogjakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Foucault. Michel. 2011. *Pengetahuan Dan Metode* (Terj. Yogyakarta, Jalasutra).
- Frederick, W. 1998. *Creatures, Corporations, Communities, Chaos, Complexity: A Naturological View Of The Corporate Social Role*. *Business and Society*, 37(4), 358-389.
- Fayol, Henry. 2016. *General And Industrial Management*. *Diterjemahkan Oleh Constance Storrs*, London: Ravenoi Books.
- Farazmand, A. 2004. *Sound Governance: Policy And Administrative Innovations*. Praeger Publishers.
- Goldhaber. 1993. *Organizational Communication 6th Ed*. USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Gray, W. 2007. *Integrated Models Of Cognitive System*. Oxford University Press.
- Griffin.2013. *Perilaku Organisasi Manajemen*. Jakarta : Salmeba Empat. Hanggraeni, Dewi.
- Hicks, Herbert G. dan G. Ray Gullet. 1996. *Organisasi Teori Dan Tingkah Laku*. Jakarta: Burni Aksara
- Knights, David, dan David Collinson. 1987. "Disciplining The Shopfloor: A Comparison Of The Disciplinary Effects Of Managerial Psychology And Financial Accounting." *Accounting Organizations And Society*, Vol. 12, No. 5 Pp. 457--477,.
- Kuspriatni, Lista, 2009, *Studi Tentang Organisasi*, Bandung: PT Remaja Rosda Karya.
- Lubis, Hari. S.B. dan Martani Husaini. 1987. *Teori Organisasi (Suatu Pendekatan Makro)*. Jakarta: Pusat Antar Universitas Ilmu-ilmu Sosial Universitas Indonesia .
- McAuley, John, Duberley, Joanne and Johnson, Phil. 2007. *Organization Theory Challenges And Perspectives*. England. Publisher: Edinburgh Gate Harlow Essex CM20 2JE.
- Önday, Özgür. 2016. *Classical To Modern Organization Theory*. Article: Vol.4, No.2, pp.15-59, March (2016) <https://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/Classical-to-Modern-Organization-Theory1.pdf>. Accessed 7 January 2024.
- Pace, R. Wayne, Faulers, Don F. 1994. *Organizational Communication 3rd Ed*. New Jersey: Prentice-

Hall, Inc.

- Pettigrew, A. 1990. *Studying Strategic Choice And Strategic Change. A Comment On Mintzberg And Waters: "Does Decision Get In The Way?"*. *Organization Studies*, 11(1), 6-11.
- Pinfield, L. 1986. *A Field Evaluation Of Perspectives On Organizational Decision- Making*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31(3), 414-450.
- Purwatiningsih, Aris Puji. 2018. *Histori Filantropi: Tinjauan Teori Postmodern*. Artikel: Vol. 5, No. 1, Juni (2018), https://www.google.com/search?q=junrla+internasional+ttg+organissi+klasik+samapai+postmodern&oq=junrla+internasional+ttg+organissi+klasik+samapai+postmodern&gs_lcrp=EgZjaHJvbWUyBggAEEUYOTIJCAEQIRgKGKABMgkIAhAhGAoYoAEyCQgDECEYChigAdIBCTM3NTg5ajBqNKgCALACAA&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8. Accessed 7 January 2024.
- Rarick, C. 2008. *Confucius On Management: Understanding Chinese Cultural Values And Managerial Practices*. *Journal of International Management Studies*, 4(8), 3-6.
- Rokeach, M. 1973. *The Nature Of Human Values*. MacMillan.
- Richards, R. 1996. *Does The Lone Genius Ride Again? Chaos, Creativity, And Community*. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 36(2), 44-60.
- Singh, H. & Singh, A. 2002. *Principles Of Complexity And Chaos Theory In Project Execution: A New Approach To Management*. *Cost Engineering*, 44(12), 23-33.
- Skarda, C. and Reeman, W. 1990. *Chaos And The New Science Of The Brain. Concepts*. *Neuroscience Journal*, 5(1), 275-285.
- Stephen, Robbins, 2007, *Perilaku Organisasi*, Jilid 1 & 2, Alih. Bahasa :Hadyana Pujaatmaka, Jakarta: Indeks Kelompok Gramedia.
- Sutarto, 2009, *Dasar-Dasar Organisasi*. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press.
- Tetenbaum, T. 1998. *Shifting Paradigms: From Newton To Chaos*. *Organizational Dynamics*. 5(3), 2-77.
- Thompson, J. 1967. *Organizations In Action*. McGraw-hill.
- Weinberg, J. 1964. *A Short History Of Medieval Philosophy*. Princeton University Press.