

A Theoretical Examination of Paradigm Developments in Management Theory

Chimwani, Pamela Muhenje

Abstract

Each paradigmatic era in the development of management theory espoused different perspectives on how to maximize efficiency, effectiveness and quality in organizations. Increasingly what is clear over the years is that there is no one best way to manage the organization and no one best organizational structure as Taylor and Weber had hoped. This is because organizational life is a complex multidimensional phenomenon. The personnel too are complex and the behavioural paradigm with management ideas based on employees' personal success and welfare, so that they feel valued and increase productivity, unable to measure up to the increasing complexity to guarantee organization's success and sustainability. The systems management thinking brought about the importance of inter-functional linkages within and outside the organization, stressing their interdependence towards achieving organizational objectives. However, with the complex problems of the current global economy, management practices based on these yester-century paradigms narrow down the solutions search box and often ultimately prove to be ineffective

Date of Submission: 02-11-2022

Date of Acceptance: 14-11-2022

I.Introduction

Management can be viewed as a social group of people who have the power and responsibility to control and operate a business or organization. As a group of people the role of management cannot be gainsaid, as their expertise to provide leadership, make decisions and effectively deploy the resources of the organization are critical to the success of the enterprise. By this definition, the rationale of the group's identity and existence derives from the function(s) it serves the organization. These functions are enumerated and accepted universally as planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating and controlling. The other most pervasive view is of management as a process by which people in leading positions consciously and continually mobilize other people to achieve organizational goals using the available resources in an effective and efficient manner (Cassidy & Kreitner, 2012; Okwiri, 2014; Stoner et al., 2003; Woldesenbet, 2018).

Conceptualization and linking of the 'doers of management' and the 'management process' to better understand the management activity is required. What do managers do and why? Do they act on the basis of biologically determined personalities or cognitively adopted attitudes or socially constructed identities? Are managers born or made? Is management a profession or an occupation?

Management has been with us for thousands of years, with early managers relying on authority, carrot-stick welding and strong-arm tactics to reach their goals. From the building of the pyramids in Egypt, the running of empires in ancient Greek and Roman civilizations, slave production in the cornfields of North America, sea-faring trade and managing wars; all have one thing to do with group goals achieved through group efforts in the context of management (Cassidy & Kreitner, 2012; Stoner et al., 2003).

II.Development of Management Practice

In the pre-Industrial era, managerial practice, having been developed through tradition, guesswork, intuition, rule-of-thumb and supported by experience produced fairly positive results. Work got done and decisions were rarely questioned (Bhatia, 2005; Roth, 1994).

Then businesses were small and mainly served local populations. Technical systems were uncomplicated and communication technology did not exist. Product variety was also limited and the customer accepted what was offered. The apprenticeship model sustained the master craftsman-apprentice relationship ensuring new product development even though it was uncoordinated and sporadic. Labor-management relations were not adversarial and worker expertise was utilized and a cooperation ethic existed (Roth, 1994).

The period from the middle of the 19th century to the beginning of the 20th century saw a rapid improvement of production techniques in Europe and the USA. Business operations grew exponentially in size, scope and nature. With expanded responsibilities, management found that guesswork, intuition, rule-of-thumb were no longer sufficient and were replaced by formalized techniques for decision making. The Industrial Revolution brought machine power to replace human power- a shift from simple hand tools to machinery (Roth,

1994). Small organizations became big organizations with more complex operations involving production planning, marketing and sales. New, urban industrial centres grew around factories. Workers operated machines and produced goods or parts of goods which were sold in other markets at a price they had no knowledge of. Worker exploitation was rife and the management-labour relationship was riddled with suspicion and lack of trust (Jaworska, 2012; Roth, 1994).

In around the same period China as a major economy in the Orient de-industrialized, but later in the last quarter of the 20th century has re-industrialized rapidly increasing its world share of GDP and predicted to surpass that of the USA by 2030. Re-industrialization of China is primarily due to de-industrialization in western countries and enhanced by globalization (Song, 2013). Meanwhile early factories in Japan were under government control due to military considerations. Private investment in the cotton spinning industry towards the end of the 19th century saw Japan compete favorably with India and England and even surpass them as they had mechanized the processes.

Back in the western world, formal theories were needed by managers to tackle the prevailing challenges which included high production costs due to inefficiency and waste; low wages which led to labour unrest and interruptions of operations through strikes. This was the genesis of the development of management as a science with its own concepts, principles, and theories (Bhatia, 2005; Cassidy & Kreitner, 2012).

According to Corley and Gioia (2011), a theory is a statement of concepts and their interrelationships that shows how and/or why a phenomenon occurs. (dos Santos et al., 2002), consider a theory as 'condensed learning' of reflections in practice. (Wacker, 1998) further stipulates that theories carefully outline precise definitions in a specific domain to explain why and how relationships are logically tied so that the theory gives specific predictions. Researchers thus concede that theories provide a framework for analysis and have predictive power for the relationships between variables within a certain context. Scientists, on the other hand, opine that theories are well-substantiated explanations of some aspect of the natural world that is acquired through the scientific method and repeatedly tested and confirmed, preferably using a written, pre-defined, protocol of observations and experiments. They are highly regarded universally as the most reliable, rigorous, and comprehensive form of scientific knowledge.

In light of the above statements, therefore it may be deduced that management theories emerged as managers sought to systematize their reflections to avoid contradictions in their managerial practice (Wren et al., 2009). The theories provided an efficient framework and method for analysis and possible solutions for the observable phenomena of the day. The consistent practical application of a set of assumptions that a manager had, in other words, a theory of management, as opposed to guesswork and intuition was a milestone. It represented a shift in management thinking that could justifiably be called a paradigm shift.

Noting that a paradigm is a framework of basic assumptions, theories and models that are commonly and strongly accepted and shared within a particular field of activity, at a particular point in time (Jamali, 2005), the rule-of-thumb and intuition held good as long as the size, scope and nature of operations of industry were small and simple (Bhatia, 2005)(Bhatia, 2005). When the scale of operations ushered in by the Industrial Revolution grew, they became inadequate and had to be replaced as they had lost their influence.

III. Development of Modern Management Theory

Contributions into the management field have come from a plethora of scholars and practitioners from various disciplines ranging from economics, psychology, sociology, mathematics and science. The result has been a context described by (Koontz, 1961, 1985; Koontz & H., 2007) as a management theory jungle. Each group of scholars and practitioners has interpreted and reformulated from its own perspective, what management is and emergent from this has been differing assumptions, research techniques, conceptual frameworks and technical jargon (Cassidy & Kreitner, 2012).

Attempts to transform theory into practice and vice versa, brings in new ideas resulting in the continuous evolution of management theory. Out of this, is an evolution of management thought that springs from the shop floor, to the factory and to modern complex organizations with paradigm shifts marked by challenges to methods and viewpoints of managers in each era of the evolution (Cassidy & Kreitner, 2012; dos Santos et al., 2002).

Management theory is embedded in a philosophy, which comprises a study of the general problem relating to existence, mind, reason, values and knowledge. Attention is given to two spheres of the philosophy of management: the ontological and epistemological evolution of management theory. The ontology aspect deals with the nature of organizational phenomena, their grouping options and relationships within a hierarchy and how they can be subdivided based on similarities and differences; whilst the epistemological aspect deals with the nature of knowledge about organizations.

Organizations come into existence when commonly understood goals are identified by a social unit of people for a particular purpose with consciously coordinated activities of two or more persons. They are socially constructed realities without material form; as artificial creations organizations are labeled and named based on their convenience for making sense of the external world. As social concepts, the definition of organizations, their components and roles, is dependent upon collectively accepted descriptions by a community. They are dependent on specific activities being carried out by certain humans which bring about their transformation (Boella & van der Torre, 2006; Fleetwood, 2005). The researchers surmise that organizations are modelled as collections of agents, gathered in groups, playing roles or regulated by organizational rules. They have a personality and identity of their own and thus they are agentive entities but act in a very peculiar way, namely through the actions of some agents who, by virtue of the roles they play, are delegated to act on their behalf (Bottazzi & Ferrario, 2005).

Organizations as entities, typically, are always undergoing evolution and change mainly due to societal pressures (Fleetwood, 2005). From the guild-based system of the pre-industrial era in which the domestic system of production was informally organized around families specialized in a certain craft - for instance, weavers, smiths, shoemakers and so forth; to the large, formal organizations of the Industrial era able to carry out large-scale production of more varied goods cheaper and faster. Earlier firms had been run by their owners and foremen, but expansion of firms into large diverse operations necessitated the need for professional managers who worked for salaries. The need for bureaucratization thus arose with many layers of authority and complex division of labour in the large organizations. The organizational structures have remained hierarchical for the most part of the twentieth century, with the prevalent atmosphere being paternalistic (Gupta, 2000). In today's rapidly changing techno-socioeconomic environment, the structure of organizations is being reconstituted necessitated by the need for faster decision making in an erratic global environment (Jamali, 2005).

Epistemology or theory of knowledge, on the other hand, is concerned with the nature and scope of knowledge, its presuppositions, basis and general reliability of claims to knowledge (Nodoushani, 2000). In the epistemological evolution of management theory, positivism has been the dominant ideological construct with research methodologies relying on systematic and rigorous scientific techniques that make provision for generalization, replicability and explanation of behavior, not meaning (Nodoushani, 2000). Management research has been characterized by the application of the scientific method to organizational problems thereby producing knowledge about the social phenomena comparable to the natural sciences. The mode of knowledge production in the twenty-first century is transdisciplinarity (Raut & Veer, 2014) from positivist epistemology to a pragmatic/ critical realism that integrates the rigour of the scientific method and the richness of individual subjective experience and interpretation of the social world. Incorporation of qualitative research methodologies such as interviews, focus groups and action research enable construction of meanings and contextual understanding (Nodoushani, 2000).

Managerial practice in precedent generations was by personal experience using knowledge and insight derived from the recollection of lessons learned in general life (Wren et al., 2009). As theory of management began to emanate, its influence on practice began to be felt in the component activities of the organization; particularly managerial objectives for increasing labour productivity such as technical planning, control, payment systems and employee relations (Smith & Boyns, 2005; Wren et al., 2009). Succeeding generations of managers have progressively moved towards a pragmatic realist stance, applying new knowledge to organizational phenomena that is relevant and useful in the particular context (Raut & Veer, 2014).

Examination of extant literature reveals two perspectives each with a set of differing and changing views, theories and frameworks based on diverse management thoughts. The traditionalist perspective comprises the classical theories and human relations/behavioural theories of management and the modernist perspective, systems theory and its variants and contingency theory of management. On the basis of the synthesis of the original works of seminal theorists (Lemak, 2004) proposes that the set of theories be described as paradigms. He further postulates that their main differentiating characteristics are along the focus of managerial attention, role of managers and the ultimate objective of the organization.

IV. Classical Management Paradigm

The set of homogeneous ideas on management of organizations that evolved at the turn of the 20th century comprised mainly three streams: Fredrick Taylor's Scientific Management theory (1912); Max Weber's Bureaucracy theory (1922) and Henry Fayol's Principles of Administration (1949). The rapid industrial growth in the early twentieth century enlarged the scale of enterprise to unprecedented levels with a workforce that was largely unskilled, limited in its language proficiency and new to industrial life. Managerial decision making was based on the rule of the thumb and there was a mismatch between tasks and workers' ability leading to gross production inefficiencies and waste (Wren et al., 2009).

The classical paradigm advocates a process approach to management, prescribing centralized decision making, and hierarchical channels of communication in a highly formalized and departmentalized organization (Jamali, 2005). In seeking to improve management practice Taylor's approach is at the workshop/technical level, whilst Fayol and Weber methods are for managing large organizations at the upper levels of administration. The key objective is to ensure production and structural efficiencies, by emphasizing specialization and standardized processes. The management practices allowed to flourish are order-giving and control, enforced cooperation/ compliance to laid down rules using punishment or reward and authoritarian/disciplinary approaches (DiPadova, 1996; Jamali, 2005; Sarker, S.I. Khan, 2013; Weymes, 2004; Wren et al., 2009).

Proponents of the classical theories, attest to the fact that managerial practice are systemized towards more logical ways of operating; that productivity and efficiency are achieved because of specialization and that social order is assured with "the right man in the right place" also securing material order thus avoiding waste. The clear chain of command facilitates clarity of communication transmitted albeit from the top to the bottom buttressed by autocratic leadership (Jamali, 2005; Lemak, 2004; Wren et al., 2009).

Hewege (2012) notes that classical theories originated in an accounting-dominated environment hence their preoccupation with cutting costs, with a narrow focus on promoting production efficiency and combating waste; their effort to control human behavior falls short as human reaction to the same stimuli varies according to socio-cultural and political contexts as well as organizational and individual differences. Classical theories are prescriptive in nature and were adequate when markets were localized and stable; new product development was slow to change and technologies were simple and unsophisticated. Their mechanistic orientation holds assumptions such as people are motivated purely by economic needs so will conform if financial incentives are right, resulting in dehumanization of workers and treating them like machines (Hewege, 2012; Jamali, 2005; Lemak, 2004)

The strongest positive legacy of the scientific management, administrative and bureaucratic theories, still prevalent to the present day, is production, organization and structural efficiencies. Indeed, modern day operations management has evolved from process-based approach to management. Except for Weber, the other two theorists were practicing managers trained in engineering and science (Lemak, 2004). The bases of knowledge lean towards clean-cut logical positivistic orientation leaving little room for subjective interpretivism. Had the organizational structures been less mechanistic and the managers more humane, would the classical paradigm have been the panacea of the managerial challenges of the day?

V. Behavioural Management Paradigm

More important than anything else for the classical paradigm, is improving the firm's productivity by managing available resources effectively whilst downplaying the human factor of the organization, the importance of group dynamics and the complex human motivations (Jamali, 2005). Hewege (2012) stresses that the classical paradigm fails to explain complex issues that were interwoven with socio-cultural aspects of society. The Hawthorne experiments of Mayo and Roethlisberger (1927-1932) built upon much earlier works in the 19th century, that put forth ideas about power of the group and participation, worker health and safety and hierarchy of human needs developed by among others, Mary Follet Parker (Lemak, 2004). Utilizing scientific methods and techniques, the Hawthorne studies established that men were social beings and were motivated by social as well as economic needs; important ideas that were derived from the studies include: the factory as a social system, leadership style, participation, morale, communication, informal and formal work groups and motivation (Korajczyk, 1961).

The theories of motivation: notably Maslow's Hierarchy of needs (1954), McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y and Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene theory (1959); explain motivation in the workplace further emphasizing that man is a "complex person" driven by intrinsic rather than extrinsic factors and can manage his own manage behavior without coercion. Job satisfaction is derived from non-financial incentives (Dye et al., 2005; Lemak, 2004; Pardee, 1990).

The behavioural paradigm espouses management practices that consider the employee as a social person and not a machine. The manager's role is more geared towards persuasive leadership as opposed to ordering and giving instructions, recognizing worker participation in decision-making and allowing for employee teams to take responsibility for work (Cassidy & Kreitner, 2012; DiPadova, 1996; Dye et al., 2005; Jamali, 2005; Lemak, 2004; Stoner et al., 2003; Weymes, 2004).

Lauding the fact that human relationists/ behaviourists pressurize management to be more people oriented, the pervasive influence of the informal work group is recognized and worker's views are sought (Lemak, 2004). However, avowed critiques see a hidden agenda in the persuasive leadership mode of managers terming it as manipulative and insincere because all other forms of coercion such as dismissal from work are no longer effective; inherently it is still a form control and managers are looking out for their own interests (Korajczyk, 1961). Indeed, several writers attest to the point that the human relationists/behaviourists studies

lack scientific rigour both in their methodologies and research bases, bringing into question the generalizability, validity and reliability of findings (Dartey-Baah & Amoako, 2011; Kroth, 2007; Opu, 2008; Pardee, 1990; Perry, 2000). The focus is too much on observable behavior and a satisfactory instrument of the measurement of the dimensions' variables not yet found due to inadequate operationalization (Dartey-Baah & Amoako, 2011; Schein, 2011). The theories also fail to specify the behaviours to which they apply and according to Perry (2000), their volume of behaviours is too wide and bewildering.

Motivation theories are useful in reviewing what makes people get going and enjoy their jobs. (Haque et al., 2014), state that employees are the competitive advantage of organizations and can make or break the organization. (Perry (2000) observed that, the heavily subjective interpretivism orientation of motivation theories, lends itself to a myriad of inexhaustible analysis which is too detailed and unstructured; causing a proliferation of new theories. An integrated model that captures the essence of human nature of the theories is required. The present array is a distinct and bewildering jungle of its own. The question then: is concern for human welfare by management the missing ingredient so that the wheels of evolution could cease?

VII. Modernist Management Paradigm

With the emergence of new industrial technologies and complicated transportation and communications, the conventional means of tackling managerial problems that came with these developments via the classical and behavioral management theories fell short as their thinking relied on understanding organizations through analysis – looking at the constituent parts and seeing how they fit together. Increased organizational complexity and interdepartmental dependency, made managers consider the impact that their decisions would have on other departments and indeed the entire organization. The environment outside the organization had to be factored in as well and bridges built to facilitate interaction. The relevance of the traditional hierarchical organization chart diminished as inter-functional linkages were sought after (Jamali, 2005; Lemak, 2004).

Surfacing during the Second World War (1939-1945) as an outgrowth of mathematicians trying to solve perplexing problems and combining with the Weiner's (1948) works on Cybernetics and Von Bertalanffy's (1951) General Systems Theory; the systems paradigm advocates for a holistic consideration of the organization as a collection of interrelated and interdependent parts mutually interacting to achieve a common purpose with the assumption that, the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. The organization is a cooperative, unified interconnected entity made up of complex physical, biological, personal and social components that could only be studied as a whole. By focusing on interrelationships both within subsystems and between the system and the external environment, implies a dialogue between holism and reductionism (Jamali, 2005; Lemak, 2004; Mele et al., 2010; Okwiri, 2014).

Subsequent events, led to the emergence of contemporary management theories which are variants of the systems theory namely: contingency theory, organization learning and knowledge management, the chaos theory and complex adaptive systems (Cassidy & Kreitner, 2012; Olum, 2004).

Contingency Theory: is a practical approach to the systems theory with each real-world situation studied to determine the appropriate managerial response, shattering the Taylorist concept that 'one size fits all'. The application of appropriate management tools/ techniques for a particular situation is imperative since each presents unique problems (Lemak, 2004; Weymes, 2004).

Organization Learning and Knowledge Management: portrays the organization as a thinking open system relying on feedback to adjust to changing conditions. Just like the human mind, organizations learn from experience and thus engage in complex mental processes such as anticipating, perceiving, envisioning, problem solving & remembering. When organizational learning becomes a strategic objective to identify and fully exploit ideas from both inside and outside, then a knowledge management program exists (Cassidy & Kreitner, 2012).

The Chaos Theory and Complex Adaptive Systems: brought about by the work of mathematicians Edward Lorenz (1960s) and James Yorke (1970s). Chaologists try to find order in seemingly random behavior patterns of everything from weather patterns to stock markets. In the complex adaptive systems field, the challenge is to discover 'the rule' in seemingly chaotic systems. A chaordic organization exists between chaos and order and the whole does not control the parts and none of the parts control the whole (Laszlo & Krippner, 1998; Mele et al., 2010).

From the time systems thinking began, managers are alerted to the nature of embeddedness and interdependencies in the organization. In their practice, they are challenged to be more flexible and adaptive than in the past as the traditional command-control management is limited in complex systems. Unsettling as it

has been for managers and organizations (Jamali, 2004) the idea of coordination and communication is implicit (Lemak, 2004). The role of the manager has morphed into synthesizer- helping others see the “big picture”, explaining trends and articulating the organization’s vision; and integrator- keeping people focused on the strategic goal and helping them see how their daily activities contribute towards achieving those goals (Cassidy & Kreitner, 2012; Jamali, 2005; Lemak, 2004; Stoner et al., 2003).

Some writers have critiqued the systems paradigm for being too abstract and vague (Charlton & Andras, 2003) and that it fails to offer specific tools and techniques for practising managers. Its impracticability with regard to specification of the nature of interaction and interdependence between the organization and its environment, to assessment of outcomes and rational decision-making has also been pointed out. Although high with description power, system theories lack predictive power.

It is a pretentious assumption that the wheels of evolution will ever cease, as the environment and society is increasingly complex and dynamic (Lemak, 2004; Mavrofides et al., 2011a). System theories represent a robust paradigm that is itself adaptive for evolutionary development (Laszlo & Krippner, 1998). The system paradigm ably handles the concept of complexity and the factors that reproduce them in the social context (Mavrofides et al., 2011b).

VIII. Context of Management Practice in the 21st Century

The functional hierarchical management structures and systems developed by Taylor, Fayol and Weber that have endured up to the present time may have been adequate then, when markets were small, products limited and technology slow to change (Jamali, 2005). The business environment was stable, with slow competition and information science had not yet permeated every corner of the globe. It was assumed that industry structure could be accurately determined and problems reduced to a few clear-cut available alternatives. Workers had inhibitions and were largely uncreative as new ideas could be dismissed and there was no room to take risks and experiment. The skills of workers were, therefore under-utilized and their willingness to take initiative underestimated. In addition, markets were assumed to be non-heterogeneous and consumer demands were taken for granted, leading to customer exploitation. The customer had no voice and had to do with what was offered (Jamali, 2005; Lemak, 2004; Levine & Luck, 1994). The goal of the firm was primarily considered as maximization of shareholder wealth regardless.

Jamali (2005) aptly captures the unprecedented wave of change in the business environment that began to occur in the last two decades of the 20th century and the dawn of the 21st century; from mass production/standardization to mass customization; from energy/material- intensive products to information-intensive products; from a national/regional market place to a growing global market place where information, goods and capital flow freely; from a docile, less educated customer with limited choices to a more educated, enlightened, inquisitive, critical and demanding customer with expanding choices. Indeed, he describes the 21st century environment as dynamic, ever turbulent and increasingly complex, that reassessment of widely accepted management concepts and practices, has to be considered by managers and academicians alike, as they are inadequate for the range of contemporary challenges.

The changes in the world political and economic systems are fast-paced and accelerating; in a competitive environment in which more complex markets and technological changes are key influences. The end of the Cold War and fall of Communism in the last decade of the 20th century has changed the landscape of world affairs, with a general move towards more market-oriented economies around the globe as erstwhile government-controlled societies open up and become players in the global field. Furthermore, communication in the 21st century, enabled by the explosive growth of the Internet has people and organizations continuously connected and updated through various social media networks such as Face Book, Twitter, blogs and microblogs. This enables individuals and groups to create movements and voice their sentiments on virtually every issue. A shift in the management paradigm is occurring as instruments of performance measurement and practices that were novel in earlier paradigms become insufficient. Productivity levels that were acceptable have become unacceptable (Cassidy & Kreitner, 2012; Jamali, 2005; Robbins et al., 2014; Weymes, 2004; Zachariev, 2002).

IX. Conclusion

As we have seen, each paradigmatic era in the development of management theory espoused different perspectives on how to maximize efficiency, effectiveness and quality in organizations. Increasingly what is clear over the years is that there is no one best way to manage the organization and no one best organizational structure as Taylor and Weber had hoped. This is because organizational life is a complex multidimensional phenomenon. The personnel too are complex and the behavioural paradigm with management ideas based on employees’ personal success and welfare, so that they feel valued and increase productivity, unable to measure up to the increasing complexity to guarantee organization’s success and sustainability. The systems management thinking brought about the importance of inter-functional linkages within and outside the organization, stressing

their interdependence towards achieving organizational objectives. However, with the complex problems of the current global economy, management practices based on these yester-century paradigms narrow down the solutions search box and often ultimately prove to be ineffective (Jaworska, 2012).

The question therefore, arises whether management models based on the classical, behavioral and systems paradigms will enable organizations to build sustainable competitive advantage in the 21st century. Jaworska (2012) offers that at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries classical theorists forced a managerial revolution; in the course of the 20th century behaviorists and system thinkers drove the change. However, the present forces of organizational changes facing hyper-competition, sophisticated customers and rapid technological change need to take care of different dimensions of management.

In the current 21st century context, is not a change of management paradigm due? Since the organizational environment is in constant flux, are the management practices espoused by traditional paradigms sufficient to assure organization success into the future? Management practices should indeed change (Okwiri, 2014) and there is need to identify new constructs to address problems faced by management hitherto not tackled by the traditional management paradigms of the 20th century. An analysis of literature surmises the concepts as customer value, process/ technical and organizational system factors (Bounds et al., 1994; Dean & Bowen, 1994; Martin, 2005; Okwiri, 2014). In addition, it is argued that traditional management theories had limited predictive power in decision-making which further jeopardizes organization survival, requiring management practices that go far beyond earlier ones already developed. This paper proposes that the current context demands management thought and practice based on different thinking to drive performance, as the precedent paradigms have become insufficient for operation. That there is need for a shift from the incumbent paradigm is in no doubt. The question therefore is: what is now important for the organizations? What is should the focus be now?

That fundamentally new types of leaders for the contemporary organic 21st century organizations are required with different mindsets and leadership styles is the apparent consensus amongst modern day management theorists, academicians and practitioners. The clarion call seems to be re-invent management or perish. Management mental models require to be displaced from how-to-get-people-to-do type of thinking and replaced by how-to-help-people-to-do type of thinking. Present day managers need skills to manage transformational systems with the intangible aspects of organizations at the centre stage (Buble, 2015; Nevins & Stumpf, 1999).

Whilst consensus exists that change is inevitable, the current debate amongst scholars is the mechanics of the how the change will be brought forth; is it by evolution or by revolution? A number of theorists advocate for a total overhaul of the long-held management assumptions terming them as obsolete, stifling to the creativity and vitality of employees. Championing for a shaking off of the shackles of the status quo, revolutionaries question the assumptions of managerial orthodoxy with new propositions. Drucker (2012) in his book *Management Challenges of the 21st century* postulates that the emergent management discipline is people centered with business' primary focus being "to create a customer".

However, others argue that management theory is onto the next phase in the evolutionary path which will involve the extension of existing management principles and practices to embrace higher levels of complexity- particularly multidimensional integration. According to Grant (2008), management has to contend with achieving more complex patterns of integration that can support more sophisticated and variegated bundles of organizational capabilities. Repackaging and rearranging of old knowledge, broadening the scope beyond theory to bring out new phenomena, defining new constructs are some of the milestones to be achieved in the evolutionary process; without a wholesale dismantling or contradiction of the formalized structures and systems with the principles that underpin them (Buble, 2015; Grant, 2008; Okwiri, 2014).

In contemporary society, increasingly efforts in organized groups are becoming more complex with management tasks gaining importance. The dynamic business environment needs a management paradigm that will address the fundamental needs of organizations. The disruptions in the environment do not warrant the invalidation of conventional principles of organizational design; but rather in this era according to Maguad (2006) the quality management paradigm will define the role of management in the contemporary economy. We therefore ask; what is quality management? Is it bringing anything new? What organizational needs does the quality management paradigm address? Is there evidence of new approaches or forms of management?

References

- [1]. Bhatia, R. C. (2005). Principles of office management. Lotus Press.
- [2]. Boella, G., & van der Torre, L. (2006). A Foundational Ontology of Organizations and Roles (Vol. 4327).
- [3]. Bottazzi, E., & Ferrario, R. (2005). A Path to an Ontology of Organizations.
- [4]. Bounds, G., YORKAS, L., Adams, M., & Ranney, G. (1994). Beyond total quality management: Toward the emerging paradigm.
- [5]. Buble, M. (2015). Tendencies in evolution of 21st century management. *Management: Journal of Contemporary Management Issues*, 20(Special issue), 1–17.
- [6]. Cassidy, C. M., & Kreitner, R. (2012). Principles of Management. South-Western Cengage Learning.
- [7]. Corley, K. G., & Gioia, D. A. (2011). Building theory about theory building: what constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy*

- of Management Review, 36(1), 12–32.
- [8]. Dartey-Baah, K., & Amoako, G. K. (2011). Application of Frederick Herzberg's Two-Factor theory in assessing and understanding employee motivation at work: a Ghanaian Perspective. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 3(9), 1–8.
- [9]. Dean, J. W., & Bowen, D. E. (1994). *Management Theory and Total Quality: Improving Research and Practice through Theory*. In *Source: The Academy of Management Review* (Vol. 19, Issue 3).
- [10]. DiPadova, L. N. (1996). Towards a Weberian management theory: lessons from Lowell Bennion's neglected masterwork. *Journal of Management History*.
- [11]. dos Santos, A., Powell, J. A., & Sarshar, M. (2002). Evolution of management theory: the case of production management in construction. *Management Decision*.
- [12]. Drucker, P. F. (2012). *Management Challenges of the 21st Century*. Elsevier Ltd.
- [13]. Dye, K., Mills, A. J., & Weatherbee, T. (2005). Maslow: Man interrupted: Reading management theory in context. *Management Decision*.
- [14]. Fleetwood, S. (2005). Ontology in Organization and Management Studies: A Critical Realist Perspective. *Organization*, 12, 197–222.
- [15]. Grant, R. M. (2008). The future of management: Where is Gary Hamel leading us? *Long Range Planning*, 41(5), 469–482.
- [16]. Gupta, N. S. (2000). *Management Principles, Practices and Techniques* (2nd ed.). Atlantic Publishers & Distributors Pvt Ltd.
- [17]. Haque, M. F., Haque, M. A., & Islam, M. (2014). Motivational Theories-A Critical Analysis. *ASA University Review*, 8(1).
- [18]. Hewege, C. R. (2012). A critique of the mainstream management control theory and the way forward. *SAGE Open*, 2(4), 2158244012470114.
- [19]. Jamali, D. (2005). Changing management paradigms: Implications for educational institutions. *Journal of Management Development*, 24, 104–115.
- [20]. Jaworska, A. (2012). Future of the Management. From Fayol's 14 General Principles of Management to 25 Management's Grand Challenges of Gary Hamel. In *Management of Organization in the Age of Globalization* (pp. 201–216). Knowledge Innovation Center Sp. z o.o.
- [21]. Koontz, H. (1961). The Management Theory Jungle. *Academy of Management Journal*, 4(3).
- [22]. Koontz, H. (1985). THE MANAGEMENT THEORY JUNGLE REVISITED. In *Readings and Exercises in Organizational Behavior*.
- [23]. Koontz, H., & H., W. (2007). *Essentials of Management, An International Perspective*, 7th Edition. TBS.
- [24]. Korajczyk, R. W. (1961). The Human Relations Approach and Its Critics.
- [25]. Kroth, M. (2007). Maslow-move aside! A heuristical motivation model for leaders in career and technical education. *Journal of STEM Teacher Education*, 44(2), 3.
- [26]. Laszlo, A., & Krippner, S. (1998). Systems theories: Their origins, foundations, and development. *Advances in Psychology-Amsterdam-*, 126, 47–76.
- [27]. Lemak, D. J. (2004). Leading students through the management theory jungle by following the path of the seminal theorists: A paradigmatic approach. *Management Decision*, 42(10), 1309–1325.
- [28]. Levine, A., & Luck, J. (1994). *The New Management Paradigm: A Review of Principles and Practices*.
- [29]. Maguad, B. A. (2006). The modern quality movement: Origins, development and trends. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 17(2), 179–203.
- [30]. Martin, J. (2005). *Organizational Behaviour and Management*. Thomson Learning.
- [31]. Mavrofidis, T., Kameas, A., Papageorgiou, D., & Los, A. (2011a). On the Entropy of Social Systems: A Revision of the Concepts of Entropy and Energy in the Social Context. In *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* (Vol. 28, Issue 4, pp. 353–368).
- [32]. Mavrofidis, T., Kameas, A., Papageorgiou, D., & Los, A. (2011b). On the Entropy of Social Systems: A Revision of the Concepts of Entropy and Energy in the Social Context. In *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* (Vol. 28, Issue 4, pp. 353–368).
- [33]. Mele, C., Pels, J., & Polese, F. (2010). A brief review of systems theories and their managerial applications. *Service Science*, 2(1–2), 126–135.
- [34]. Nevins, M. D., & Stumpf, S. A. (1999). 21st-century leadership: Redefining management education. *Strategy and Business*, 41–51.
- [35]. Nodoushani, O. (2000). Epistemological foundations of management theory and research methodology. *Human Systems Management*, 19, 71–80.
- [36]. Okwiri, O. A. (2014). Quality Management as an Outcome of Management Field Evolution: A Review.
- [37]. Olum, Y. (2004). *Modern management theories and practices*. Uganda: Makerere University, 1–24.
- [38]. Opu, S. (2008). *Motivation and Work Performance: Complexities in Achieving Good Performance Outcomes; A Study Focusing on Motivation Measures and Improving Workers Performance in Kitgum District Local Government*.
- [39]. Pardee, R. L. (1990). *Motivation Theories of Maslow, Herzberg, McGregor & McClelland. A Literature Review of Selected Theories Dealing with Job Satisfaction and Motivation*.
- [40]. Perry, J. L. (2000). Bringing society in: Toward a theory of public-service motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2), 471–488.
- [41]. Raut, U. R., & Veer, N. B. (2014). Management research: To understand the role of epistemology in management research. *Journal of Management and Science*, 4(1), 64–70.
- [42]. Robbins, S. P., Coulter, M. A., & Coulter, M. K. (2014). *Management*. Pearson.
- [43]. Roth, W. (1994). *The evolution of management theory: Past, present, future*. CRC Press.
- [44]. Sarker, S.I. Khan, M. R. A. (2013). Classical and Neoclassical approaches of Management: An overview. *IOSR-Journal of Business and Management*, 14(6), 1–5.
- [45]. Schein, E. (2011). Douglas McGregor: theoretician, moral philosopher or behaviorist? An analysis of the interconnections between assumptions, values and behavior. *Journal of Management History*.
- [46]. Smith, I., & Boyns, T. (2005). British management theory and practice: The impact of Fayol. In *Management Decision* (Vol. 43, Issue 10, pp. 1317–1334).
- [47]. Song, L. (2013). China's rapid growth and development: A historical and international context. In *China's New Role in the World Economy* (pp. 39–64). Routledge.
- [48]. Stoner, J. A. F., Freeman, R. E., & Jr., D. R. G. (2003). *Management* (6th ed.). Prentice Hall of India Private Limited.
- [49]. Wacker, J. G. (1998). A definition of theory: research guidelines for different theory-building research methods in operations management. *Journal of Operations Management*, 16(4), 361–385.
- [50]. Weymes, E. (2004). A challenge to traditional management theory. In *Foresight* (Vol. 6, Issue 6, pp. 338–348).
- [51]. Woldesenbet, T. (2018). PETER F. DRUCKER (1999): THE MANAGEMENT CHALLENGE FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (BOOK REVIEW) AND CRITICAL ARGUMENT OF DRUCKER'S IDEA FROM POSTMODERNISM PERSPECTIVE BY: Tarekegn Tamiru Woldesenbet.

- [52]. Wren, D. A., Bedeian, A. G., & Wren, D. A. (2009). *The evolution of management thought*. Wiley.
- [53]. Zachariev, E. (2002). PETER DRUCKER'S CONCEPTION OF THE NEW MANAGEMENT PARADIGM UDC 005.1. Knowledge and Process Management.

Chimwani, P.M. (2022). A Theoretical Examination of Paradigm Developments in Management Theory. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 24(11), 36-44.