

A critical report on

“While many areas of contemporary life have changed significantly in the 21st century, management has remained largely unchanged and rooted in 19th century theories and paradigms”

Visions for the Future:

Theoretical Perspectives on Management

LCDB7008

Submitted To:

Prof. Amare Desta [PhD, MEd, MSc, LCGI, BSc (Hons)]

Senior Lecturer and

Doctoral Supervisor, Director of Studies, Internal Examiner and Chair

UWTSD, London

Submitted By:

Sujana Acharya

Student Number: 2416726

2416726@student.uwtsd.ac.uk

1 Westferry Circus, London, E14 4HA

April 2025

TABLE OF CONTENT

TITLE PAGE

TABLE OF CONTENT.....	i
------------------------------	----------

ABSTRACT.....	iii
----------------------	------------

CHAPTER I.....	11
-----------------------	-----------

INTRODUCTION.....	1
--------------------------	----------

1.1 Background.....	1
---------------------	---

CHAPTER II.....	45
------------------------	-----------

EVOLUTION OF SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT THEORIES.....	5
---	----------

2.1 Scientific Management – Frederick Winslow Taylor (Early 1900s).....	5
---	---

2.2 Administrative Management – (Henri Fayol, early 20th century).....	6
--	---

2.3 Bureaucratic Theory – Max Weber.....	8
--	---

CHAPTER III.....	10
-------------------------	-----------

DEVELOPMENTS OF MANAGEMENT THEORY (20TH CENTURY).....	10
--	-----------

3.1 The human relations movement; A Softening of the Edges.....	10
---	----

3.2 Behavioural management theories.....	11
--	----

3.3 Systems theory.....	12
-------------------------	----

3.4 Contingency theory.....	13
-----------------------------	----

CHAPTER IV.....	15
------------------------	-----------

CONTEMPORARY MANAGEMENT THEORIES (Late 20th – 21st Century).....	15
---	-----------

4.1 Learning Organizations	15
----------------------------------	----

4.2 Agile and Lean Management.....	15
4.3 Knowledge Management and Innovation Theory.....	16
4.4 Digital and Platform Economy Theories.....	16
CHAPTER V.....	18
CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES AND CONTRIBUTION OF CONTEMPORARY MANAGEMENT THEORISTS AND THEIR THEORIES IN MANAGEMENT.....	18
5.1 Globalization: Managing Cultural Diversity and Decentralized Operations.....	18
5.2 Technology: The Impact of AI, Automation, and Big Data.....	19
5.3 Workplace Change: Remote Work, Flexible Teams, and the Gig Economy.....	20
5.4 Values Shift: Emphasis on Purpose, Ethics, and Sustainability.....	21
5.5 Speed and Complexity: The Need for Agility and Rapid Decision-Making.....	21
CHAPTER VI.....	23
ENDURING TRADITIONAL PRACTICES IN CONTEMPORARY ORGANIZATIONS.....	23
6.1 Structural Rigidity in Modern Corporations.....	23
6.2 Taylorism in the Age of Algorithms.....	<u>23</u>
6.3 Bureaucratic Governance in Public and Non-Profit Sectors.....	24
6.4 Legacy of Division of Labor and Specialization.....	24
6.5 KPIs and Performance Metrics: A Taylorism Legacy.....	25
CHAPTER VII.....	26
CONCLUSION.....	26
REFERENCES	

ABSTRACT

From classical origins of the late 19th and early 20th centuries to its present-day applications in tackling contemporary organizational challenges, this report examines the development of management theory. Starting with key theories like Max Weber's Bureaucratic Management, Henri Fayol's Administrative Theory, and Frederick Taylor's Scientific Management, the study emphasizes how these primal models brought systematic approaches to organizational control, efficiency, and structure. The conversation towards the Human Relations Movement, highlight the writings of Elton Mayo and others who appreciated the importance of human motivation and behaviour in the business activities of organization. In the context of contemporary management, the paper analysed the effort of theorists like Peter Senge, Nonaka & Takeuchi, and Clayton Christensen, especially in how their ideas address challenges like adaptability, innovation, and the shift toward a digital and global economy.

The report also investigated how real-world execute the contemporary management techniques like Agile, Lean, and platform economy theories, demonstrating their applicability in the fast-paced business world of today. The final section of the study analysed how these developing theories provide solution to contemporary managerial problems like organizational agility, employee engagement, and making wise decisions in the face of swift societal and technological alteration. Conventional management paradigms, which have their roots in early 20th-century thinking, still have an impact on many industries despite the emergence of contemporary ideas.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Almost every element of human life has undergone through the trans-formative modification in the twenty-first century. Modern civilization is significantly different from the industrialized world of the 19th century, from dynamic cultural standards and workplace kinetics to digital technologies, globalization, and intelligence services (Daft and Armstrong, 2021). However, despite this heavy transformation, an arguable title still creates a discussion in scholarly and professional settings: Is management theory still founded on antiquated 19th-century thought, or has it changed to reflect the contemporary world?

On the surface, management might seem to have developed alongside other fields, adopting new concepts, methods, and technology. Companies now have remote working models, agile approaches, diversity and inclusion frameworks, and flatter hierarchies (Daft and Armstrong, 2021) . Many of the fundamental ideas that underpin management practice, however, including task specialization, standardized processes, and hierarchical authority, are straight out of the traditional management theories that emerged throughout the industrial revolution (Taylor, 1911; Weber, 2009). There are important problems raised by this contradiction: Are we just using more contemporary language to repackage outdated concepts? Are tools designed from a previous era now used to solve existing issues?

The enduring dominance of 19th and early 20th-century paradigms such as Scientific Management (Frederick W. Taylor), Bureaucratic Theory (Max Weber), and Administrative Principles (Henri Fayol) continues to influence contemporary management practices across sectors. These classical models, while foundational and structurally sound for the industrial age, often fall short in addressing the complexities, fluidity, and ethical challenges of modern organizational environments. The outgrowth of business market economy during this period established a need for structured systems of control, efficiency, and labour coordination (Taylor, 1911; Fayol, 2016) Mastermind like Frederick Winslow Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber laid the basis for what became known as classical management theory. These models stressed out scientific analysis of tasks, bureaucratic organization, and top-down control principles that mirrored the mechanical logic of the time. Taylor's "Scientific Management" centred on optimal individual productiveness (Taylor, 1911) . (Fayol,

2016) identified important functions of management, and Weber's idea of bureaucracy institutionalized stratified composition governed by formal regulation (Weber, 2009).

These views, while revolutionary in their historical setting, viewed workers as passive productivity tools and organizations as machines. This mechanistic perspective frequently prioritized efficiency and predictability over emotions, creativity, and social dynamics (McGregor, 1989; Goleman, 2005). Paradoxically, a lot of these cornerstone ideas still have an impact on modern managerial attitudes, performance reviews, and organisational strategies (Kumar et al., 2014).

With time, this rigid organization started to show defects. The importance of social relationships and worker well-being was emphasized by the Human Relations theory of the middle of the 20th century, particularly the Hawthorne Report carried out by Elton Mayo and his subordinate (Mayo, 2004). It became clear that workers were social organism as well as economic ones, impelled by a need for acceptance, care, and a feeling of gathering. This output in these theories basically focused on communication, motivation, and leadership style. Maslow's hierarchy of needs, Douglas McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y, and Herzberg's two-factor theory are basis example (Maslow, 1943, p. 370; Hertzberg, Mausner and Snyderman, 1959; McGregor, 1989, pp. 314–324)

Later, after establishment of systems theory and contingency theory in the 1960s and 1970s the complex organizational structure is totally changed into flexible organizational structure (Katz and Kahn, 2015, pp. 152–168). Instead of seeing organization as closed, linear person, managers were forced by systems thinking to see them as open, interdependent systems. In turn, situational factors including organizational size, technology, and environment were crucial for effective management, rejecting the phrase that one-size-fits-all approaches is a theme of contingency theory (Lawrence, Lorsch and Garrison, 1967).

Social equity trends, technological disruption, shifts in demographics, environmental degradation, and the aftermath of worldwide crises like the COVID-19 pandemic have made rigid theories of management progressively ineffective (Goleman, 2005; Yukl et al., 2013, pp. 38–48). Therefore, it is especially concerning to think about the multifaceted and fluid troubles that modern organization face. In addition to efficiency, organizations are now expected to be innovative, inclusive, sustainable, and resilient.

A new generation of modern management theorists has arisen in response to these issues, providing frameworks that are more appropriate for the demands of the twenty-first century. Peter Senge's learning organization model places a strong emphasis on systems thinking,

flexibility, and a common goal. Henry Mintzberg criticises the official strategic planning process and support emerging strategy based on real-time learning (Mintzberg, 1994) . Leadership competencies have been redefined by Daniel Goleman's emotional intelligence (EQ) framework, which emphasizes empathy, self-awareness, and relationship management.

These contemporaries opine offer collaborative, agile, and humanitarian management strategies that go against accepted trait. They place more emphasis on shared leadership, soft skills, and ongoing education than on strict hierarchy and set norms. Their efforts recognize that workers are now stakeholders, co-creators, and change agents in addition to being employees. Therefore, these views represent a more ethical and realistic view of organizational life in the 21st century, which is digital, globalized, and values-driven.

But the crucial question is whether these modern theories have had a significant impact on managerial practice or if they are still viewed as ancillary. While startups and internet companies have adopted more flexible, flatter structures, older organizations typically find it difficult to adjust. Many continue to see employee engagement as an HR job rather than a leadership duty, cling to performance metrics that are based on Taylorism reasoning and oppose structural changes that challenge existing authority((Mintzberg, 1994; Kumar et al., 2014; Daft and Armstrong, 2021)

So, this essay critically examines the assertion that management remains largely unchanged and rooted in outdated paradigms, despite dramatic evolutions in other aspects of life and work. It begins by tracing the historical evolution of management thought, spotlighting the major classical theories that shaped early organizational structures. It then transitions to a discussion on the emergence of behavioural, systems, and contingency approaches in the mid-20th century that sought to humanize and contextualize organizational dynamics. Yet, the essay argues that even these "modern" adaptations were often evolutionary rather than revolutionary, remaining tethered to mechanistic and hierarchical conceptions of work and control.

In analysing the 21st-century landscape, the essay highlights the complex challenges faced by today's organizations ranging from digital disruption, global crises, workforce diversification, and sustainability concerns to demonstrate the inadequacy of rigid, legacy management models. It further evaluates the contribution of contemporary theorists such as Peter Senge (Learning Organizations), Clayton Christensen (Disruptive Innovation), and Nonaka & Takeuchi (Knowledge-Creation Theory), along with modern approaches like Agile, Lean, and platform-based business models. These efforts, though impactful, have often remained

siloed or difficult to fully embed within traditional, bureaucratic corporate structures that resist transformation.

Through critical analysis and real-world examples, this essay supports the argument that while management theory has indeed developed in academic scope and conceptual richness, in practice, it often remains affixed in old-fashioned frameworks that hinder responsiveness, creativity, and resilience. The goal is not to dismiss classical contributions but to call for a paradigm shift one that genuinely aligns with the volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) nature of the modern world.

CHAPTER II

EVOLUTION OF SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT THEORIES

The lines of management as a formal discipline trace back to the Industrial Revolution, a period of great social and economic disruption. This era is taken as a witnessed of transition from small-scale, craft-based production to automated, factory-based production. As firms grew and complication increased, the conventional methods of directing a worker in small shops became ineffective. The pressing need for systematic ways to coordinate labour, manage production processes, and improve productivity created fertile ground for the emergence of foundational management theories. During late 19th and early 20th centuries, thought of management came up and dominated by three key model: scientific management, administrative management, and bureaucratic theory.

2.1 Scientific Management – Frederick Winslow Taylor (Early 1900s)

Frederick Winslow Taylor is widely considered as the "father of scientific management." His work altered the way of managers to manage the labour and productivity (Taylor, 1911; Boddy, 2019) He is initially working as a machinist and later as a chief engineer at Midvale Steel Company in the United States, Taylor perceived incompetence, rule-of-thumb work procedures, and incompatible performance among workers. He concluded that a scientific approach to management was essential to improve industrial effectiveness.

a. Key Principles of Scientific Management

Taylor proposed several principles to scientifically optimize work:

- · Scientific analysis of tasks through time and motion studies.
- · Scientific selection and training of workers.
- · Cooperation between management and labour.
- · Division of work between managers and workers.
- · Performance-based pay systems(Simon, 2022, pp. 12–23)

b. Legacy of Scientific Management

Taylor's influence cannot be overstated. Scientific management laid the groundwork for:

- Modern operational management, especially in manufacturing.
- The development of standard operating procedures (SOPs), performance metrics, and workflow analysis (Witzel and Warner, 2015, pp. 55–70)
- The rise of industrial engineering and quality control systems.
- Influences on Fordism, particularly the assembly line production system pioneered by Henry Ford.

Even today, Taylorism principles can be seen in:

- Call centres, where tasks are tightly timed and scripted.
- Fast food chains, such as McDonald's, which use highly standardized processes.
- Software development, particularly in task-tracking systems like Kanban boards or JIRA.

c. Critiques of Scientific Management

Despite its practical impact, scientific management has been widely criticized:

- Mechanization of labour: Workers were taken as mechanisms in a device, not as intelligent, intuition individuals.
- Neglect of psychological and social needs: The focus on productivity and overlooked the importance of motivation, job enjoyment, and collaboration within organization.
- Resistance from labour unions: Most of workers perceived Taylorism as a means of misusing labour for profit rather than developing working conditions.
- Creativity suppression: By reducing work to repetitive tasks, scientific management discouraged innovation and employee initiative.
- These limitations later gave rise to the Human Relations Movement, which sought to address the emotional and social dimensions of work that Taylor overlooked (Smith, 2021)

2.2 Administrative Management – (Henri Fayol, early 20th century)

While Taylor focused on task-level efficiency, Henri Fayol, a French mining engineer and manager, took a broader organizational perspective. His theory of Administrative Management emphasized the principles and functions of management at a macro level what managers do, and how they should manage the organization (Fayol, 1949; Boddy, 2020).

a. Key Contributions of Henri Fayol

Fayol developed 14 principles of management, which include:

- Division of work – Specialization increases output by making employees more efficient.
- Authority and responsibility – Managers must be able to give orders and be responsible for them.
- Discipline – Employees must obey and respect rules.
- Unity of command – Each employee should receive orders from one superior only.
- Unity of direction – Activities with the same objective should be directed by one manager.
- Centralization – The degree to which subordinates are involved in decision making.
- Scalar chain – A clear line of authority from top to bottom.
- Others include equity, order, initiative, remuneration, stability of tenure, etc.

b. Legacy of Fayol's Administrative Theory

Fayol's work remains foundational in the teaching and practice of management. Universally applicable, not just for industrial organizations but for any formal structure, including government, schools, and hospitals. Found in modern organizational charts, planning processes, and hierarchical structures. A major influence on the classical school of management thought. To recognize that management is a definite mastery with its own processes, separate from technical or engineering expertise, Fayol's involvement was mostly significant (Giustiniano et al., 2020, pp. 971–975)

c. Critiques of Administrative Management

- While Fayol's work was visionary, it too has faced criticisms:
- Overemphasis on hierarchy and command, which can lead to rigid, top-down cultures.
- Lack of attention to human factors, like Taylor employees are seen more as resources than as people.
- Limited adaptability, especially in dynamic environments where decentralization and flexibility are necessary.
- Nevertheless, Fayol's emphasis on planning, organizing, and coordination remains a cornerstone of modern management education (Smith, 2021)

2.3 Bureaucratic Theory – Max Weber

Around the same time, Max Weber, a German sociologist, offered a theory of management rooted in rational-legal authority. He was concerned with the chaotic and often arbitrary nature of management in the early industrial era. His solution was the bureaucratic model an ideal type of organization based on formal rules, hierarchy, and impersonal relationships.

a. Key Characters of Bureaucracy

- Clear hierarchy: An organized chain of authority with distinctly defined roles and responsibilities.
- Division of labour: Jobs are divided into specific tasks and assigned to individual within organization.
- Formal directions and methods: Functions are directed by written rules that confirm uniformity.
- Impersonality: Decisions are made because of rational rules, not personal preference or nepotism.
- Merit-based employment: Selection and promotion are based on qualifications and performance.

b. Legacy of Bureaucratic Theory

Weber's theory became the foundation for:

- Public administration in governments around the world.
- Large corporations, especially in finance, healthcare, and education.
- Modern practices such as job descriptions, organizational hierarchies, and civil service examinations.

c. Critiques of Bureaucracy

Despite its stabilizing influence, bureaucracy has been criticized for:

- Inflexibility: Rigid structures often struggle to adapt to rapid change.
- official procedures: Excessive documentation and approvals can delay decision-making process.
- Dehumanization: The impersonal of bureaucracies can lead to alienation among employees.

- Restricting innovation: Strict adherence to process may oppose creative thinking or risk-taking.
- Bureaucratic systems often excel in steady atmospheres but waver in the face of dynamic challenges demanding agility, collaboration, and fast responses trademarks of the 21st-century structural setting (Knights and Clarke, 2017, pp. 337–356)

CHAPTER III

DEVELOPMENTS OF MANAGEMENT THEORY (20TH CENTURY)

3.1 The human relations movement; A Softening of the Edges

Growing dissatisfaction with the mechanistic principles of scientific management were present in early 20th century. Industrial workers were progressively seen as more than just extensions of devices; rather, they were acknowledged as complex individuals with social and psychological needs. As a response to this recognition and sought, the concept of human relations movement arose to realize the role of human behaviour in organizational effectiveness.

3.1.1 Elton Mayo and the Hawthorne Studies (1924–1932)

Elton Mayo, an Australian psychologist and organizational theorist, is often known as the father of the human relations theory. His piece of work on the Hawthorne Survey at the Western Electric Company's in Chicago discovered innovative visual perceptives towards employee behaviour.

At first, the studies aimed to find out the effect of physical conditions particularly lighting on worker productiveness. Amazingly, researchers found that productivity developed not just when conditions are better, but even when they worsen, because of that workers felt they were being observed and cared for. Later, this phenomenon termed as Hawthorne Effect and suggested that psychological and social factors could surpass physical working conditions in determining performance of employee (Muldoon, 2017, pp. 74–94)

Resulting, the studies explored other factors that have a significant impact on worker productivity such as rest breaks, team cohesion, communication, and leadership styles. Furthermore, he concluded that informal work-groups, social relationships, and a sense of belonging considerably affected on worker morale and output.

Criticisms of the Movement

- i. The methods and interpretations of the Hawthorne Studies have been questioned for lack of scientific rigor and over-generalization.
- ii. Critics argue it underplayed structural factors such as wage levels, job security, and power imbalances.

- iii. While advocating for worker satisfaction, it did not always account for worker empowerment or voice in decision-making.

Nevertheless, the Human Relations Movement was instrumental in humanizing the workplace, reminding managers that employees are motivated by more than money, and that their social context greatly impacts their performance (Bruce and Nyland, 2017).

3.2 Behavioural management theories

While the Human Relations Movement emphasized the social context of work, the Behavioral School went further by focusing on individual motivation, needs, and development. For effective management, this school proposed that understanding human needs and motivation is crucial within the organization.

3.2.1 Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (1943)

Abraham Maslow formed a five model of human needs, from the most basic needs like food and shelter to higher-level psychological needs such as esteem and self-actualization needs. According to Maslow, people are motivated to fulfil lower-level needs at first, and once they satisfied, they move on to pursue higher level of needs.

3.2.2 McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y (1960)

An American social psychologist, Douglas McGregor innovate Theory X and Theory Y to depict two different managerial beliefs regarding workers:

- Employees are naturally lazy, lack ambition, and must be controlled by other according to theory X.
- In contrast, employees are self-motivated, enjoy work, and seek responsibility and fulfilment is believed phenomena developed by theory Y.

Rigid control mechanisms are replaced by Theory Y-style leadership, where participation, delegation, and trust are present (McGregor, 1960).

3.2.3 Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1959)

Frederick Herzberg distinguished between:

- i. Hygiene factors such as salary, company policy and working conditions prevent dissatisfaction but don't motivate the employees.

- ii. Motivators like achievement, recognition and growth truly enhance job satisfaction and performance (Hertzberg, Mausner and Snyderman, 1959)

3.2.4 Critiques of Behavioral Theories

Behavioral theories of management, while influential, face several critiques. First, there is a lack of cultural universality, as what motivates an individual in one culture may not motivate a person from another culture, making their application across various settings is highly challenging. Second, many organizations face difficulties to implement strategies like Theory Y or intrinsic motivation in practice, particularly in hierarchical or performance-driven environments so that these theories can be idealistic. Furthermore, human behavior is more complex and variable than the linear models proposed by behavioural theories suggest, making it difficult to predict or manage effectively. Despite these criticisms, behavioral theories have importantly contributed to the improvement of emotional intelligence, leadership development, and job design, all of which have become indispensable components of modern organizational life, shaping how organizations foster talent and improve performance today (Maslow, 1943; Freedman, 2023).

3.3 SYSTEMS THEORY

Organizations are open systems that constantly interact with their surroundings; this was made clear by the middle of the 20th century. Systems Theory, developed by Ludwig von Bertalanffy in 1968 and later applied to organizational studies by theorists like Kenneth Boulding and Daniel Katz, was influenced by the biological and engineering sciences and saw organizations as made up of interconnected components that worked towards a shared objective. Internal processes, directed by feedback mechanisms that support balance and flexibility, convert inputs (resources) into outputs (products or services) in these systems. Systems theory encouraged managers to see organizations as dynamic and flexible rather than static by highlighting the significance of external elements like markets, competition, and regulations. In addition to encouraging cross-functional cooperation and improved information flow, it established the foundation for corporate architecture, organizational development, and strategic management. Systems Theory continues to be a useful framework for comprehending the complexity and interconnection of contemporary organizations, despite criticism for its abstract nature and lack of focus on power dynamics or cultural conflicts.

3.4 Contingency theory

To address the limitations of universal management principles, Contingency Theory emerged in the 1960s and 1970s. Contingency theorists believed that the effectiveness of any management scheme depends on contextual factors so management should focus on other factors rather than advocating a “one-size-fits-all” approach, (Muldoon, 2017)

A. Key Contributors and Ideas

Scholars such as Joan Woodward, Paul Lawrence, and Jay Lorsch studied how organizational structures and strategies varied across industries and environments.

There is no single best way to manage organizational success depends on aligning internal structures with external conditions such as technology, size, and environment. Emphasized fit between organizational design and task environment.

B. Legacy

Contingency theory played a crucial role in repudiating the rigid follow to classical management theories by emphasizing the need for flexibility in organizational design and leadership. They arguing on that the effectiveness of management depends on understanding the unique conditions and challenges of each situation. This perspective set the base for more dynamical and adaptable models, such as Mintzberg’s organizational set up, which highlight the different organizations have different structural needs, and Fiedler’s Contingency Model of Leadership, which emphasizes the leadership style should match with situational factors. These models, grounded in contingency theory, demonstrate that transformation toward a more significance and context-driven approach to management.

C. Critique

Though, the contingency theory of management offers precious modality to customized management pattern based on organizational contexts, also has various limitations. First, it is a complex phenomenon as it makes a process difficult to identify and measure all relevant event which has a significant influence on decision-making. Second, it is often criticized for being too reactive, this approach offers a limited descriptive message on how to tackle with the complex organizational situation. However, despite these drawbacks, the core principle of contingency theory is, fitting the unique conditions of a given situation by adapting management practices remains crucial in today's volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous

(VUCA) business world. This ability to adopt a new management practice to navigate the rapid changes and unpredictability that characterize modern organizational environments.

CHAPTER-IV

CONTEMPORARY MANAGEMENT THEORIES (Late 20th – 21st Century)

Globalization, technical development, digitization, and changing social expectations transformed the management scenery as the 20th century gave way to the 21st. The need for agile, knowledge-rich organizations, data-driven decision-making, remote teams, and quick innovation cycles are just a few of the complex issues that lead to modern theories. An broad scrutiny of the main theories that still shape management theory and practice are explored below.

4.1 Learning Organizations – Peter Senge

A fundamental basis for businesses looking to stay competitive in a world that is becoming more complex and changing quickly is Peter Senge's idea of the learning organization, mentioned in his book named “The Fifth discipline” in 1990. He develops five different disciplines such as mental models, shared vision, systems thinking, personal mastery, and team learning and these are basically intended to encourage current learning at the individual and organizational levels, which in turn encourage the flexibility and creativity at work. By understanding problems in a more comprehensive, interrelated context, the fundamental discipline of systems thinking helps organizations to tackle problems more comprehensively.

These ideas have been adopted by contemporary companies like Google, which promote cultures of cooperation, knowledge exchange, and ongoing learning. In a corporate environment that is changing quickly, Google has retained its competitive edge by promoting both individual and group intelligence. Organizations that implement a learning framework are better able to handle the intricacies of the contemporary business environment, reacting swiftly to shocks and promoting long-term sustainability, as suggested by (Senge, 1990).

4.2 Agile and Lean Management

Lean and Agile Management stand for two different antonymous but distinct epistemology that have change the way organization’s function. Lean Management, applied in the Toyota Production System, is mainly focused on minimizing waste and continuous improvement in production process. Lean generalization used to get rid of non-value-added activities and ensuring that all company resources are utilized as efficiently as possible. On the other hand, Agile Management introduced with the Agile Manifesto in 2001, places a strong focus on

flexibility, customer collaboration, and iterative progress. Unlike Lean, which primarily focuses on process efficiency, Agile promote group to adapt speedily to ever-changing customer needs and market conditions.

Spotify, known for its execution of Agile principles, uses cross-functional teams, or "squads," to promote liberty and adaptability in decision-making process (Kansy, 2024). From software development to healthcare industries use Agile principles in various ways to demonstrates its ability and cognition to help organizations respond fleetly to uncertainty and alteration (Rigby, Elk & Berez, 2020). Both Lean and Agile offer powerful model for companies searching for better efficiency, reduce waste, and foster a culture of continuous improvement in an unforeseeable business environment.

4.3 Knowledge Management and Innovation Theory

Knowledge Creation Theory by (Hoe, 2006) play a pivotal role shaping the field of knowledge management (KM). SECI model (Socialization, Externalization, Combination, and Internalization) by them detail the process through which implied and expressed knowledge are created and shared within organizations. Implied knowledge, which is challenging to systematize, can be changed into expressed knowledge through social interaction, discussion, and collaboration. This ever-changing exchange of knowledge is key to innovation and competitive advantage (Hock-Doepgen et al., 2021)

Apart from this, Christensen's Disruptive Innovation Theory (1997) become fundamental to understand how smaller, innovative companies can compete with dominant market players. (Christensen, 2020) put forward the theory that troubled innovations are typically simpler, more affordable alternatives that initially serve niche markets but sooner or later replace more accepted products or services. Institution such as Netflix represent the disruptive innovation by investing in technological advancements to create new business models that surpass the traditional competitors. As Christensen and his colleagues emphasize (2020), firms must balance prolong innovations to improve existing products with disruptive innovations as breakthrough innovations to maintain long-run competitiveness.

4.4 Digital and Platform Economy Theories

The appearance of platform economy models has basically transformed the business landscape. (Parker, Van Alstyne, and Choudary, 2016) introduced platform theory, identifying differences between traditional pipeline businesses and platform businesses. In traditional businesses, they create and deliver value directly to customers, and in platform

businesses, they facilitate exchanges between users and service providers. These platforms leverage network effects, as more users participate, and data feedback loops support to continuously refine and improve their offerings then value of a product or service increases. Amazon and Airbnb, famous Digital platforms have redefined traditional industries by using technology to make scale-able, asset-light business models.

For instance, Airbnb provide a separate platform to the owners of property to directly link up with travellers and changed the hospitality industry by breaking the traditional hotel model. Similarly, to alleviate the growth of third-party sellers, leveraging vast amounts of data and by creating feedback loops to optimize its trading operations to alleviate the growth of third-party sellers, leveraging vast amounts of data and feedback loops to optimize its trading operations, Amazon also utilized its platform model (Parker, Van Alstyne, & Choudary, 2024). In the context of the global digital economy, the scalability and adaptability of platform-based businesses are especially valuable, where rapid expansion and data-driven decision-making are crucial for success.

Platform models support organizations to bypass traditional structure constraints, allowing for more flexible, efficient, and user-driven solutions. These digital platforms play an important role to develop global business system by creating new opportunities for growth, innovation, and customer involvement (Parker, Van Alstyne & Choudary, 2024).

CHAPTER V

CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES AND CONTRIBUTION OF CONTEMPORARY MANAGEMENT THEORISTS AND THEIR THEORIES IN MANAGEMENT

In the 21st century, the management scenery has changed drastically, with organizations facing numerous new challenges that demand a redefinition of conventional leadership and management practices.

Present-day management realized the necessarily to address the complex interaction of globalization, technological advancements, changing work dynamics, shifting societal values, and the demand for speed and agility in decision-making process. Organizations must adapt to these challenges and rethink how they lead, manage, and engage their employees to remain competitive and sustainable in today's business environment.

To addressing these modern challenges faced by today's organizations, contemporary management concept provides significant contribution. These contributions span have various field, including globalization, technology, workplace shift, ethical responsibility, agility, and the persistence of traditional management thinking. The following section outlines various issues and how theorists and their models respond to these challenges.

5.1 Globalization: Managing Cultural Diversity and Decentralized Operations

Scope of organizational operations is now becoming wider because of Globalization and introducing various challenges such as managing culturally diverse teams and decentralized structures. Effectiveness of communication, leadership expectations, and employee engagement is highly affected by Cultural diversity. So, Managers must create intercultural competency to promote comprehensive circle that value diverse orientation (Stahl et al., 2020). Failure to recognize cultural variation may create misunderstandings among employees, decreased productivity, and lead towards workplace conflicts.

Furthermore, decentralized trading operations enabled by global expansion and remote working technologies require perfect leaders because while granting local autonomy at that time he/she should maintain alignment with corporate values. Managers must balance international uniformity with local responsiveness, often done through distributed leadership and cross-border coordination scheme (Joshi et al., 2021). As businesses become more

globalized, the knowledge to incorporate diverse teams and manage practical coordination effectively is becoming a core managerial skill (Ang and Van Dyne, 2022).

To address globalization issue, Peter Senge's Systems Thinking, part of his wide theory defined in *The Fifth Discipline* (1990), emphasizes the interdependence of organizational elements and their surroundings. Senge's work encourages managers to adopt a holistic view in the context of globalization and help to manage cultural diversity. This approach helps leaders understand how decentralized operations and cultural dynamics interact within a broader organizational system.

Moreover, Geert Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions Theory is directly applicable in cross-cultural management. His attribute such as individualism vs. collectivism, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance supports managers to plan effective communication and decision-making scheme that are delicate to cultural shade. Together, these theories help to build cultural intelligence, comprehensive leadership exercise, and globally competent squad.

5.2 Technology: The Impact of AI, Automation, and Big Data

The integration of AI, automation, and big data analytic is radically reshaping the management viewpoint. AI-driven systems now carry out cognitive tasks like pattern recognition, decision-making, and natural language processing, creating both opportunities and fears of manpower replacement (Davenport and Ronanki, 2018). By fostering human-machine collaboration, managers must administer technological acceptance in a way that augments rather than replaces human capabilities,

Moreover, big data provides immense volumes of information that require effective analysis and interpretation. The challenge lies in cultivating data literacy among leaders and ensuring ethical data governance (George, Merrill and Schillebeeckx, 2020). Decision-making is increasingly data-driven, yet managers must guard against bias and over-reliance on algorithms, reinforcing transparency and privacy (Lindebaum, Vesa and den Hond, 2020). Balancing efficiency with ethical responsibility is a critical management concern in the digital era.

However, Thomas H. Davenport and Jeanne G. Harris's work on *Competing on analytic* (2007) mark the strategic use of big data and predictive analytic. Their frameworks guide managers in leveraging AI and automation, not just for efficiency, but for strategic decision-making. They emphasize building an analytical capability within organizations—one that integrates human judgment with machine intelligence.

Erik and Andrew further address the implications of The Second Machine Age (2014). They argue for complementarity between humans and intelligent systems. Managers are urged to redesign jobs, invest in digital upskilling, and foster human-machine collaboration—crucial in a time when automation is redefining work.

5.3 Workplace Change: Remote Work, Flexible Teams, and the Gig Economy

Remote and hybrid work arrangements have accelerated in the post-pandemic period and reshaping management model. Managers face various challenges like ensure productivity, collaboration, and engagement without physical proximity. Leading virtual teams requires digital fluency, emotional intelligence, and outcome-focused performance monitoring (Kniffin et al., 2021).

Additionally, the rise of the gig economy has diversified employment models. Many organizations now manage a mix of permanent employees, freelancers, and contractors, necessitating new strategies for team integration and loyalty-building (Kellogg, Valentine and Christin, 2020). These flexible workforce structures demand agile leadership, adaptive communication, and dynamic resource allocation (Ashford, Caza and Reid, 2020). Cultivating belonging and performance in non-traditional teams is an evolving managerial challenge.

Agile methodology, originally planned for software development, has become a powerful model for flexible, team-based management. The Agile Manifesto (2001) boost responsiveness, continuous feedback, and cross-functional collaboration for making it ideally appropriate for managing remote teams, gig workers, and dynamic project environments. Leaders using Agile concept basically focus on outcomes, autonomy, and trust rather than rigid hierarchies and control system in workplace.

Brian Robertson's Holacracy extends this concept, replacing traditional management hierarchies with self-managing teams. Holacracy distributes authority across roles instead individuals to make it adaptable for managing decentralized, flexible teams in a post-pandemic world. This heightens employee engagement, innovation, and adaptability attribute necessary in the gig economy.

5.4 Values Shift: Emphasis on Purpose, Ethics, and Sustainability

For ethical and sustainable conduct consumers, investors, and regulators create a pressure so there is a growing shift toward purpose-driven business practices. Alongside profits, organizations are now expected to deliver social and environmental value (Eccles, Ioannou and Serafeim, 2014). This alteration creates numerous challenges for managers to adjust firm strategies with Environmental, Social, and Governance objectives.

Integrating ethics and sustainability into decision-making processes needed a leader to prioritize long-term effect over short-term profit (Kiron et al., 2022). Managers must also improve stakeholder transparency and accountability, especially as ESG metrics become standardized in corporate reporting. The ability to lead with purpose and foster ethical cultures is increasingly seen as a source of competitive advantage (Mayer, 2021).

Ed Freeman's Stakeholder Theory challenges the shareholder-centric framework by emphasizing the value of all stakeholders, employees, customers, communities, and the environment. This aligns nearly with the modern-day importance on ethical management, corporate purpose, and sustainability.

John Elkington's Triple Bottom Line (People, Planet, Profit) further builds on this by encouraging the organizations to measure success not only in economic status but also in social and environmental consequence. These frameworks help managers to match their business strategies with corporate social responsibility (CSR) and environmental, social, and governance (ESG) metrics, addressing the increasing demand for ethical and sustainable practices.

5.5 Speed and Complexity: The Need for Agility and Rapid Decision-Making

"The modern business environment is pronounced by unprecedented speed and complexity, driven by technological innovation, market volatility, and geopolitical uncertainty. Managers must embrace agility by adapting strategies, reallocating resources, and making decisions in real time" (Rigby, Elk and Berez, 2020). Traditional hierarchical decision-making processes are too slow for today's demands.

Effective leaders now must foster decentralized decision-making, enabling cross-functional teams to act swiftly and autonomously. It requires culture of trust, rapid feedback loops, and real-time data usage (Brosseau et al., 2019). Moreover, agility must be balanced with

strategic alignment by ensuring that quick decisions within the company support long-term objectives. It is essential to Navigate uncertainty through adaptability.

John Kotter, through his hypothesis of Leading Change and Accelerate (XLR8) (2014), introduced the idea of the dual operating system. This is a balancing system in between a traditional hierarchy and a network of agile teams. Organizations remain stable while also being nimble enough to seize emerging opportunities only because of dual structure.

Rita McGrath's Discovery-Driven Planning emphasizes making conclusion amid uncertainty by focusing on learning, experimentation, and repetitive testing. This theory is appropriate with today's need for real-time decision-making under volatile conditions. Managers can adopt this approach to avoid the paralysis that comes from waiting for complete information in complex circle.

CHAPTER-VI

ENDURING TRADITIONAL PRACTICES IN CONTEMPORARY ORGANIZATIONS

Traditional management model like Taylor, Fayol and, Weber still applied in many industries, even in the face of the growth of dynamic models like Agile, Lean, Systems Thinking, and platform-based tactics. This is particularly apparent in legacy businesses, public services, and bureaucratic firms that continue to operate using early 20th-century idea derived from Administrative Theory and Scientific Management are still deeply embedded in the routines, hierarchies, and performance measurement systems of today's institutions.

6.1 Structural Rigidity in Modern Corporations

Most modern corporations still operate under bureaucratic and hierarchical models that mirror the visions of Fayol and Weber. The vertical organizational chart, with clear lines of authority, centralization of decision-making, and formal chains of command, continues to be the norm in many large-scale enterprises. These structures may provide predictability and order, but they also restrict rapid decision-making and creativity, which are critical in fast-changing environments.

Example: Traditional financial institutions like HSBC or Citibank have maintained multi-tiered hierarchies with rigid departmentalization. Despite the push towards digital transformation, innovation often stalls due to complex approval chains, centralized decision-making, and departmental silos. This rigidity has made it challenging for these institutions to compete with agile fintech firms such as Revolut or Stripe, which prioritize flexibility, flat hierarchies, and customer-centric innovation.

6.2 Taylorism in the Age of Algorithms

Taylor's scientific management, with its focus on optimizing worker productivity through measurement and control, has found a digital reincarnation in algorithmic management. Many organizations use software to monitor employee productivity, assign tasks, and evaluate performance practices rooted in Taylorism ideology.

Example: Amazon's warehouse operations are often cited as a modern-day embodiment of Taylorism. Employees are assigned tasks by algorithm, and their movements are tracked using wearable devices and surveillance systems. Performance is continually monitored, with quotas and metrics determining shift targets and rest times. Worker's report experiencing

extreme pressure and burnout, reminiscent of the industrial-era critiques of mechanistic labor conditions. Though enhanced by digital technology, the fundamental principles mirror Taylor's belief in task optimization and managerial control.

6.3 Bureaucratic Governance in Public and Non-Profit Sectors

Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy remains particularly influential in government bodies, universities, and health institutions. These sectors often value formal rules, documentation, and a hierarchical distribution of roles. While this structure advances order and accountability, it often affects flexibility and provides response to external change (Hamel and Zanini, 2020). Top-down authority separates front-line staff from strategic input, creating a gap between operational realism and executive judgment, which limits the organization's ability to innovate or adaptability (Alvesson and Sveningsson, 2020).

Such firms frequently encourage a culture where employees are considered as task executors rather than strategic contributors. Ultimately, this strategy discourages innovation and quality, which let down morale and performance (Parker, 2021). Rigid hierarchies are becoming less and less relevant in today's business climate, when flexibility and employee empowerment are essential for success (Hodgkinson and Healey, 2023).

Example: Many national healthcare systems, such as the UK's National Health Service (NHS), are governed by intricate bureaucratic frameworks that make systemic change exceedingly difficult. The COVID-19 pandemic exposed these limitations, with delays in decision-making and resource allocation stemming from bureaucratic red tape. Even when agility and real-time response were urgently needed, the systems remained mired in protocol and paperwork.

6.4 Legacy of Division of Labor and Specialization

Fayol's and Taylor's advocacy for division of labour continues to shape modern job roles and departmental boundaries. In large organizations, employees are often confined to narrow roles, discouraging cross-functional collaboration and innovation. While it promotes efficiency, it restricts learning and reduces opportunities for innovation and employee development (Grant, 2021). Repetitive, narrowly defined roles may increase short-term productivity but contribute to employee disengagement and limit adaptability (Witzel and Warner, 2015, pp. 55–70).

Organizations reliant on hyper-specialization become vulnerable when skilled individuals are absent or leave, disrupting workflow and institutional knowledge. Furthermore, such siloed

roles hinder collaboration and interdisciplinary problem-solving—both of which are crucial for innovation in today’s complex work environments (Mayo, 2020)

Example: In traditional automotive companies like Ford or GM, departments such as engineering, marketing, and production still operate as silos. This creates challenges in responding to market shifts, such as the transition to electric vehicles, which require integrated thinking across technology, policy, consumer behaviour, and environmental design. In contrast, Tesla's more fluid structure allows for rapid collaboration across units, enabling faster innovation and iteration.

6.5 KPIs and Performance Metrics: A Taylorism Legacy

The use of performance metrics such as KPIs (Key Performance Indicators), OKRs (Objectives and Key Results), and balanced scorecards are ubiquitous in corporate settings. While these tools provide clarity and focus, they often prioritize short-term outputs over long-term learning and creativity. Performance is still evaluated in isolation from real-time feedback or employee development, leading to short-termism and demotivation (Hamel and Zanini, 2020). The continued use of these outdated models restricts agility, reduces psychological safety, and limits innovation hindering the organization's ability to compete in dynamic environments (Hodgkinson and Healey, 2023).

Example: In many multinational corporations, quarterly reviews revolve around meeting sales quotas, cost-reduction targets, or efficiency gains—quantifiable outputs deeply influenced by Taylor's principles. This can lead to practices such as “managing to the metric,” where employees focus on gaming the system rather than genuine value creation. It also fosters a culture where failure is penalized rather than seen as a learning opportunity, contrary to what contemporary management theorists advocate.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

The development of management theory tells a story of constant adaptation, from the industrial efficiency of the 19th century to the complex need of the digital era. Classical scientist such as Frederick Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber set the foundational pillars of management standardization, hierarchy, and control designed to maximize productivity during the rise of industrial capitalism. These models, despite their historical connection, still heavily influence how many organizations operate today.

In a similar vein, this essay has critically examined how, despite significant shifts in the technological, social, and economic landscape of the twenty-first century, management as a science and practice is still influenced by the fundamental concepts of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Many contemporary organisational structures and performance systems bear the ongoing impact of Weber's Bureaucracy, Fayol's Administrative Theory, and Taylor's Scientific Management. Their focus on hierarchy, control, and standardisation continues to shape management philosophy in a variety of industries, including public administration, industry, and finance.

Nonetheless, current theorists like Clayton Christensen, Nonaka and Takeuchi, and Peter Senge have tried to reconcile ancient ideas with the present demand for creativity, adaptability, and knowledge-based economies. Despite providing strong alternatives like knowledge creation, disruptive innovation, and learning organisations, these concepts have not been widely adopted. This lag in evolution is caused by several factors, including resistance to change, structural inertia, the superficial adoption of contemporary methods, and the persistence of classical education models.

Holding onto antiquated management paradigms stifles organisational potential in a time of digital revolution, flexible business models, and increased ethical and social responsibilities. Management philosophy needs to alter more profoundly to fully address the difficulties of the twenty-first century. This shift must go beyond little adjustments and incorporate new principles that are based on flexibility, teamwork, and human growth. Only then will management be able to change with the ever-changing world it aims to control and enhance.

REFERENCES

- Bertolaso, M. and Rocchi, M., 2022. Specifically human: Human work and care in the age of machines. *Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility*, 31(3).
- Birkinshaw, J., 2022. Move fast and break things: Reassessing IB research in the light of the digital revolution. *Global Strategy Journal*, 12(4).
- Boddy, D., 2019. *Management*. Pearson UK.
- Brosseau, D., Ebrahim, S., Handscomb, C. and Thaker, S., 2019. The journey to an agile organization. McKinsey & Company, May 10.
- Caza, B.B., Reid, E.M., Ashford, S.J. and Granger, S.E., 2020. It's Cold Outside: Measuring the Challenges of Independent (Gig) Work. In: *Academy of Management Proceedings*. Academy of Management.
- Christensen, T., Lægreid, P. and Røvik, K.A., 2020. *Organization theory and the public sector: Instrument, culture and myth*. Routledge.
- Daft, R.L. and Armstrong, A., 2021. *Organization theory and design*. Cengage Canada.
- Davenport, T.H. and Ronanki, R., 2018. Artificial intelligence for the real world. HBR's 10 Must Reads.
- Eccles, R.G., Ioannou, I. and Serafeim, G., 2014. The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. *Management Science*, 60(11).
- Fayol, H., 2016. *General and industrial management*. Ravenio Books.
- George, G., Merrill, R.K. and Schillebeeckx, S.J., 2021. Digital sustainability and entrepreneurship: How digital innovations are helping tackle climate change and sustainable development. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 45(5).
- Giustiniano, L., e Cunha, M.P., Simpson, A.V., Rego, A. and Clegg, S., 2020. Resilient leadership as paradox work: Notes from COVID-19. *Management and Organization Review*, 16(5).
- Goleman, D., 2005. *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R.E. and McKee, A., 2013. Primal leadership: Unleashing the power of emotional intelligence. Harvard Business Press.

Grant, R.M., 2021. Contemporary strategy analysis. John Wiley & Sons.

Hamel, G. and Zanini, M., 2020. Humanocracy: Creating organizations as amazing as the people inside them. Harvard Business Press.

Hertzberg, F., Mausner, B. and Snyderman, B., 1959. The motivation to work. New York.

Hill, L.A., Brandeau, G., Truelove, E. and Lineback, K., 2014. Collective genius: The art and practice of leading innovation. Harvard Business Review Press.

Hock-Doepgen, M., Clauss, T., Kraus, S. and Cheng, C.F., 2021. Knowledge management capabilities and organizational risk-taking for business model innovation in SMEs. *Journal of Business Research*, 130.

Hoe, S.L., 2006. Tacit knowledge, Nonaka and Takeuchi SECI model and informal knowledge processes. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 9(4).

Hodgkinson, G.P., Burkhard, B., Foss, N.J., Grichnik, D., Sarala, R.M., Tang, Y. and Van Essen, M., 2023. The heuristics and biases of top managers: Past, present, and future. *Journal of Management Studies*, 60(5).

Joshi, Y., Uniyal, D.P. and Sangroya, D., 2021. Investigating consumers' green purchase intention: Examining the role of economic value, emotional value and perceived marketplace influence. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 328.

KANSY, D., 2024. Agile values in a modern organization. *Scientific Papers of Silesian University of Technology. Organization & Management*, (214).

Katz, D. and Kahn, R., 2015. The social psychology of organizations. In: *Organizational Behavior 2*. Routledge.

Kellogg, K.C., Valentine, M.A. and Christin, A., 2020. Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1).

Kniffin, K.M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F., Antonakis, J., Ashford, S.P., Bakker, A.B., Bamberger, P., Bapuji, H., Bhawe, D.P., Choi, V.K. and Creary, S.J., 2021. COVID-19 and the workplace: Implications, issues, and insights for future research and action. *American Psychologist*, 76(1).

Knights, D. and Clarke, C., 2017. Pushing the boundaries of amnesia and myopia: A critical review of the literature on identity in management and organization studies. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19(3).

Kumar, V., Abbas, A.K., Fausto, N. and Aster, J.C., 2014. Robbins and Cotran pathologic basis of disease, professional edition e-book. Elsevier Health Sciences.

Lawrence, P.R., Lorsch, J.W. and Garrison, J.S., 1967. Organization and environment: Managing differentiation and integration.

Lindebaum, D., Vesa, M. and Den Hond, F., 2020. Insights from “The Machine Stops” to better understand rational assumptions in algorithmic decision making and its implications for organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(1).

Livermore, D., Van Dyne, L. and Ang, S., 2022. Organizational CQ: Cultural intelligence for 21st-century organizations. *Business Horizons*, 65(5).

Maslow, A.H., 1943. A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4)

Mayo, E., 2004. The human problems of an industrial civilization. Routledge.

Mayer, R.E., 2021. Evidence-based principles for how to design effective instructional videos. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 10(2).

McGregor, D., 1960. The Human Side of Enterprise. McGraw-Hill.

Mintzberg, H., 1994. Rise and fall of strategic planning. Simon and Schuster.

Muldoon, J., 2017. The Hawthorne studies: an analysis of critical perspectives, 1936–1958. *Journal of Management History*, 23(1).

Nyland, K. et al., 2017. An application of multi-band forced photometry to one square degree of SERVS: Accurate photometric redshifts and implications for future science. *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 230(1).

Parker, G.G., Van Alstyne, M.W. and Choudary, S.P., 2016. Platform revolution: How networked markets are transforming the economy and how to make them work for you. WW Norton & Company.

Parker, G. and Van Alstyne, M., 2024. Platforms: Their structure, benefits, and challenges. In: Werthner, H., Ghezzi, C., Kramer, J., Nida-Rümelin, J., Nuseibeh, B. and Prem, E., eds.

Rigby, D.K., Elk, S. and Berez, S., 2020. Doing agile right: Transformation without chaos. Harvard Business Press.

Rigby, D.K., Sutherland, J. and Noble, A., 2018. Agile at scale. *Harvard Business Review*, 96(3).

Senge, P., 1990. Peter Senge and the learning organization. *Dimension*, 14.

Simon, N., 2022. Is temporal continuity shared by the brain and self? A combined behavioral-EEG study (Doctoral dissertation, Carleton University).

Smith, D., 2021. Is temporal continuity shared by the brain and self? A combined behavioral-EEG study (Doctoral dissertation, Carleton University).

Stahl, G.K., Brewster, C.J., Collings, D.G. and Hajro, A., 2020. Enhancing the role of human resource management in corporate sustainability and social responsibility: A multi-stakeholder, multidimensional approach to HRM. *Human Resource Management Review*, 30(3).

Sveningsson, S. and Alvesson, M., 2020. Global leadership: Sustaining classic managerialism. In: *Research Handbook of Global Leadership*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Taylor, F.W., 1911. *The principles of scientific management*. Noton & Company.

Varshney, S., Gora, A.H., Siriyappagounder, P., Kiron, V. and Olsvik, P.A., 2022. Toxicological effects of 6PPD and 6PPD quinone in zebrafish larvae. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 424. Weber, M., 2009. *The theory of social and economic organization*. Simon and Schuster.

Witzel, M. and Warner, M., 2015. Taylorism revisited: Culture, management theory and paradigm-shift. *Journal of General Management*, 40(3).

Yukl, G., Mahsud, R., Hassan, S. and Prussia, G.E., 2013. An improved measure of ethical leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(1).