

## PARADIGMS IN GUIDING MANAGEMENT APPROACHES AND THEORIES: CLASSICAL, NEOCLASSICAL, MODERN AND POSTMODERN THEORIES

Prof. Dr. Ilhan Günbayi  
Akdeniz University, Faculty of Education- TURKEY

Sath Sorm  
Akdeniz University, Faculty of Education- TURKEY

### Abstract

Dynamic human cultural evolution along with social, economic, political and technological development have required organization scientists' constant effort to formulate various approaches and theories in purpose of satisfying the demand of management realm. So does this article, its objective is to clarify the ways in which social paradigms, namely functionalist, interpretivist, radical structuralist and radical humanist paradigms, to guide the formulation of the management approaches and theories through influencing the assumptions of man in management; consequentially, under the umbrella of the four paradigms' ideologies, those assumptions generate the approaches and theories respectively. Rationally, the concept of man possesses the logical explanation on the natural motive as driving force behind human behaviour. Finally, it was observed that these paradigms guided the management approaches or theories very logically with scientific systematic procedures. Finally, as implication, these paradigms can be applied to set up the theories or approaches directly by excluding the concept of man. Broadly, these paradigms can play active philosophical roles effectively in directing in several aspects of social theories, not only management ones.

**Keywords:** Approach, man, management, paradigm, theory.

### INTRODUCTION

Social paradigms have been used for different purposes serving different benefits in social affairs depending on their consistent assumptions. Researchers have applied paradigms to guide not only researches, but also to create new research method or strategies (Gunbayi & Sorm, 2018). For sociologists, they have counted on social paradigms to illustrate social phenomena and to formulate models, theories, analytical tools and various social approaches. In management field, paradigm has also provided frameworks for the mainstream of management practice by directing management scholars, managers, decision makers, and policy makers to orient or to clarify their ideas, activities, vision, strategies, and to develop tools for doing assessment and evaluation. Historically and temporarily, management and administration discipline have been interrelated academically, and practically, have been used interchangeably. Whenever we make a historical view on the administration, the management is automatically included. Thus, the description below is the summary of public administration and management evolution.

Henry (1975) divides a nexus of development of public administration into five phases by putting a central focus on *focus* and *locus* in his analysis. The first is the stage of politics/administration dichotomy, traced back from 1900 to 1926, which expounded the separation of politics and administration. At this stage, he builds on three main achievements. Basically, he depends on Goodnow's seminal work on *Politics and Administration* in 1900. Goodnow posits that government has two primary functions: politics and administration. The former is about the policies or the expressions of the state will while the latter is dealing with the execution of those policies. Then, the recognition of the field drew much more attention among the social scientists through a report made by the Committee on Instruction in the American Political Science Association in 1914 which put special

emphasis on training citizenship and professional preparations for the government position. Gradually, it became a significant subfield of political science. Until 1920s, administration was transformed from the politic subarea into academic legacy with the publication of the *Introduction to the Study of Administration*, written by Leonard D. White in 1926.

The second phase is the principle of administration from 1927 to 1937 which was relied on a crucial book on *Principle of Public Administration*, written by F. W. Willoughby and published in 1927. It is the second main turning point of administration after White's accomplishment that pushed administration field to be more mature. The administrators' task at this stage was clearer indicated. For Henry (1975), the Public administrationists were in high demand during the 1930s and early 1940s for their managerial knowledge, courted by the locus of industry and government bureaucracy. Noticeably, public administration reached to its climax in 1937 with the publication of Luther H. Gulick and Lyndall Urwick's Papers on *the Science of Administration*. At this point, focus was favored over locus. In terms of the third stage, it is called public administration as political science from 1950 to 1970. Even though it had been endeavored to gain independent from political science, public administration was located in the same department as political science because a renewed definition of locus-the governmental bureaucracy, but corresponding loss of focus. In 1962, administration was excluded from political sciences. However, it disappeared again in 1967 due to lack of interest from political scientists.

Additionally, the fourth phase is public administration as administrative science from 1956 to 1970. Because of lack of attention from political scientists, public administrationists started finding alternative ways. Thus, administrative science was born again. However, it put most emphasises on focus by ignoring locus. At this stage, it provides techniques that need expertise and specialization, but where expertise should be deployed is not identified (Henry,1975). Fortunately, in 1960s, organization development rose rapidly as specialty of administrative science. Due to including social psychology in the study of organization development, the new generation of public administrators alter their research interest to public bureaucracies in the framework of administrative science. As implication, democratic value was considered, normative concern was further discussed, and intellectual rigor and scientific methodologies were applied. The final stage is public administration as public administration from 1970 to present. At this stage, public administration became more and more autonomous. The students enrolled in public administration increased rapidly from 1971 to 1972. Remarkably, locus increased considerably. The functional units of public administration were separated, and fast growth of school of public administration spread widely.

Regarding progression of management thoughts, in *the Evolution of Management Thought*, Wren and Bedeian (2009) claim the dynamic changes of management thought evolve around three facets of the culture because, according to them, managers are affected by their cultural environment, and the ways in which they allocate and utilize resources have shifted within the changing views about economic, social, political institutions and technology. Precisely, economic facet is the relationship between human and resources. The resources may be created by human or nature such as land, buildings, raw materials, semi-finished products, tools, and equipment or other tangible objects used by people and organizations, and social facet focuses on the relationship between people and people. These affect the ways of theoretical development. Political facet is the relation of the individuals to the state, including the legal and political arrangements for the establishment of social order and for the protection of life and property. The last is that technology is the art and applied science of making tools and equipment. Therefore, these facets are also tools for investigating the development of management thought, and show how the management idea develops.

Practically in management philosophy, the theories have developed into four phases. First, classical theories which includes scientific management of Taylorism, Bureaucracy, Fayolism. These theories hyphenise that human is passive and economic oriented, so strict control is the only solution. Second stage of development derives from the critiques of the classical ones. In order to fulfil the world of management needs, the neoclassical theories were founded under the influence the Hawthorne's

experiment which explored the work effectiveness and productivity. The results revealed that the economic incentive does not determine work productivity, but social needs is the catalyst. The third phase has been called modern theories, including system approach, career management, human resource etc. These management theories were created upon criticizing the idea of strict control and social relation as the effective strategies for improving work productivity. Based on their view, self-actualizing is the top demand for which employees necessarily work. These theories believe that, to obtain employees' loyalty and productivity, the managers should provide sufficient highest needs of human nature such as freedom and empowerment or autonomy. The last stage is post-modern theories, namely learning organization, total quality management, theory Z etc. These were built upon the assumption of complex man which assumes that man is a complex being. All human needs from the basic to the highest one are important.

The objective of the article is to clarify the ways in which social paradigms; namely functionalist, interpretivist, radical structuralist and radical humanist paradigms to guide the formulation of the management theories and approach such as classical, neo-classical, modern and post-modern management theories through directly influencing the assumptions of man in management.

Table 1: Paradigms in guiding management theories

Paradigms	Concept of Man	Management Theories	Division of Theories
Radical structuralist Functionalist	Homo economicus man	Bureaucracy Fayolism System approach (functionalist) Taylorism Theory X	Classical
Radical structuralist Functionalist	Social man	Hawthorne experiments	Neo-classical
Interpretivist Radical humanist	Self-actualizing man	Career management Human resource management Theory Y System approach (interpretivist)	Modern
Radical structuralist Functionalist Interpretivist Radical humanist	Complex	Learning organization Theory Z Total quality management	Postmodern

Generally, the paradigm frames the way in which we view the world. When any paradigmatic ideology is located in your mind, it will cause major impact upon our point of view, and alter the way we are seeing the world. This is the reason that different people look into the same thing, but see it differently. Literally, our beliefs exerts a dominant effect on our thinking of, valuing or judging something. So do functionalist, interpretive, radical structuralist paradigms, and radical humanist paradigm. If management theorist's tendency has been on the side of functionalist or radical structuralist ideology, they would prefer strict and directive control as the mean to manage or to lead the organization, for example, scientific management of Frederick W. Taylor, Fayolism and Bureaucracy of Mark Weber. However, if they are in the sides of the interpretive and radical humanist paradigms, they will be democratic in style of management. For example, Abraham Harold Maslow, Edgar Henry Schein, Eton Mayo.

Theoretically, the functionalist paradigm is in the dimension of sociology of regulation which use objectivist approach as an analytical tool that tends to be realist ontology, positivist epistemology, determinist in human nature and nomothetic methodology to analyse the status quo, social order, consensus, social integration, solidarity, need satisfaction and actuality of social affair (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, Sorm & Gunbayi, 2016). It is a perspective which is highly pragmatic in orientation,

concerned to understand society in a way which generates knowledge which can be put to use. It is often a problem-orientated approach, concerning with practical solutions to practical problems. It is usually firmly committed to a philosophy of social engineering as a basis of social change and emphasizes the importance of understanding order, equilibrium and stability in society and the way in which these can be maintained. Shortly, it puts central focus upon the concrete regulation and control of social affairs.

In terms of radical structuralist or radical functionalist paradigm, it applies the same approach to the functionalist's, but practically, gives the rational explanation on radical change, emancipation, and potentiality, in its analysis focusing on structural conflict, modes of domination, contradiction and deprivation. The radical structuralist paradigm's frame of reference lays emphasis upon the changes of structural relationship in realistic social world. This radical change transform the very nature of contemporary society, and they provide explanations upon the interrelationship in social formation. To examine the causes leading to radically changing, some radical structuralist theorists have utilized the power relation analysis as a tool to illustrate the radical changes while others underscore the deep-seated internal contradictions as a mean to change. However, commonly, they applied political conflict and economic crisis as lens to explain the transformation of existing social arrangement (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, Sorm & Gunbayi, 2016).

The interpretive paradigm is a social regulation philosophy, using subjective approach as an analytical lens. The subject area of analysis is stressed upon the same to those of functionalist paradigm, namely the status quo, social order, consensus, social integration and cohesion, solidarity and actuality that intends to be nominalist, anti-positivist, voluntarist and ideographic. Its assumption is that, to understand the world, we must be aware of the fundamental nature of social world at the level of subjective experience. It provides rational explanation on the realm of individual consciousness and subjectivity or intersubjectivity, seeing the social world as emergent social process, created by the individuals concerned, and the world of human affair is cohesive, ordered, and integrated. To find social reality, we should scrutinize in-depth of human consciousness and subjectivity in order to seek for the fundamental meanings that underscore in social life (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, Sorm & Gunbayi, 2016).

In respect of the radical humanist paradigm, it is in the dimension of radical change which lays emphasises upon radical change, modes of domination, emancipation, deprivation and potentiality. It uses the same approaches to those of the interpretive paradigm that become nominalist, anti-positivist, voluntarist and ideographic. The humanist paradigm's frame of reference beholds the society to be transformed the limitation of existing social arrangement, concerning with release from the constraints within which are existing social arrangements place upon human development. Its entire assumption is based on the premise that there will be revolution or transformation through consciousness that is the means through which society will change with people throwing off the chains of psychic oppression which ties them into alienating modes of life. It is a belief in the ability to change society through changing consciousness by changing the way people think, see, and understand of the world. It tries to bring about a new world view, a new paradigm which allows people individually in conjunction with others to reorganize their experiences (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, Sorm & Gunbayi, 2016).

Strategically, based on Burrell and Morgan (1979), applying the four paradigms to guide the management theories is a powerful method for scientific practice in not only management field, but also in most of social sciences' approaches. There are systematic procedures for utilizing them in this matter. Firstly, we should be clear about the objectives we intend to explain the phenomena or to guide the practitioners. About what do we want to explain or which direction we want to lead the practitioners? These subject concerns can be divided into two main categories, sociology of regulation and radical change. The former expounds the status quo, social order, consensus, social integration and cohesion, need satisfaction, solidarity and actuality whereas the latter can be radical change, structural conflict, modes of domination, contradiction, emancipation, deprivation and potentiality.

Secondly, we should examine the approaches with which we attempt to employ, subjectivist or objectivist. If we use subjectivist approach, we should look more in-depth. Do we use nominalist ontology, anti-positivist epistemology, voluntarist as the assumption of human nature and ideographic methodology? In contrary, if they deploy objectivist approach. Do they use realist ontology, positivist epistemology, determinist assumption of human nature and nomothetic methodology?

### **Homo Economicus Man in Guiding Classical Theories**

The view of man in management is not a new concept in organizational science. It has been hotly debated by many social scientists, psychologists and theologians for many decades. For Karl Marx, man is not a blank sheet by nature, but a recognizable and ascertainable existence, and can be defined not only biologically, anatomically and physiologically, but also psychologically; furthermore, he adds the man can survive as long as he is productive, but he is dead if he is not productive (Fromm, 2004). Based on him, man can be studied and be understandable, so he can be led, and be trained skills to be more productive. There are many models explaining about the nature of human being. In management science, the concept of man was under the significant influence of three hypotheses; namely, the rabble or economic man, social man and complex man hypothesis (Dayal, 1981). In addition, one more model, called self-actualizing man, was built upon the self-actualized assumption of Goldstein (1995). Rabble hypothesis has been used synonymously with homo economicus or (rational) economic, tool or machine man which assists us to explore more deep aspect of man analysis in organization. Definitely, based on David Ricardo, Dayal (1981) views that the main features of raddle hypothesis rests originally on two assumptions about nature of man. Firstly, the man is unorganized and works primarily for his self-interest. Secondly, providing him adequate incentive, he could do what the manager wants him to do.

Thus, based on Rabble hypothesis, the man is idle in nature. He needs something done for him, and is passive for his activities which cannot make choice by himself. As Schein view homo economicus man as being lazy, passive and unwilling to take responsibilities (Dzimbiri, 2009). Similarly, Agarwal (1982) also mentions the theoretical foundations of rational-economic man as follows:

- Economic gain is the primary source of man motivation. So, he does everything in order to maximize it.
- The man is passive to be manipulate and controlled by the organization because the organization controls the economy.
- The man has irrational feelings.

Drawing from the assumptions above, Beenerjee (1995) establishes implications for organization management design:

- Organization design should be aimed at neutralizing and controlling man's irrational feelings by inputting economic incentive and other benefits.
- The system of authority for rewards and penalties should be created.
- The employees are expected to obey the holders of position power.
- Job should be designed in terms of efficiency and economy.
- Incentive budget should be planned.
- To promote productivity, individual bonus should be included.

In management context, the work of workmen have to be arranged to serve the goals of the organization either by coercion or extra incentive. His work should be planned and directed by management superiors, and the tasks should be guided by a clear instruction, describing the roles and responsibilities he will conduct (Dayal, 1981). Whenever he accomplishes his job well, he shall receive additional generous bonus.

Philosophically, the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms affects perspective of homo economicus man which paves the way for stimulating various classical management theories. More

specifically, the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigm work as a strong philosophical background leading our standpoint on the assumptions of human nature while homo economicus plays a key role as a platform for orienting the theories of management. This platform allows the management theorists to formulate various classical management such as Taylorism, Fayolism and Bureaucracy. For detail example, the most undeniable one is Taylorism created by Frederick W. Taylor in purpose of maximizing efficiency and worker productivity through balancing employees' and employer's interest. That is the objective of management. Connecting to homo economicus view, Taylor (1998) clarifies:

*The principal object of management should be to secure the maximum prosperity For the employers, couple with the maximum prosperity for employee....Throughout the industrial world, a large part of the organization of the employers, as well as employees is the war rather than the peace, and that perhaps the majority of either side do not believe that it is possible so to arrange their mutual relation that their interest become identical. ...scientific management, on the contrary, has for its very foundation the firm conviction that the true interests of the two are one and the same; prosperity of employer cannot exist through a long term of year unless it is accompanied by prosperity for the employee and vice versa; that is possible to give the workmen what he most wants-high wages-and the employer what he wants-a low labor cost for his manufactures... (p,1 )*

To reach the goal, after his observation on a proper day's work in steel industry, he realized that by matching men, tools and the tasks they were required to perform, it was possible to increase productivity without putting physical burdens upon the workmen. Instead, it should be set up a systematic structure of management in which comprises of four principles that do not only help the firms to increase productivity, but also to avoid conflict interest. Furthermore, he confirmed that all kinds of every kind of man activities can be applied by scientific methods, particularly objectivist approach to examine daily work, even in a big cooperation (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). That seems consistent with functionalist and radical structuralist which rely on objectivist approach to view the world reality, and concrete and strict control. Lunenburg & Ornstein (2011) summarize the four principles from Taylorism as follows:

- Scientific job analysis: through observation, and careful measurement, management determines the "one best way" of performing each job analysis replaces method.
- Selection of personnel: once the job is analyzed, the next step is to scientifically select and then train, teach, and develop workers.
- Management cooperation: Managers should cooperate with workers to engage that all work being done is in accordance with the principles of the science that has been developed.
- Functional supervising: the managers should plan, organize, and make decision the activities whereas workers perform their job.

This practical principles as well as other classical theories such as Fayolism and Weberism creates a structural system in organization which using functional paradigm or radical structuralist paradigm as a foundation. As Burrell & Morgan (1979) assert:

*The theories of Taylor, Fayol and the classical management school as a whole are founded upon assumptions which characterize the most objectivist region of the functionalist paradigm. The world of organizations is treated as if it were the world of natural phenomena, characterized by a hard concrete reality which can be systematically investigated in a way which reveals its underlying regularities. Above all else it is a world of cause and effect; the task of the management theorist is seen as the identification of the fundamental laws which characterize its day-to-day operation. Given this overall view, the individual is assigned an essentially passive and responding role; the individual and his behaviour at work is seen as being determined by the situation to which he is exposed. From this, the golden rule of scientific management emerges: Get the situation right, and the appropriate human behaviour and organizational performance will follow, (p. 127).*

Therefore, Taylor saw economic man as instrument oriented to work who consider economic incentive as the centred catalyst for motivating them to perform his or her tasks. Technically, they should be led by autocratic or authoritarian leaders because they need telling, directing, and some circumstances, coercing. In similar way, Fayolism, Bureaucracy, system approach and theory X are in form to those of Taylorism.

### **Social Man in Guiding Neo-Classical Theories**

Beyond self-interest oriented doctrine of human nature, Elton Mayo, based on his and Roethlisberger's experiment in the Hawthorne plant of Western Electric (1927-1933), assume that economic benefits is not the motive that employees desire, and it is not an effective mean for employers for promoting work productivity, but social satisfaction is. It is in line with Aristotle's perception of human nature, man is a social animal who seeks to make companionship with others. Beneficially, as Forsyth (2010) argues we study about group because it helps us improving productivity in a factory, problem solving in a boardroom, or learning in the classroom. It is a key to many societal problems as racism, sexism, and international conflict. On the other hand, group explain us about the people's feeling and behaviour as well. Specifically, good relationship among colleagues and with their leaders is proofed by plenty of researches and literatures for efficiency and effectiveness. The same as found in Mayo researches.

After the three Hawthorne researches, namely the illumination experiment from 1924 to 1927, a series of experiments (the first Relay Assembly Test Room from April 1927 to February 1933 and the second Relay Assembly Test Room from August 1928 to March 1929), and the Mica Splitting Test Room from October 1928 to September 1930) and the Bank Wiring Observation Room from November 1931 to May 1932). Separately, first experiment showed that the light did not contribute to the work productivity, but special attention to them does. The second experiment revealed that the employees respond to the improve style of supervision. They got more work satisfaction by feeling more valued and responsible for his or her performance belonging to the teams. Thus, social cohesiveness and self-esteem of workers was more important for performance than the improvement of the working environment. The third experiment proofed that economic interest is not the reason for them to work productively (Naidu, 1996). Therefore, social relation makes the workers' attitude confident and candid. They developed a sense of participation and become more socially unified. They developed a positive attitude rapidly towards management. The output increased that make supervision revolutionized, improving wholehearted cooperation with management. The workers are easy to be transformed into an enthusiastic team that promote higher productivity regardless physical or economic condition (Handel, 2003).

The Hawthorne experiment gave birth to "social man". It is based on the assumptions bellows:

- Man is primarily motivated by social needs and get a sense of identity through relationship with others.
- As a result of division of work and rationalization, meaning has gone out of works, therefore, satisfaction is sought in social relations on the job.
- Man is more interested in the social forces of peer group than in the incentives and controls of management.
- Man is responsive to management to the extent that a supervisor can meet a subordinate's social needs and needs acceptance by his fellow workers (Reddy, 2004; Naidu, 1996; Beenerjee, 1995; Agarwal, 1982).

Relying on assumptions above, it can be drawn the principles for effectively managing or leading social man. Firstly, the manager should employees' social need rather than output. Secondly, the manager should be concerned with people's feelings about their belongingness. Thirdly, group work and individual interaction should be motivated, and organizational structure should be designed democratically and opened so that the employees can freely interact with each other. Then, employee's behaviour should be analysed and motivated in the form of groups and not on individual

basis. Fourthly, the manager or leader should work as an initiator, a facilitator, a helper or a supporter rather than a controller, a director or a commander.

The functionalist paradigm shaped Mayor's and his colleagues' view on experiments in four main ways from two main features of the paradigm, Parato and Durkheim. First, he applied system approach to organization condition as theoretical model to seek social relation among workers in the factory as a mean to boost productivity because they saw workplace is the socialization area, composing of different people from different artefacts or backgrounds, which create a system of various interdependent parts. That socialization relies upon the interactions amongst the workers and between their superiors and themselves (NWE, 2017). It is consistent with the paradigm's point of view upon the society as combination of interrelated individuals that, originally, this assumption was from interactionism. Evidently, Mayor (1933) views in his *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization: The Early Sociology of Management and Organization* that:

*Human collaboration in work, in primitive and developed societies, has always depended for its perpetuation upon the evolution of a non-logical social code which regulates the relations between persons and their attitudes to one another. Insistence upon a merely economic logic of production interferes with the development of such a code and consequently gives rise in the group to a sense of human defeat. This human defeat results in the formation of a social code at a lower level and in opposition to the economic logic. One of its symptoms is "restriction."—especially if the logic is frequently changed— interferes with the development of such a code and consequently gives rise in the group to a sense of human defeat. This human defeat results in the formation of a social code at a lower level and in opposition to the economic logic. One of its symptoms is "restriction."* (p.115).

Second, they adopted the realist objectivist approach as a lens of analysis to seek the social reality in their experiments. Practically, by investigating and interviewing, they did not modify or manipulate any interpretation by their own subjective bias. It agrees with the functionalist central position that social reality exists outside the man's consciousness (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). Third, under the influence of Pareto, they believed that social system should be maintained equilibrium; if it is disturbed, forces should be used to restore it (Hassard, 1993). They kept employees' personal equilibrium at work place between economic interest and psychological satisfaction and equilibrium between technical organization and employees' social satisfaction. Fourth, under the influence of Durkheim which values the relations between the individual and society, and the relation of the individual personality to social solidarity (Burrell & Morgan, 1979), they remarked that social norm is the main factors, which might bring a group consensus or unity of their social relation that might influence their efforts to reach the organizational goal.

Because their studies are experiments, the radical structuralist paradigm also cover the objective level of Mayor's and his colleagues' view about the changes in their studies' process and expected results. In the process, there is a change in experimental structure from the top to the bottom (from experimenter or the researcher to the participants). That's is a change of the preconditions which is represented by one or more independent variables, also referred to as input variables or predictor variables. Generally, the change in one or more independent variables become result (Gunbayi & Sorm, 2018). In Hawthorne studies, during experiments, they change many times. For example, in the relay-assembly experiments, they changed the breaking time by giving two five-minute breaks (after a discussion with them on the best length of time), and then changing to two ten-minute breaks (not their preference) etc. In illumination experiment, they changed the light intensity. Most of all, they found socialization would bring different outcomes out of the strict rule of management, scientific management.

### **Self-Actualizing Man in Guiding Modern Theories**

With regard to self-actualization man, it is an updated new version of social man with the tenet that he needs to find significance for his achievement in accordance with the top Maslow's hierarchical needs. Definitely, it refers to man's desire for self-fulfilment, namely, to the tendency for him to be in



what his potential deserves. In other words, self-actualization man possesses a desire to become more and more what one idiosyncratically is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming (Maslow, 1970). As described by Craighead & Nemeroff (2001), what self-actualizing man perceives is a possibility, he tends to consider as a necessity. He tries to be exceptional rather than normal. When he satisfies, he can be regarded as self-actualizing. Furthermore, self-actualizing man have a tendency of helping other people; they are kind and less self-conscious. He has closer interpersonal relationship, especially with the people who have similar tastes and personalities. In respect to governance tendency, he strongly believes in democratic principles, however, keeping highly discriminating in his friendship. Additionally, the self-actualizing man is more creative than non-self-actualizing man. Self-actualizing man is a very good perceiver of reality and truth, and also that they were generally unconfused about right and wrong, and made ethical decisions more quickly and more surely than average people. He keenly wishes to do for the behalf of ultimate, final values, which is for the sake of principles which seem intrinsically worthwhile. He strongly protects and loves these values, in any case that the value is threatened, they will be aroused to indignation action, and often self-sacrifice (Maslow, 1970 Maslow, Stephens, Heil, 1998).

Moreover, the self-actualized man inherently needs to applied his knowledges, capacity and skills that he has possessed so that he feels he can do something significant; It is contrast to the formal organization which blocks the man potential by strict rules of bureaucracy and incentive (Reddy, 2004). Knowingly, the self-actualizing man assumes that as long as the low needs such as physiological, safety and esteem needs have been met, the next higher level of self-actualization of human demand will be dominant on his behaviour and must be explored and completed in order that he may find social meanings and psychological fulfilment. Moreover, his natural tendency is to direct and control himself by realizing his own needs and the demand of organization (Beenerjee, 1995). Self-actualization man needs autotomizing and independence, so for management implication, the organization should give him opportunities to take risks for better significance exploration of work creativity and maturity.

Therefore, to lead self-actualization man effectively, democratic environment should be designed in organization widely, and power delegation as mean of an effective management should be delivered. According to Maslow (1970), self-actualization man cannot satisfy with basic needs, but with meta motivation from meta needs. The meta needs are wholeness (unity), perfection (balance and harmony), completion (ending), justice(fairness), richness (complexity), simplicity(essence), liveliness (spontaneity), beauty (rightness of form), goodness (benevolence), uniqueness (individuality), playfulness (ease), truth (reality), autonomy(self-sufficiency) and meaningfulness(values) (Coon & Mitterer, 2009). Thus, the manager should adhere to the following characteristics:

1. Has warmth, closeness, and sympathy.
2. Recognizes and shares negative information and feelings.
3. Exhibits trust, openness, and candour.
4. Does not achieve goals by power, deception, or manipulation.
5. Does not project own feelings, motivations, or blame onto others.
6. Does not limit horizons; uses and develops body, mind, and senses.
7. Is not rationalistic; can think in unconventional ways.
8. Is not conforming; regulates behaviour from within (Cherry, 1976).

Paradigmatically, where does the concept of self-actualizing man come from? Maslow is a humanistic psychologist in which humanistic ideology dominates his view of the studies about human work behaviour. Humanists see every man is good in nature, and has unlimited potential. Additionally, it assumes that human being loves autonomy, dignity, and freedom. That is consistent with interpretivists and radical humanists who views the human behaviour as unpredicted one; they respond to the same thing in different ways (Wang, Brain, Hope & Hansman, 2017).

When we examine the implied philosophical frame of references in the actualization man, we have seen that the interpretive paradigm and radical human paradigm have served as active agents in supporting such a concept of man. There are three reasons in which Maslow applied interpretivist and radical humanist paradigm to develop the concept of self-actualizing man. Firstly, Maslow used subjectivist approach of interpretivist and radical humanist paradigms to seek for the reality of human nature. More specifically, he is a voluntarist who emphasizes that the essence of self-actualization is autonomous and free-willed, which is in line with voluntarist assumptions, arguing man is definitely autonomous and free-willed in nature (Lindsay, 1918). Energetically, such a man's will can shape the organization evolution. As Wundt the father of voluntarist psychology conceived of the development of the will in regressive direction, at the same time, when the will grows more advanced and becomes complex forms of social life, it extends outward. Thus, this cycle of voluntary action orients him to automatic movement (Araujo, 2016). Secondly, epistemologically, the self-actualizing man of Maslow is underpinned by anti-positivist philosophy which holds the position that, in order to understand the human affair, we should understand the subjective world of human experiences, understanding from the inside rather than the outside. On the other hand, respect to the social world, it is essentially relativistic and can only be understood from the point of view of the individuals who are directly involved in the activities which are to be studied (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). Thirdly, methodologically, Maslow was on the side of ideographic dominance because he used naturalistic observation approach as a tool for collecting information or formulate the idea in setting up the hierarchy of human needs.

More evidently, the most influential feature of the radical humanist paradigm in guiding self-actualizing man is Karl Mark. For him, the emancipation of human consciousness is the key for self-actualization creation; in contrast, economic interest is not the ideal need, but the need in spiritual level that leads to psychic motivation is. So, the man could emancipate to overthrow the psychic domination and social oppression via building his capacity. As Fromm (2004) argues, *...the very aim of Marx is to liberate man from the pressure of economic needs, so that he can be fully human; that Marx is primarily concerned with the emancipation of man as an individual, the overcoming of alienation, the restoration of his capacity to relate himself fully to man and to nature; that Marx's philosophy constitutes a spiritual existentialism in secular language and because of this spiritual quality is opposed to the materialistic practice and thinly disguised materialistic philosophy of our age* (p.3).

Karl Mark, additionally, believes that man is the production of history, which created by man himself via developing himself; then, he transforms himself. History is the history of man's self-actualization; that is nothing but the self-creation of man through the process of his work and his production (Fromm, 2004). Thus, human history had created by self-realization man.

Practically, whenever we are aware of the nature of self-actualization man, we are able to select suitable management strategies or theories to administer organization effectively, especially human management, and this concept helps the theorists to stimulate or formulate many management theories or approaches. One of which is career management. The career model presently changes from organization activity into an individual process of self-responsibility by exploring his or her career opportunities, sets career goals, develops strategies, and searches for a relevant definition from time to time (Greenhaus, Callanan & Godshalk., 2010; Smelser & Baltes, 2001). The career annotation implied subjective meaning that is the employment-related experiences (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2006). Definitely, borrowing the concept of career development from Hiebert Worgen, & Schober (2010), career management can be defined as a life-long process of managing learning, work, and transitions in order to move toward a personally determined and evolving preferred future. This view has been embedded by the career anchors that more exactly and explicitly originated from the self-actualizing man. In his longitudinal study, Schein (2006) formulates career anchors in eight categories: autonomy/independence, security/stability, technical/functional competence, general management competency, entrepreneurial creativity, lifestyle, service/dedication to a cause and pure challenge. Therefore, this approach's overall objective focuses man's self-development from high level of human need to the highest one in accordance with Maslow's theory to explore self-actualization.

Besides the theory above, self-actualizing man also functions as a backbone of human resource management approach since, based on the overall goal of human resource management, one is the people management at which aims maximize employees' work productivity through training and fulfilling their need from the basic to the ultimate goal of employees' satisfaction, self-actualization. More particularly starting with the responsibilities of human resource manager, it is depicted as the process of recruiting, selecting, inducting employees, providing orientation, imparting training and development, appraising the performance of employees, deciding compensation and providing benefits, motivating employees, maintaining proper relations with employees and their trade unions, ensuring employees safety, welfare and health measures in compliance with labour laws of the land (Arthur, 2006). Philosophically, the objectives and roles of this approach exhibit the idea behind the creation of human resource management that theorist believes the only way to motivate employees to be honest, to get training and to optimize all their potential to meet the organizational expectation is to make them happy via fulfilling the peak of their needs because, according to Maslow et al. (1998) on self-actualizing man, the ideal work's attitude might be under the most favourable circumstances. These integrate the man's work into an individual's definition of life or self-identity and become psychotherapeutic and psychagogic (makes the individual grow well to be a self-actualizing man); then, it improves industry.

Theory Y is also guided by self-actualizing man because, relying on McGregor, man is willing to work and likes their responsibilities, freedom and participation. More importantly, they, in essence, are sufficiently capable of self-control, self-direction and creative. If the manager can provide them the opportunity to fulfil his esteem and self-actualization need. They will exhibit his potential by conducting his duties as the organization expected with inspiration and high performance (Schermerhorn, 2011).

System approach are underpinned by self-actualizing man as well. Remarkably, there are two kinds of system approach, the interpretivist and functionalist system approach. The former has been known as "soft system thinking" which concerns about human being such as perception, value, belief and interest rather than technology, structure or organization as the latter does (Jackson, 2002). In other dimension, both of them have emancipatory characteristics that can be radical structuralist or radical humanist. In line with concept of man, the interpretivist system approach is under the umbrella of the complex man while the functionalist system approach is under the coverage of homo economicus man.

### **Complex Man in Guiding Postmodern Theories**

Homo economicus, social and self-actualizing man are just simplistic and generalized assumptions of specific human nature. They provide us straightforward explanation on man behaviour and methods to manage employees, depending upon particular needs level in particular conditions. However, because fast and constant social change towards more and more complex which is a catalyst for transforming man's work behaviour from simple to complex one, the man's management attitude become more diverse and unpredictable. To respond to such a complexity, an adaptable and flexible model was formulated. Complex man depends upon the preposition that human being is under the influences of the unpredictable complex variables which determine human behaviour, and his needs can be ranked hierarchically, but not universally (Reddy, 2004). Distinctive from other men, complex man does not focus on any specific need since he covers all human needs. Originally founded by Schein (1965), its thesis is that man is naturally multiplex and varied, and their behaviour changes at any time in any given situation. The needs are different individually in the organization. Relying on him, some people are fulfilled by basic needs and others' demand goes to high level. More perplexedly, the same person's needs may change over the time and circumstances accordingly because the man's motive is not fixed and immovable. As a result, motivation also varies; the manager should understand such as complexity and be flexible in applying his approaches. One-size-fits-all is not applicable (Tyson, 2015; Dzimbiri, 2009; Furnham, 2005).

Backed by the interpretive and radical humanist paradigm, Schein views the human nature is complex in the level subjectivist standpoint. Edgar Schein was influenced by the writing of Abraham Maslow (Pierson, Bugental & Schneider, 2001). He is also a humanist, who used anti positivist epistemology which views the social world as being relativistic and being understood only from the standpoint of individuals who participate directly in activities studied (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). Like complex man, the interpretivist paradigm hold the premise that social world of the man is complex; to understand the man we should examine in-depth the meaning, experiences or behavior of individuals within particular social contexts (Markula & Silk, 2011).

The radical humanist paradigm participates in advocating the complex man building as well since, based on complex man, human needs and behavior always change in accordance with distinct settings. As Schein (2004) convincingly argues:

*...human nature is complex and malleable that one cannot make a universal statement about human nature; instead, one must be prepared for human variability. Such variability will reflect (1) changes in the life cycle in that motives may change and grow as we mature and (2) changes in social conditions in that we are capable of learning new motives as may be required by new situations (p.173).*

Therefore, an individual's demands possess the natural potentiality and emancipation of change in their opinion on work and satisfaction. It is consistent with the radical humanist paradigm which considers potentiality and emancipation as the cause of transformation in the subjective level because when man sustains his life through works, and communication; phenomenologically, responsibilities and autonomy interest causes emancipatory cognitive interest which creates self-reflection for self-formative process, and such a self-reflection changes a life (Habermas, 1971). Shortly, complex man does include the assumption of self-actualizing man as its component as well.

On the other hand, the functionalist and radical humanist paradigms contribute to build complex man either since the assumptions of complex man partly put focus on the importance of basic needs. These attributes affect the way in which the theorists view the characteristics of man. Such an opinion orients the theorists themselves to develop new management theories, and leaders to choose leadership approaches in organization operation. Overall, paradigmatically, complex man is gotten the influence of the functionalist and the radical structuralist paradigm in the same mode of homo economicus man and social man receive because complex man is the combination of all concepts of previous men.

Practically, learning organization theory is supported by complex man because, based upon it, the organization should endeavor to provide all needs which the employees should receive so that they are happy to develop their skills and capacity. These, all of individuals' and organizational needs, should be kept equilibrium (Marquardt, 2002). Ingredients of learning organization consists of five components (Senge, 1990). Personal mastery is the discipline of continually clarifying and deepening our personal vision, of focusing our energies, of developing patience, and of seeing reality objectively while mental models are the abilities to unearth our internal pictures of the world, to scrutinize them, and to make them open to the influence of others. Thirdly, team learning is the capacity to think together which is gained by mastering the practice of dialogue and discussion. As Marquardt (2002) defines individual learning as the changes in skills, insights, knowledge, attitudes, and values acquired through self-study, technology based instruction, and observation whereas group learning covers the increase in knowledge, skills, and competencies accomplished by and within groups, and organizational learning represents the enhanced intellectual and productive capability gained through commitment to and opportunities for continuous improvement across the organization. Fourthly, systems thinking is the discipline that integrates the others, fusing them into a coherent body of theory and practice. In essence, it values the flexibility and agility in response to the changing environment. Finally, building shared vision is the practice of unearthing shared pictures of the future that foster genuine commitment (Fulmer & Keys, 1998). So, since learning organization is under the

influence of complex man, its assumptions are also similar to interpretivist and radical humanist paradigms in the sense that it lays emphasis on maintaining equilibrium between organization's and individuals' needs and the transformational process of human development. Moreover, the functionalist and the radical structuralist are embedded in the theory either because the company should provide the employees the basic needs as a force so that they are willing to improve capacity. However, the interpretivist and radical humanist are more dominant than the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms in the theory.

Looking from macro view of total quality management coverage rather than the process in the mechanic management system, we have seen that it is dominated by the shadow of complex man as well since, regarding customer satisfaction as the ultimate goal, Joseph M. Juran refers to it as the set of management processes and systems that create delighted customers through empowered employees leading to higher venue and higher cost (Ross, 1999). According to Deming (2018), total quality management comprises of fourteen principles within which most of those emphasize on human needs from the basic to the highest one. For instance, first principle is that the organization should create constancy of purpose for continual improvement of products and service which use resources for innovative idea, for education and research, and consistently improve designing product and service for customer satisfaction, for better life of the people and for market position while the second principle focuses on adopting of new philosophy about a commitment to quality, eliminating obstacle and fulfilling employee's needs as a mean for survival and global competitiveness. Other principle is to train the employees new skills for achieving the quality of their job, and the organization should get rid of fear by creating an opened environment for employees to ask questions or to express their opinion because Deming (2018) believes that open communication and coordination based on the common goal improve quality and productivity; additionally, employees should be motivated, encouraged and rewarded for achievement.

Developed by William Ouchi, theory Z is the extension of theory X and Y, which is based upon the synthesis of American individualism and Japanese collectivism. Theory Z is a humanistic approach in management that emphasizes homogeneity of cultures, beliefs and human interest that is called clan culture, valuing the importance of social relation among members to accomplish congruence of individuals and group goal. This concern contributes crucially to the long-term commitment of the organization. Not only focusing on humanistic view, theory Z also maintains some components of bureaucracy characteristics: formal authority relations, performance evaluation, and work specialization (Mehta, 2009). Therefore, theory Z is directed by complex man since it takes care of all aspects of employees' life, both low and higher human needs, including family life as the necessary elements man cannot live or work without (Fiore, 2004). Totally, theory Z was built upon the assumptions of complex man, too. Theoretically, it is very clear that the indirect influences of the synthesis of four paradigms' ideology are occupying in-depth the path through which the theory works because the theory is humanistic in nature and strict rules of classically technical approach in managing process.

All in all, Maslow's hierarchical needs plays central roles in creating theories because of their rational explanation on the natural motive as driving force behind human behaviour. Management theorists, who are basic need oriented, are more likely to be on authoritarian tendency which prefers strict and coercive to democratic approaches in management as high need oriented ones. Furthermore, those who are on the side of complex man are mixed and more flexible in management approaches. Those have been regarded as postmodern theories.

## CONCLUSION

Consequentially, the four paradigms do not act as four dynamic lenses of social analysis only, but also as powerful theoretical frameworks for directing management theory or approach formulation. A long the way of developing theories, it was founded in this article that the paradigms influences the theorists or practitioners indirectly and concept of man directly.

Those man assumptions direct their views on man nature; as result that nature allows them to find proper methods to design practical approaches. In addition to the effect of the paradigms, based on their assumptions of social regulation and radical change and their approaches, subjectivist and objectivist, we have seen the paradigms are able to guide the theory directly by excluding the concept of man in the formulation of the theory process.

### BIODATA AND CONTACT ADDRESSES OF AUTHORS



He completed his BA studies on English Language Teaching, MA on Educational Administration and Supervision, PhD. on Educational Administration, Supervision, Planning and Economy in Hacettepe University in Turkey and Post Doctorate Study on Qualitative Research Methods in Sheffield Hallam University in the UK. He has been working as a Professor Doctor at Akdeniz University, Faculty of Education, Educational Sciences Department since 2003. He is scholarly interested in qualitative research methods, organizational communication, organizational culture and climate, motivation at work, job stressors and school leadership, vocational education and training linked to employment issues and national development particularly in Turkey but also in Central/Western Asia and Europe.

Prof. Dr. Ilhan Günbayi  
Akdeniz University  
Faculty of Education  
Educational Sciences Department  
Antalya- TURKEY  
E. Mail: [igunbayi@akdeniz.edu.tr](mailto:igunbayi@akdeniz.edu.tr)



He completed his BA studies on English Language Teaching in Asia Euro University in Cambodia and his MA on Educational Economics and Management in Northeast Normal University in China. He is currently a PhD. student at Akdeniz University Educational Sciences Institute Department of Educational Sciences and Educational Administration and Supervision Program in Antalya in Turkey. He is scholarly interested in social paradigms and school leadership.

Sath Sorm (Ph.D. Student)  
Akdeniz University  
Faculty of Education  
Educational Sciences Department  
Kampus 07058 Konyaalti,  
Antalya- TURKEY  
E. Mail: [sorm\\_sath@hotmail.com](mailto:sorm_sath@hotmail.com)

### REFERENCES

- Agarwal, R, D. (1982). *Organization and management*. The McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Araujo, S.D.F. (2016). *Wundt and the philosophical foundations of psychology*. A reappraisal. Springer.
- Arthur, D. (2006). *Recruiting, interviewing, selecting & orienting new employees*. Associates

Management Consultants, Ltd.

Benerjee, M. (1995). *Organization behavior*. Allied Publishers Limited.

Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis: elements of the sociology of corporate life*. Heinemann Educational Books Inc.

Cherry, G.W. (1976). The serendipity of the fully functioning manager. *Sloan Management Review*, 17, 3, 69-82.

Coon, D & Mitterer, J.O. (2009). *Introduction to psychology: gateways to mind and behavior*. Cengage.

Craighead, W.E & Nemeroff, C. B. (2001). *The Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology and Behavioral Science*, Volume 4. John Wiley & Sons

Dayal, I. (1981). Concept of man in management. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (16) 22. 81-86

Deming, W.E. (2018). *Out of the crisis*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dzimhiri, L.B. (2009). *Organisation and management theories: An African focus: integrating structure, people, processes and the environment for human happiness*. Cuvillier Verlag.

Fiore, D.J (2004). *Introduction to educational administration: standards, theories, and practice*. Eye on Education, Inc.

Forsyth, D.R. (2010). *Group dynamics*. Wadsworth.

Fromm, E. (2004). *Marx's concept of man*. Continuum.

Fulmer, R. M. & Keys, J. B. (1998). A conversation with Peter Senge: New developments in organizational learning. *Organizational Dynamics*, 27 (2), 33-42.

Furnham, A. (2005). *The psychology of behavior at work: The individual in the organization*. Psychology Press.

Goldstein, K. (1995). *The organism: A holistic approach to biology derived from pathological data in man*. Urzone, Inc.

Greenhaus, J.H; Callanan, G. A & Godshalk, M.V. (2010). *Career management*. Sage Publication Inc.

Gunbayi, I. & Sorm, S. (2018). Social paradigms in guiding social research design: The functional, interpretive, radical humanist and radical structuralist paradigms. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*. 9, 2, 57-76.

Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and Human Interests*. Beacon Press.

Handel, M.J (2003). *The sociology of organizations: Classic, contemporary, and critical readings*. Sage Publication Inc.

Hassard, J. (1993). *Sociology and organization theory: Positivism, paradigms and postmodernity*. Cambridge University Press.

Henry, N. (1975). Paradigms of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 35 (4), 378-386.

- Hiebert, B., Worgen, W. & Schober, K. (2010). *Career development: the role of guidance and counselling in fostering an increased range of educational and career alternatives*. Retrieved on 28.12.2018 from [https://unevoc.unesco.org/up/Career\\_Development.pdf](https://unevoc.unesco.org/up/Career_Development.pdf)
- Jackson, M.C. (2002). *Systems approaches to management*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Lindsay, J. (1918). Voluntarism and realism in medieval ethics. *Oxford Journals*, 28, 3, 433-455.
- Lunenburg F.C. & Ornstein, A.C. (2011). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices*. Cengage Learning.
- Markula, P. & Silk, M. (2011). *Qualitative research for physical culture*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Marquardt, M. J. (2002). *Building the learning organization*. Davies-Black Publishing.
- Maslow, A.H.; Stephens, D.C. & Heil, G. (1998). *Maslow on management*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Mayor, E. (1933). *The human problems of an industrial civilization: The early sociology of management and organization*. Macmillan Company.
- Mehta, A. (2009). *Organization development: principles, process & performance*. Global India Publication Pvt Ltd.
- Naidu, S. P (1996). *Public administration: concepts and theories*. New Age International (P) Ltd.
- NEW (New World Encyclopedia) (2017). *Hawthorne effect*. Retrieved on 28.12.2018 from [http://www.Newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Hawthorne\\_effect#History\\_of\\_the\\_Hawthorne\\_Experiments](http://www.Newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Hawthorne_effect#History_of_the_Hawthorne_Experiments).
- Pierson, J.F, Bugental, J.F.T., & Schneider, K.J. (2001). *The handbook of humanistic. Psychology: Leading edges in theory, research and practice*. Sage Publication, Inc.
- Reddy, R. J. (2004). *Organizational behavior*. APH Publishing Corporation.
- Roethlisberger, F.J & Dickson, W.J. (1939). *Management and the worker*. In Thomson, K. (2003). *The Early Sociology of Management and Organizations*. Routledge: Taylor and Francie Group.
- Ross, J.E (1999). *Total quality management: Text, cases, and readings*. CRC Press LLC.
- Schein, E, H. (2006). *Career anchors: Participant workbook*. John Wiley & Sons. Inc.
- Schein, E.H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Schein, E. H. (1965). *Organizational psychology*. N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Schreuder, A.M.J & Coetzee, M. (2006). *Careers: An organizational perspective*. Junta & Co. Ltd.
- Schermerhorn, J. J. R. (2011). *Management*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Senge, P.M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization*. Currency Doubleday.



Smelser, N.& Baltes, P. (2001). *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences*. Elsevier.

Sorm, S. & Gunbayi, I. (2016). An Integration of social paradigms into the analysis of social development theories. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*. 7, 4, 65-83.

Taylor, F.W (1998). *The Principles of scientific management*. Dover Publications. Inc.Originally, published in New York: Harper & Bros, 1911.

Tyson, S. (2015). *Essentials of human resource management*. Routledge.

Wang,V. C. X; Bain, B. ; Hope, J. & Hansman, C.A. (2017). *Educational leadership and organizational management: Linking theories to practices*. Information Age Publishing Inc.

Wren, D.A & Bedeian, A. (2009). *The management though*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.