

MODULE: LCDB7008

**Visions for the Future :
Theoretical Perspectives on Management**

ASSIGNMENT TITLE:

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

REPORT

Student Name: Fan SHI

Student Number: 2325423

Supervisor: Dr. Amare Desta

WORD COUNT : 7,986

SUBMISSION DATE : April 20th, 2025

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	3
INTRODUCTION	4
HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND THEORETICAL EVOLUTION	6
• Early to Mid 20th Century	
• Mid to Late 20th Century	
• Late 20th to 21st Century	
MORGAN’S METAPHORS AND THE PERSISTENCE OF MANAGEMENT PARADIGMS	15
• Interpreting Tradition Through Metaphor	
• Why Scientific Management Still Works in the Algorithmic Age	
• Bureaucracy in the Digital State and Corporate Hybrids	
• Administrative Control in KPI and MBO Systems	
THEORETICAL INTEGRATION AND ORGANISATIONAL RESPONSES TO CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES	18
• Challenges of Contemporary Management	
• Organisational Culture as a Medium of Integration	
• The Paradox of Changing Organisational Culture	
• Strategies for Theoretical Integration	
• Case Studies of Cultural and Theoretical Integration	
CONCLUSION AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES	25
• Rethinking What Theory Is For	
• Managing Through Paradox, Not Certainty	
• Leadership Beyond Competency Models	
• Designing for Reflexivity, Not Just Control	
• Future Trajectories: Toward Humanistic and Plural Management	
APPENDIX	29
• List of References	

1.

Abstract

Has management truly evolved—or merely changed its clothes?

This paper explores that question by critically examining the claim that, despite sweeping changes in technology, globalisation, and workforce expectations, management theory remains stuck in paradigms born in the 19th century. By tracing the evolution of management thought—from Taylor’s scientific management and Weber’s bureaucracy to contemporary ideas like emotional intelligence, cultural leadership, and reflexive systems—it challenges the assumption that little has changed.

Using Gareth Morgan’s organisational metaphors as a lens, the study reveals that traditional management logics still influence many modern organisations—not always in obvious ways, but through embedded structures, language, and behaviours. Yet through case studies of Burberry, Starbucks China, and Huawei, it also shows how these long-standing ideas are being reimagined: blended with human-centred, culturally sensitive, and innovation-driven approaches that better reflect the complexity of today’s business world.

Rather than being obsolete, classical theories continue to provide structure—but they are now being reinterpreted to meet contemporary needs. This paper argues that management has not failed to evolve; it has evolved differently—not by abandoning the past, but by adapting and reconfiguring it. The conclusion calls for continued research into hybrid logics, emotionally intelligent leadership, and context-aware management models that align with the realities of a fast-changing, human-focused organisational landscape.

2.

Introduction

Are We Still Managing Machines in a Human-Centric World?

Since the late 19th century, the rise of large-scale industrial organisations gave birth to modern management theory. Foundational models such as Taylor’s scientific management, Weber’s bureaucracy, and Fayol’s administrative theory laid the groundwork for what became known as the “golden age” of 20th-century management. These classical frameworks offered clarity, control, and efficiency, and shaped organisational practice across much of the last century (Wilkinson et al., 2017).

But the 21st century presents an entirely different landscape. The Fourth Industrial Revolution (Industry 4.0)—driven by artificial intelligence, automation, data analytics, cyber-physical systems, and digital ecosystems—has fundamentally changed how value is created. In this new environment, assets are increasingly intangible: organisational learning, talent agility, data, and innovation capacity now matter more than fixed capital or physical infrastructure. Likewise, value no longer stems solely from efficiency and scale, but from experience, adaptability, and stakeholder collaboration across networks.

Yet, despite these seismic shifts, many organisations remain tied to 20th-century models—structurally and culturally grounded in control, hierarchy, and predictability. This creates an unresolved tension between legacy mindsets and the demands of a fast-changing, hyperconnected, and human-focused economy.

This report explores that paradox. It examines how traditional management theories—shaped by industrial-era assumptions—still influence today’s practices, despite decades of theoretical evolution. Using Gareth Morgan’s organisational metaphors, the report argues that enduring mental models (like viewing organisations as machines) have contributed to the slow transformation of management thinking. At the same time, comparing 20th- and 21st-century paradigms reveals clear shifts: from shareholder value to stakeholder value, from command to collaboration, and from control to co-creation.

To address this, the report takes a two-pronged approach. First, it offers a critical literature review tracing the evolution of management theory—from classical models to contemporary approaches such as systems thinking, emotional intelligence, and transformational leadership. Second, it draws on real-world examples from Burberry, Starbucks, and Huawei to explore how organisations are blending traditional and modern logics into hybrid management models that balance structural discipline with adaptive agility.

While some insights may be relevant to public sector organisations, this report focuses primarily on the private sector—particularly market-driven, innovation-led enterprises. To address these questions, the report is structured into four parts:

Part 1 provides the introduction, outlining the historical background, research rationale, theoretical framing, and report objectives. It also introduces the tension between traditional and contemporary management logics and explains the relevance of Morgan’s metaphorical framework.

Part 2 traces the evolution of management theory from the early 20th century to the present, examining how classical models such as scientific management, bureaucracy, and administrative control continue to influence contemporary thinking. It also introduces Gareth Morgan’s metaphorical framework to understand how enduring mental models continue to shape organisational logic and structure.

Part 3 builds on this foundation by exploring how these paradigms persist in practice. Using Morgan’s metaphors, it reveals how traditional management assumptions—such as control, predictability, and mechanistic thinking—still underpin many modern organisational behaviours, often in subtle and symbolic ways.

Part 4 shifts the focus to how traditional and contemporary management theories are being integrated in response to emerging challenges. Through critical literature analysis and case studies from Burberry, Starbucks China, and Huawei, this section examines how organisations are blending structural control with cultural adaptability, emotional intelligence, and strategic flexibility to meet 21st-century demands.

Finally, **Part 5** concludes the report by synthesising the key findings, challenging the idea that management is obsolete, and offering directions for future theory and practice in an increasingly human-centric, digitally driven world.

3.

Historical Context and Theoretical Evolution

From Control to Complexity: How Management Theories Reflect Their Times

The 20th century marked a transformative era in the development of management theory. As industrialisation intensified and large organisations became the dominant mode of economic activity, the need for systematic approaches to planning, organising, and controlling work gave rise to foundational management models. These early theories emerged not merely as academic frameworks but as practical responses to real-world problems—how to maximise productivity, structure authority, motivate workers, and maintain control in increasingly complex settings. Four of the most influential schools of thought from this period are scientific management, bureaucratic theory, administrative theory, and the human relations movement. Though developed in an industrial age, the influence of these models has extended well into the digital era, continuing to shape modern organisational structures and managerial assumptions.

Building on this historical context, this section presents a critical review of key theoretical models that have defined different phases in the evolution of management thought. The analysis follows a roughly chronological sequence, not to suggest linear progress, but to understand how each paradigm was shaped by—and in turn responded to—the demands and tensions of its time. Altogether, the chapter provides a theoretical foundation for understanding how modern management has evolved across time, and sets the stage for examining its integration and practical relevance in contemporary contexts.

3.1 Early to Mid 20th Century: From Control to Human Understanding

The early to mid-20th century witnessed the institutionalisation of management as a formal discipline. Rooted in the context of industrial expansion and large-scale manufacturing, management during this era was primarily concerned with designing systems that could ensure efficiency, predictability, and control. The dominant view positioned organisations as technical mechanisms, and workers as components within a broader productive system. Accordingly, management was conceived as a scientific and hierarchical function aimed at optimising output while maintaining order.

This period gave rise to several foundational theories, each representing distinct approaches to the challenges of authority, efficiency, and human motivation. While some of these models have since been reinterpreted or critiqued, they continue to underpin many organisational practices and mindsets today.

3.1.1 Scientific Management – F. W. Taylor

Frederick Winslow Taylor's scientific management, developed in the early 20th century, laid the groundwork for the managerial focus on control and standardisation. Based on the principle that there is "one best way" to perform any task, Taylor advocated for the decomposition of work into discrete, measurable actions and the scientific selection and training of workers (Taylor, 1911).

At its core, scientific management emphasised the separation of planning from execution: managers were responsible for analysing and designing efficient workflows, while workers executed tasks under close supervision. Time-and-motion studies, differential piece-rate systems, and incentive schemes were introduced to maximise productivity and minimise waste.

Although Taylorism significantly improved efficiency in industrial settings, it has been criticised for its mechanistic view of labour, neglecting the emotional, social, and intellectual dimensions of work. Scholars such as Braverman (1974) and Derksen (2014) argue that the dehumanising aspects of Taylor's approach contributed to workplace alienation. Nevertheless, the legacy of scientific management persists in contemporary performance metrics, algorithmic task management, and lean operations.

3.1.2 Bureaucratic Organisation – Max Weber

Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy presented a sociological framework for understanding authority and legitimacy in modern organisations. In contrast to charismatic or traditional authority, Weber proposed a model of legal-rational authority, characterised by impersonal rules, formal hierarchies, and a clear division of labour (Weber, 1947).

Weber outlined six core elements of bureaucracy: hierarchical structure, codified rules, functional specialisation, merit-based recruitment, impersonality, and separation of the official role from the individual. These mechanisms were intended to ensure consistency, fairness, and administrative efficiency.

While Weber viewed bureaucracy as a rational and technically superior form of organisation, he also warned of its potential to create an "iron cage" of rule-bound rationality, stifling individual autonomy and creativity. Later theorists such as Merton (1940) and Gouldner (1954) expanded on this critique, identifying dysfunctions such as rigidity, goal displacement, and ritualism. Despite these limitations, bureaucracy remains integral to large-scale governance and institutional accountability.

3.1.3 Administrative Management – Henri Fayol

Henri Fayol approached management as a universal function applicable across all types of organisations. In contrast to Taylor's focus on task optimisation, Fayol was concerned with broader organisational coordination and strategic direction. He articulated five primary functions

of management—planning, organising, commanding, coordinating, and controlling—alongside 14 principles such as unity of command and scalar chain (Fayol, 1949).

Fayol's administrative theory positioned managers not just as supervisors but as architects of organisational structure and culture. His work laid the foundation for later developments in strategic planning, control systems, and management education. Recent reinterpretations by Hatchuel and Segrestin (2018) have reframed Fayol not as a rigid administrator but as an early theorist of innovation and organisational creativity, linking his ideas to Enlightenment rationality and managerial agency.

Critics have argued that Fayol's model is overly formalistic and insufficiently responsive to change, yet its influence endures in hierarchical coordination, formalised roles, and process standardisation in both public and private sectors.

3.1.4 Human Relations Movement – Elton Mayo

The Human Relations Movement, initiated in the 1930s, challenged the assumptions of scientific and administrative management by foregrounding the psychological and social needs of workers. Led by Elton Mayo and colleagues at Harvard, this school of thought emerged from the famous Hawthorne Studies, which demonstrated that worker productivity was influenced not just by physical conditions but also by attention, recognition, and social cohesion (Mayo, 1933).

Mayo proposed that organisations should be understood as social systems, with informal relationships, group norms, and emotional climates playing a crucial role in performance. This represented a fundamental shift from seeing workers as economic agents to viewing them as individuals embedded in social contexts.

While the movement laid the groundwork for modern organisational behaviour and HR practices, it has been critiqued for romanticising harmony and downplaying conflict, power asymmetries, and structural inequalities (Bendix, 1956). Nonetheless, its insights into motivation, leadership, and group dynamics remain deeply embedded in contemporary management thinking.

3.1.5 Theory X and Y, Managerial Grid – McGregor, Blake & Mouton

Douglas McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y offered a psychological lens on managerial assumptions about human motivation. Theory X posited that employees are inherently lazy and must be coerced, while Theory Y assumed that people are self-directed and seek fulfilment through work (McGregor, 1960). These contrasting views shaped managerial style, from authoritarian control to participative engagement.

Building on this, Blake and Mouton (1964) introduced the Managerial Grid, a diagnostic model mapping leadership behaviour along axes of concern for people and concern for production. This tool aimed to help managers evaluate and develop more balanced leadership styles.

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

8

While both models have been criticised for oversimplification and cultural bias, they signalled a broader turn toward psychological insight and interpersonal dynamics in management. Their influence endures in leadership development programmes, employee engagement strategies, and performance coaching.

3.2 Mid to Late 20th Century: A shift toward systemic, strategic, and context-responsive approaches to management

In the latter half of the 20th century, organisations faced mounting complexity due to globalisation, technological disruption, and shifting societal expectations. This environment demanded adaptive management approaches that could respond to instability, ambiguity, and diversity. Theories emerging during this time increasingly viewed organisations not as closed systems governed by rigid control, but as dynamic entities shaped by context, feedback, and human agency.

This section introduces five influential models that reflect this epistemological shift: operations and quality management, management by objectives, systems thinking, contingency theory, and the learning organisation. Collectively, these models challenged the one-size-fits-all logic of earlier paradigms and redefined effectiveness as situational, participatory, and process-oriented.

3.2.1 Operations & Quality Management

Operations and quality management transitioned from manufacturing techniques into comprehensive management philosophies. Influential contributors such as Deming, Juran, and Ohno developed practices—like Total Quality Management (TQM), Six Sigma, and the Toyota Production System—that combined statistical process control with employee involvement and continuous improvement (Deming, 1986).

The emphasis on standardisation, waste elimination, and customer value marked a shift from hierarchical supervision to team-based accountability and real-time problem-solving. Nonetheless, critics like Adler and Borys (1996) warned that excessive routinisation could stifle innovation and diminish intrinsic motivation. Even so, operations management remains central in today's service design, supply chains, and digital workflow optimisation.

3.2.2 Management by Objectives (MBO) – Peter Drucker

Drucker's Management by Objectives (MBO) provided a structured yet participatory method for aligning personal and organisational goals. It advocated that employees at all levels should set performance targets collaboratively and be evaluated against clear outcomes (Drucker, 1954).

MBO anticipated later trends in decentralisation and employee autonomy, laying the groundwork for performance appraisal systems, key performance indicators (KPIs), and management dashboards. Yet it has also been critiqued for promoting short-termism and reinforcing individual accountability at the expense of collaboration (Odiorne, 1965). Despite these tensions, MBO contributed to the shift from control to strategic engagement.

3.2.3 Systems Thinking – Senge, von Bertalanffy

General Systems Theory, developed by Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1968), proposed that living and social systems must be understood holistically rather than as isolated parts. Peter Senge (1990) built on this foundation in *The Fifth Discipline*, introducing systems thinking as a core managerial competency for dealing with interdependence, complexity, and delayed effects.

Senge identified systemic dysfunctions such as “shifting the burden,” “limits to growth,” and “fixes that fail,” offering tools to trace root causes and feedback loops. His work marked a shift from linear planning to iterative learning. While systems thinking has been critiqued for its conceptual abstraction and limited empirical grounding, it remains vital in scenario planning, policy design, and sustainable strategy.

3.2.4 Contingency Theory – Burns & Stalker, Lawrence & Lorsch

Contingency theory rejected the search for universal best practices and instead proposed that effective management depends on alignment between organisational structure and environmental conditions. Burns and Stalker (1961) distinguished between mechanistic structures suited to stability and organic forms adapted to change. Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) extended this logic by showing that different departments within the same firm might require different configurations.

Contingency thinking introduced the principle of situational fit, emphasising contextual diagnosis over prescriptive frameworks. However, it has been criticised for being descriptive rather than prescriptive and for lacking clear guidance for implementation. Still, it contributed to more nuanced thinking about organisational design, especially in complex and turbulent environments.

3.2.5 Learning Organisation – Peter Senge

The concept of the learning organisation, popularised by Senge (1990), envisions organisations as adaptive systems that evolve through collective learning. Senge proposed five “disciplines”—personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, team learning, and systems thinking—that cultivate organisational intelligence and capacity for change.

Senge’s model inspired a generation of management thinking focused on dialogue, reflection, and decentralised learning. Yet critical scholars such as Contu, Grey, and Örtengren (2003) challenged its ideological neutrality, arguing that “learning” is often invoked to obscure power relations and discipline employees under the guise of empowerment. They emphasised that learning is not merely cognitive or behavioural, but political and contextual.

Today, the learning organisation remains an aspirational model, especially in innovation-intensive sectors. Its critiques, however, serve as a reminder that learning must be interrogated not only for its potential, but for the conditions and interests it serves.

3.3 Late 20th to 21st Century: Postmodern, Cultural and Reflexive Turns

As management theory entered the late 20th century, it became increasingly clear that structural and systems-based models could not fully capture the lived experience of organisational life. The rise of cultural complexity, digitisation, globalisation, and shifting workforce identities required new lenses—ones that emphasised meaning, identity, emotion, and power. A wave of theorists began to challenge the assumptions of rationality, objectivity, and control that underpinned earlier paradigms.

This section explores five streams that exemplify this intellectual shift: organisational culture, Morgan's metaphors, postmodern critiques, emotional intelligence, and the Neo-Weberian hybrid state. Each represents a move away from deterministic models towards interpretive, reflexive, and critical understandings of organising.

3.3.1 Organisational Culture – Schein, Handy, Hofstede

Organisational culture emerged as a response to the limitations of structural and functionalist models. Edgar Schein (1985) introduced a layered model of culture—artifacts, espoused values, and basic assumptions—arguing that culture is both shaped by leadership and a constraint upon it. Culture, in this view, is not an input to be manipulated but an evolving reality that informs behaviour, perception, and identity.

Charles Handy (1993) provided a typology of cultural forms—power, role, task, and person cultures—highlighting that different strategic goals and organisational environments demand different cultural configurations. Meanwhile, Hofstede (1980, 1991) extended the study of culture to a cross-national level, identifying enduring dimensions such as power distance and individualism that shape organisational behaviour globally.

These theories collectively shifted management thinking from formal control to symbolic management and meaning-making. Culture is now widely recognised as central to strategic change, employee engagement, and brand identity. However, its tacit, dynamic, and contested nature also renders it difficult to measure, manage, or change deliberately.

3.3.2 Morgan's Metaphors

In *Images of Organization*, Gareth Morgan (1986) advanced the idea that how we think about organisations is shaped by the metaphors we use. These metaphors—organisation as machine, organism, brain, culture, political system, psychic prison, flux and transformation, and instrument of domination—each highlight certain organisational dynamics while obscuring others.

Morgan's framework invited managers and scholars to adopt multiple lenses and resist reductive interpretations. For instance, viewing an organisation both as a machine (for efficiency) and a

political system (for power negotiation) reveals different dimensions of the same entity. The use of metaphors enabled richer diagnosis, deeper reflection, and greater contextual sensitivity. However, critiques such as those by Örtenblad et al. (2016) warn that metaphors can also reinforce managerial ideologies or be reduced to pedagogical devices. The metaphor-as-tool approach may risk oversimplifying complex realities if not critically examined. Nonetheless, Morgan's work remains foundational in cultivating interpretive flexibility and reflective practice.

3.3.3 Postmodern and Philosophical Critiques – Alvesson, Clegg, Tsoukas

Postmodern theorists rejected the idea of management as a neutral, rational science. Scholars such as Alvesson (1996), Clegg (1990), and Tsoukas (2005) questioned the epistemological foundations of mainstream theory, highlighting how language, power, and identity shape what is considered legitimate knowledge.

These perspectives proposed that organisations are not stable systems but contested spaces of meaning-making. Power is embedded in discourse, and management practices often reproduce rather than resolve inequality. Tsoukas, drawing on philosophical traditions, urged a shift toward practical wisdom (phronesis), arguing that management should be understood as situated judgment under conditions of uncertainty.

Postmodern critiques are sometimes criticised for abstraction or cynicism. Yet their contribution lies in revealing the constructed nature of managerial truths and in promoting ethical, pluralistic, and reflective approaches to leadership and organising.

3.3.4 Emotional Intelligence & Transformational Leadership

In response to growing interest in relational and human-centred leadership, emotional intelligence (EI) and transformational leadership emerged as influential frameworks. Daniel Goleman (1995, 1998) argued that EI—comprising self-awareness, self-regulation, empathy, and social skill—is a key determinant of effective leadership, particularly in emotionally complex and ambiguous environments.

Transformational leadership, developed by Burns (1978) and expanded by Bass and Avolio (1994), prioritises intrinsic motivation, vision, and follower development. It contrasts with transactional leadership by focusing on values, purpose, and emotional resonance.

Critics argue that EI is conceptually diffuse and prone to managerial appropriation. Nonetheless, research continues to link EI with leadership effectiveness, team cohesion, and service quality (Cherniss, 2010). In the context of AI and automation, some scholars suggest that EI may offer a distinctly human advantage in the evolving world of work (Whelan & Teigland, 2020).

3.3.5 The Neo-Weberian State and Hybrid Bureaucracy

Despite the postmodern turn, bureaucratic structures did not disappear. Instead, they evolved into hybrid forms that integrate hierarchical authority with flexibility, accountability, and customer focus. The concept of the Neo-Weberian State (NWS), developed by Pollitt and Bouckaert (2011), captures this synthesis in public sector reforms across Europe and beyond.

NWS retains the Weberian emphasis on legality, standardisation, and professionalisation, while incorporating elements from New Public Management (NPM) such as performance metrics, decentralised service delivery, and digital governance. These hybrid arrangements aim to reconcile stability with responsiveness, though they often entail tensions between procedural compliance and innovation.

Scholars such as Monteiro and Adler (2022) argue that hybrid bureaucracy can be understood as a site of ongoing negotiation between competing logics. While potentially unwieldy, such models may offer a pragmatic response to the plural demands of legitimacy, efficiency, and adaptability.

4.

Morgan's Metaphors and the Persistence of Management Paradigms

Old Minds in New Machines? Why Traditional Logics Still Rule Modern Organisations

While the previous chapter has outlined the chronological development of key management paradigms, this chapter turns to their contemporary manifestations. Using Gareth Morgan's metaphorical lens, it explores how early 20th-century logics—though rebranded—continue to exert powerful influence in today's digital, data-driven, and performative environments.

Despite more than a century of innovation in management theory, many principles introduced during the early 20th century—such as control, standardisation, hierarchy, and task optimisation—continue to shape how organisations operate. These classical paradigms have not disappeared; instead, they have been adapted and embedded into contemporary digital systems, cultural routines, and institutional logics (Morgan, 1986; Clegg et al., 2005).

This section draws on Morgan's metaphorical framework to explain the persistence and reinvention of classical management ideas. Through the lens of metaphor, these theories are not merely historical artefacts but symbolic structures that continue to legitimise managerial action. Each of the following sections highlights how scientific management, bureaucracy, and administrative logic continue to shape modern practice—not as theory per se, but as metaphorical scaffolding embedded in systems of control and performance.

4.1 Interpreting Tradition Through Metaphor

Gareth Morgan's central claim is that all theories of organisation are based on implicit metaphors that frame how we understand and design them (Morgan, 1986). These metaphors act as lenses through which organisational life becomes intelligible. For example, the metaphor of the organisation as a machine aligns with Taylorist principles of efficiency, standardisation, and predictability. Despite critique, this metaphor remains deeply rooted in practices such as workflow automation, KPIs, and role compartmentalisation (Derksen, 2014).

Similarly, the metaphor of hierarchy, derived from Fayol's administrative theory, persists in organisational charts and linear authority chains—even in companies claiming agile or flat structures (Hatchuel & Segrestin, 2019). These enduring images simplify complexity, reproduce existing power structures, and provide symbolic clarity amid uncertainty.

According to Örtenblad et al. (2016), metaphors are not neutral; they are ideological tools that shape what is visible, what is valued, and what is ignored. Interpreting traditional management theories as metaphors reveals their continued influence—not as obsolete logic, but as deep-seated narratives that stabilise organisational identity.

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

15

4.2 Why Scientific Management Still Works in the Algorithmic Age

Frederick Taylor's scientific management, originally grounded in time-and-motion studies and task optimisation, has evolved into the algorithmic logic of today's digital platforms (Taylor, 1911; Braverman, 1974). Platforms such as Amazon, Uber, and Deliveroo monitor performance in real time, decompose tasks into data streams, and incentivise productivity through automated feedback loops (Derksen, 2014).

Scientific management's promise of precision and predictability resonates with the appeal of algorithmic systems in managing complexity. Performance dashboards and KPIs replicate the Taylorist desire for visibility and control (Wajcman, 2017). Even knowledge workers are increasingly governed by productivity software that tracks behaviour, outcomes, and interactions.

While these tools offer operational clarity, critics warn that they reinforce instrumental rationality at the expense of autonomy, creativity, and psychological well-being (Clegg, 1990). The digital age has not rejected Taylorism—it has re-coded it. As Morgan (2016) suggests, metaphors persist not because they are accurate, but because they offer comfort, control, and legibility.

4.3 Bureaucracy in the Digital State and Corporate Hybrids

Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy described a rational-legal form of authority based on formal rules, impersonal roles, and hierarchical order (Weber, 1947). Far from being displaced, this model has evolved into what scholars call the Neo-Weberian State (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011; Monteiro & Adler, 2022).

Public administrations increasingly blend bureaucratic structures with performance regimes, citizen-centric language, and digital interfaces. These systems retain Weberian virtues—predictability, auditability, institutional memory—while integrating new tools for compliance and measurement. For example, Gov.uk's service delivery platforms enable standardisation and procedural traceability across decentralised domains.

Similarly, large corporations continue to exhibit bureaucratic traits behind the rhetoric of agility. Functional silos, approval chains, and codified processes persist due to legal, reputational, and operational risk management. As du Gay (2000) argues, bureaucracy persists because it provides an ethical infrastructure for responsibility, fairness, and accountability.

Nevertheless, algorithmic rules can obscure agency ("the system decided"), and strict compliance systems may stifle innovation. The persistence of bureaucracy in digital form reveals that structure and hierarchy remain core to how institutions stabilise themselves.

4.4 Administrative Control in KPI and MBO Systems

Henri Fayol's administrative principles—planning, organising, commanding, coordinating, and controlling—are still reflected in modern performance systems. Tools such as Management by Objectives (MBO), introduced by Peter Drucker (1954), and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) translate strategy into measurable outputs across hierarchical levels.

MBO and KPI systems frame control as participatory alignment, but they often reinforce subtle hierarchies through targets, tracking, and feedback mechanisms (Starbuck, 2005). These systems, while technologically advanced, enact Fayol's vision of structured accountability, now embedded within software infrastructures.

Critics argue that such systems reduce work to quantifiable units, prioritise short-term outcomes, and penalise collaboration (Huczynski & Buchanan, 2021). Hatchuel and Segrestin (2018) caution that managerial rationality must go beyond metrics and embrace uncertainty, dialogue, and innovation.

Yet, these tools persist because they operationalise strategic clarity and offer instruments of control within complex, distributed organisations. In this sense, administrative metaphors continue to shape the grammar of management.

5.

Theoretical Integration and Organisational Responses to

Contemporary Challenges

Can Classical Theory Still Serve in a Disrupted World? Bridging Tradition and Transformation

Building on the earlier analysis of classical paradigms and their contemporary manifestations, this section shifts focus toward how organisations are responding to the demands of complexity, disruption, and evolving expectations. Traditional management logics have not simply faded—they have been reframed, selectively retained, or hybridised in response to modern operational, cultural, and ethical challenges.

Rather than continuing a retrospective exploration, the discussion now turns to the practical implications of theoretical integration in complex organisational settings. In an age marked by rapid technological change, cultural pluralism, global interconnectedness, and shifting employee expectations, no single paradigm offers a comprehensive solution. Instead, contemporary organisations must draw from multiple, often contradictory, theoretical logics. Rather than selecting between paradigms, they engage in complex acts of integration—strategic, instinctive, and often emergent.

The following sections examine how organisations blend classical and contemporary approaches to address diverse pressures—balancing structured control with adaptability, rational systems with cultural meaning, and administrative hierarchy with emotionally intelligent leadership. The aim is to illuminate the diverse and evolving strategies through which theory is applied in practice.

5.1 Challenges of Contemporary Management

Organisations today face environments that are volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA). Unlike the relatively stable industrial conditions in which early theories were developed, the contemporary landscape is shaped by rapid change, digital disruption, and pluralistic values. This context exposes the limitations of both traditional and modern approaches when applied in isolation.

5.1.1 Technological Acceleration and Datafication : Digital platforms, algorithmic decision-making, and AI systems offer precision and scale, yet raise concerns about autonomy, surveillance, and human agency. While Taylorist principles persist in real-time metrics and automated workflows (Derksen, 2014), scholars such as Wajcman (2017) warn that these systems risk depersonalising work. As Odek and Oluocho (2023) suggest, organisations must reconcile efficiency with ethical oversight and psychological safety.

- 5.1.2 Cultural Pluralism and Identity Complexity:** In global operations, management styles encounter divergent expectations regarding hierarchy, motivation, and communication. Hofstede's (2001) cultural dimensions framework remains a foundational reference, but needs to be interpreted alongside reflexive leadership practices (Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2015). Organisational identity becomes a site of contestation and negotiation, requiring both symbolic coherence and cultural agility.
- 5.1.3 Structural Fluidity and Agility:** Flattened hierarchies and agile frameworks promise adaptability but can undermine clarity and coordination. Garud and Kumaraswamy (1995) argue that effective agility requires cognitive alignment and strong lateral processes, not just structural change. Anggraini and Sudhartio (2019) further highlight that administrative scaffolding, such as clear goals and role definitions, remains essential for coherence.
- 5.1.4 Employee Expectations and Meaningful Work:** Contemporary workers seek purpose, inclusion, and growth beyond material incentives. Ulrich and Beatty (2001) suggest this marks a shift from task-based to meaning-centred management. Rindova and Srinivas (2025) emphasise sensemaking and value affirmation as core leadership capabilities in today's context.

These challenges do not call for a theoretical replacement, but for integration. They reveal that hybrid, context-sensitive strategies are necessary to navigate competing pressures. The next sections explore how culture, leadership, and structure can support such integration.

5.2 Organisational Culture as a Medium of Integration

Organisational culture mediates the application and perception of management theory. As Schein (2010) proposes, culture exists at the levels of artifacts, espoused values, and basic assumptions. These layers shape how managerial logic is interpreted, legitimised, or rejected within a given context.

Cultural framing explains why the same practice—a KPI dashboard, for instance—can signal empowerment in one setting and surveillance in another. Theorists such as Alvesson and Willmott (2002) argue that identity regulation is a key mechanism through which culture manages competing logics. It allows efficiency and empathy, hierarchy and autonomy, to coexist within a coherent organisational narrative.

In cross-cultural environments, misalignment between formal systems and local assumptions can undermine even the most carefully designed initiatives. Hofstede's (2001) insights into power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and collectivism remain vital in diagnosing and designing culturally resonant interventions.

Culture is not just shaped by management—it shapes what kinds of management are possible. Without cultural coherence, efforts to combine classical and contemporary approaches are unlikely to take root.

5.3 The Paradox of Changing Organisational Culture

Despite its centrality, culture is often described as the most resistant aspect of organisational life. Schein (2010) argues that basic assumptions—unspoken, taken-for-granted beliefs—form the most difficult layer to access or shift. These assumptions reproduce themselves through recruitment, socialisation, evaluation, and everyday rituals.

Change efforts often falter when they fail to address this deeper layer. Alvesson (2002) describes “cultural immunity”: the tendency of entrenched cultures to reinterpret or neutralise new initiatives that conflict with established norms. Even when leaders champion new values, employees may continue to operate within legacy mindsets unless change is internalised symbolically and emotionally.

Moreover, culture is frequently invoked rhetorically without corresponding behavioural transformation. Leaders may espouse agility but maintain control, advocate innovation but punish deviation. This gap produces cultural dissonance and erodes trust.

The paradox of culture is thus: it is both the obstacle to and the medium of change. Effective integration of theories requires reflexive engagement with culture—not only as a variable to be managed, but as a living system to be co-constructed.

5.4 Strategies for Theoretical Integration

Hybrid approaches to management are not accidental—they are designed through intentional strategies that blend old and new logics.

5.4.1 Structural Layering and Temporal Segmentation: Kotter’s (2014) dual operating system model illustrates how organisations can preserve administrative discipline while fostering innovation. Budgeting, compliance, and hierarchy can coexist with agile teams and exploratory projects when separated by function or phase.

5.4.2 Narrative Framing by Leadership: Leaders translate abstract theories into lived meaning. Through language, storytelling, and symbolism, they construct coherence across conflicting logics. Denis, Langley and Rouleau (2007) show how narrative enables sensemaking across multiple stakeholders.

5.4.3 Psychological Safety and Cultural Framing: Hybrid strategies require psychological safety for experimentation. Edmondson (1999) links psychological safety to learning behaviours in teams, essential for integrating divergent approaches.

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

20

5.4.4 Capability Development and Boundary-Spanning Roles: Cross-disciplinary training and reflective practice help employees navigate theoretical ambiguity. Senge's (1990) learning organisation model remains relevant here, emphasising shared vision, team learning, and systems thinking.

5.4.5 Ritualised Practices: Embedding new logics in routine practices—such as sprint cycles within traditional planning—builds legitimacy over time. This ritualisation enables complexity to feel structured and manageable.

These strategies reveal that integration is neither formulaic nor frictionless. It requires deliberate experimentation, cultural alignment, and leadership that recognises ambiguity not as failure, but as a condition of modern organising.

5.5 Case Studies of Cultural and Theoretical Integration: Burberry, Starbucks China, and Huawei

Theoretical integration does not occur in abstraction—it is realised, negotiated, and contested within specific organisational contexts. This section presents three case studies that illustrate how different types of organisations have sought to blend traditional and contemporary management logics to respond to cultural, strategic, and operational challenges. Each case reveals a distinct approach to integration: through cultural leadership (Burberry), local adaptation (Starbucks China), and structural hybridisation (Huawei).

These examples demonstrate that theories are not just implemented—they are interpreted, often filtered through organisational identity, national culture, and historical path dependencies. The cases offer practical insight into how integration occurs across levels: symbolic, behavioural, and structural. They also underscore that no integration strategy is frictionless—tensions persist, and success often depends on the organisation's ability to navigate paradoxes rather than eliminate them.

5.5.1 Burberry: Reinventing Tradition Through Cultural Leadership

Under the leadership of Angela Ahrendts between 2006 and 2014, Burberry's transformation from a heritage-bound luxury brand to a digital innovation leader is often cited as a masterclass in cultural leadership. Drawing on Morgan's (1986) metaphor of the organisation as culture, Ahrendts did not simply modernise Burberry's operations—she redefined the symbolic structure of the company from within. Her "One Burberry" strategy integrated fragmented regional teams into a unified global identity, creating alignment across branding, operations, and employee engagement.

At the core of this transformation was a deliberate effort to align Schein's (2010) three layers of organisational culture: artifacts, espoused values, and underlying assumptions. Burberry's artifacts—such as store layouts, digital interfaces, and visual merchandising—were reimaged

Vision for the Future: "While many areas of contemporary life have changed significantly in the 21st century, has management remained largely unchanged and rooted in 19th century theories and paradigms?"

21

to project both luxury and modernity. The brand became one of the earliest luxury fashion houses to embrace livestreaming runway shows and leverage social media platforms like Twitter and Instagram to create interactive, real-time customer experiences.

Internally, Ahrendts focused on rehumanising the workforce. Employees were no longer viewed merely as executors of corporate strategy but were reframed as “brand ambassadors.” This identity regulation (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002) contributed to a sense of belonging and emotional investment. The leadership team promoted values such as inclusivity, creativity, and collaboration, which helped dismantle the elitism historically associated with luxury fashion. Strategic decision-making was informed by data analytics, enabling faster and more localised responses while maintaining a global brand vision.

Furthermore, the brand maintained its British heritage—a source of legitimacy and symbolic capital—while recontextualising it for the digital consumer. Traditional products such as the trench coat were not discarded but repositioned through new storytelling channels. Cultural continuity was not abandoned but reframed, creating what Tsoukas (2005) might term a narrative bridge between past and future. Through this process, Burberry demonstrated how classical bureaucratic structures could be transformed into living, adaptive systems anchored in identity, meaning, and symbolic alignment.

5.5.2 Starbucks China: Balancing Global Standards and Local Values

Starbucks’ expansion into China offers a unique lens into how global operational models can coexist with local cultural realities. Initially entering a market where coffee culture was underdeveloped and tea culture dominant, Starbucks had to overcome not just logistical challenges but also deep-rooted cultural expectations. Instead of force-fitting its Western business model, Starbucks opted for a “glocalisation” strategy—maintaining its core values while adapting them to Chinese preferences.

Operationally, Starbucks continued to employ Taylorist principles through standardised procedures, training modules, and service benchmarks. This consistency assured global quality and efficiency. However, Hofstede’s (2001) cultural dimensions—particularly China’s high power distance and collectivism—demanded more than operational excellence. Starbucks responded by customising its store designs, menu offerings, and customer engagement practices. Localised drinks such as green tea lattes and red bean frappuccinos became regular menu features.

Leadership development within Starbucks China also reflected this integration. Store managers and regional leaders received training not only in operational efficiency but in cultural empathy and emotional intelligence. Employees were referred to as “partners,” a linguistic shift that fostered inclusivity and mutual respect. CSR initiatives often focused on education and community-building—areas resonant with Confucian values. These efforts are consistent with Alvesson’s (2002) understanding of symbolic leadership, where legitimacy is derived not only from performance but also from emotional and cultural resonance.

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

22

In addition, Starbucks fostered upward mobility and psychological safety within its workforce. Career development paths were clearly articulated, and high-performing employees were recognised in ways that emphasised social harmony rather than individual competition. Through these efforts, Starbucks China created a hybrid management model—one that maintained global consistency while embedding itself in the emotional and cultural lifeworlds of its Chinese stakeholders.

Thus, Starbucks' success in China cannot be attributed solely to strategic localisation. It was also a cultural negotiation, where global managerial paradigms met local expectations, and where identity work—both corporate and individual—became a key mechanism for performance and legitimacy.

5.5.3 Huawei: Structuring Agility in a High-Control System

Huawei represents a distinctive organisational experiment in reconciling bureaucratic discipline with strategic agility. As a multinational technology firm rooted in China's unique socio-political environment, Huawei must operate within high regulatory, reputational, and competitive constraints. Yet, it has managed to innovate rapidly and scale globally, due in large part to its ability to blend classical management theories with culturally resonant leadership practices.

At the formal level, Huawei exhibits many Weberian and Fayolian traits. Its hierarchical structure, codified procedures, and reliance on KPIs reflect a deep commitment to control, efficiency, and predictability. The company uses scientific management tools—such as time allocation models, cost-benefit analytics, and performance scoring systems—to optimise workflows and ensure compliance. These tools help the company maintain coherence in a high-volume, high-risk, and high-stakes operating environment.

Yet Huawei also displays remarkable flexibility. The firm employs a rotating CEO model, where executive leadership is periodically rotated among senior managers. This prevents power ossification and enables a variety of leadership perspectives—an organisational innovation that draws from systems thinking (Senge, 1990) and distributed cognition. Furthermore, decentralised R&D units are given “contractual autonomy”—they must deliver agreed outcomes but can choose their own strategies. This creates a dual logic where localised innovation operates within centralised parameters.

Central to Huawei's integration model is its “striver culture” (奋斗者文化). Rooted in Confucian ideals of perseverance, duty, and collective honour, this cultural ethic infuses Weberian authority with moral legitimacy. Employees are expected to commit beyond formal job descriptions, but this is balanced by strong internal narratives of national purpose, upward mobility, and technological pride (Zhang & Liu, 2020). The result is what Alvesson & Willmott (2002) might call cultural control—where behaviour is regulated through shared meaning, not just rules.

Huawei also practices strategic international decentralisation. While its headquarters maintain core control over technology and branding, local subsidiaries adapt HR policies, marketing strategies, and partnership models to fit regional cultures. Yet these adaptations are always nested within a centralised framework of performance metrics and ideological cohesion, producing what might be termed a “networked bureaucracy.”

In sum, Huawei illustrates that high control and high agility are not mutually exclusive. Through institutional layering, cultural engineering, and hybrid leadership, Huawei sustains an organisational model that is both disciplined and adaptive—combining Taylorist rigour, Weberian hierarchy, and postmodern cultural reflexivity into a unified system.

Together, these cases demonstrate how different types of organisations reinterpret and recontextualise management theories in light of cultural, technological, and strategic demands. They show that integration is not merely structural—it is also symbolic, emotional, and identity-driven. Each case illustrates that blending classical and modern theories requires more than procedural design; it demands cultural fluency and narrative coherence that align legacy logic with emergent values.

Across all cases, integration occurred not as passive absorption, but as active reinterpretation. Management theory was adapted through leadership, culture, and institutional memory to meet complex demands.

6.

Conclusion and Future Perspectives

Breaking the Frame: What Management Must Unlearn to Evolve

Modern management exists at a crossroads. As the preceding analysis has shown, the persistence of early 20th-century paradigms—scientific management, administrative control, and bureaucratic logic—has not precluded innovation. Instead, these classical ideas have been reinterpreted, reframed, and selectively retained within contemporary structures and cultural narratives (Morgan, 1986; Schein, 2010; Hatchuel & Segrestin, 2018). Organisational life today is shaped not by the abandonment of tradition, but by its reconfiguration in the face of shifting values, technologies, and expectations.

This final section reflects critically on what the enduring presence of traditional models means for the future of management. It argues that the real task ahead is not to discard old theories or blindly adopt new ones, but to develop a more reflexive, integrative, and ethically grounded approach to navigating complexity. The future of management, it contends, lies in the ability to understand and negotiate paradox—not to eliminate it.

6.1 Rethinking What Theory Is For

The role of theory in management has traditionally been seen as offering prescriptive tools for control, planning, and optimisation. This functionalist orientation, rooted in classical rationalism (Taylor, 1911; Fayol, 1949; Weber, 1947), has proved both influential and limiting. As Alvesson and Sandberg (2011) argue, theory must go beyond prediction and control toward critical questioning of its underlying assumptions.

Increasingly, theory is being repositioned as a means of making sense of organisational life rather than governing it. Tsoukas (2005) suggests that good theory should be generative—it should enable reflection, sensemaking, and contextual sensitivity. Morgan's (1986) metaphorical approach exemplifies this by inviting pluralism and cognitive flexibility. Rather than seeking universal truths, modern theory must help leaders navigate ambiguity and plural values.

This requires a shift in how theory is taught, applied, and legitimised. Rather than treating it as static knowledge to be implemented, organisations and educators must promote interpretive, dialogical, and practice-based modes of theorising. This shift reflects what Nicolini (2012) calls a "practice turn" in organisational theory—emphasising lived experience and situated judgment over abstraction.

6.2 Managing Through Paradox, Not Certainty

The contemporary organisational environment is saturated with tensions: between global and local, stability and change, structure and agency, efficiency and empathy. Attempts to resolve these tensions through linear models or best practices often fail. Instead, successful management increasingly depends on the capacity to dwell in and work through paradox.

Smith and Lewis (2011) describe paradox as the simultaneous presence of competing yet interdependent elements. Embracing paradox requires leaders to move beyond binary thinking and adopt both/and logics. In practice, this might involve sustaining control while encouraging autonomy, preserving hierarchy while fostering collaboration, or ensuring standardisation without stifling creativity.

Such paradoxical navigation aligns with the idea of "organising as becoming"—a perspective advanced by scholars like Tsoukas and Chia (2002), who argue that organisations are not stable entities but evolving patterns of activity. From this view, management is less about imposing form and more about enabling emergence within loose constraints.

This approach does not discard structure or metrics but sees them as part of a wider ecosystem of meaning, purpose, and sensemaking. The future of management lies not in eliminating contradiction, but in designing systems that can hold and respond to it.

6.3 Leadership Beyond Competency Models

Leadership development has long been dominated by competency frameworks, emphasising traits such as strategic thinking, decision-making, and task execution. While valuable, this approach risks reducing leadership to behavioural checklists. In recent years, alternative paradigms have emerged, emphasising emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1998), authenticity (Luthans & Avolio, 2003), and identity work (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002).

Goleman's (1995, 1998) model of emotional intelligence has shifted the conversation from what leaders do to how they relate—to themselves, to others, and to the emotional climate of the organisation. This is particularly relevant in complex, high-ambiguity environments, where psychological safety (Edmondson, 1999) and trust are preconditions for innovation.

Leadership in the future must be able to traverse affective and rational domains, combining performance orientation with cultural fluency, and strategic coherence with ethical responsiveness. It must enable meaning-making, not just metric-setting.

Furthermore, leadership must become distributed. As Raelin (2016) argues, leadership is increasingly co-constructed in practice, emerging through collective action rather than being the property of individuals. This perspective aligns with the rise of networked, team-based, and lateral forms of organising.

6.4 Designing for Reflexivity, Not Just Control

Much of modern organisational infrastructure is still built on assumptions of predictability, measurability, and centralised control. However, in the face of uncertainty and pluralism, these assumptions are increasingly inadequate. Reflexivity—the capacity to question one’s own assumptions, practices, and positioning—emerges as a critical capability (Cunliffe, 2004). Reflexive organisations do not simply react to change; they engage with it critically. They treat disagreement as a resource for learning, not a threat to coherence. They create spaces for dissent, reflection, and dialogic leadership. Reflexivity thus becomes not a soft skill but a structural imperative.

This also has implications for governance. As Flyvbjerg (2001) argues, organisations must combine technical rationality with *phronesis*—practical wisdom rooted in contextual judgment. This calls for institutional architectures that are both robust and flexible, both rule-bound and adaptive.

6.5 Future Trajectories: Toward Humanistic and Plural Management

Finally, the question arises: what is management ultimately for? Classical theory often positioned it as a means to coordinate resources toward organisational goals. But as organisations become more porous, mission-driven, and socially embedded, this narrow framing becomes insufficient. Future management must be plural in both epistemology and purpose. It must draw from sociology, psychology, systems theory, aesthetics, ethics, and political philosophy—not just economics and engineering. It must support not only efficiency, but also dignity, sustainability, and justice (Mintzberg, 2009).

In this regard, the learning organisation (Senge, 1990), the reflective practitioner (Schön, 1983), and the values-based organisation (Freeman, 1994) are not utopian ideals but strategic necessities. They provide frameworks for developing organisations capable of sustained innovation, internal coherence, and external legitimacy.

To conclude, the future of management is not defined by any single theory or model. It is shaped by the ability to interrogate its past, engage with its present contradictions, and constructively respond to the demands of pluralism, reflexivity, and meaning.

In direct response to the claim that "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," this study demonstrates a more nuanced reality. Classical management theories have not frozen in time—they have been reinterpreted, re-embedded, and recombined in modern forms. What persists is not the rigid structure of 19th-century logic, but its evolving application through metaphor, metrics, digital systems, and hybrid practices.

The challenge, therefore, is not that management has remained unchanged, but that its changes are often unexamined, implicit, or unevenly distributed. The task ahead is not simply to replace old ideas, but to rethink how inherited logics shape today's choices—and to cultivate the critical capacity to adapt, integrate, and evolve. Management, at its best, is not a relic of the past—but a living, reflexive practice still learning how to lead in an unpredictable world. It is characterised by plurality, paradox, and reflexivity. As theory and practice continue to evolve, the task of management will be not to control complexity but to engage with it wisely, ethically, and creatively.

References

- Alvesson, M. (2002). *Understanding Organizational Culture*. Sage Publications.
- Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2011). Generating research questions through problematization. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 247–271.
- Alvesson, M., & Sveningsson, S. (2015). *Changing Organizational Culture: Cultural Change Work in Progress*. Routledge.
- Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2002). Identity regulation as organizational control: Producing the appropriate individual. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(5), 619–644.
- Barling, J., Slater, F., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 21(3), 157–161.
- Bodrožić, Z., & Adler, P. S. (2018). The evolution of management models: A neo-Schumpeterian theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 63(1), 85–129.
- Clegg, S. (1990). *Modern Organizations: Organization Studies in the Postmodern World*. Sage.
- Cunliffe, A. L. (2004). On becoming a critically reflexive practitioner. *Journal of Management Education*, 28(4), 407–426.
- Denis, J. L., Langley, A., & Rouleau, L. (2007). Strategizing in pluralistic contexts: Rethinking theoretical frames. *Human Relations*, 60(1), 179–215.
- Derksen, M. (2014). Turning men into machines? Scientific management, industrial psychology, and the “human factor.” *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 50(2), 148–165.
- Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.
- Fianko, G., Dzogbewu, T. C., Donkor, E., & Honyenuga, B. Q. (2020). Emotional intelligence and leadership: A study among managers in Ghana’s banking sector. *Journal of Management Development*, 39(2), 149–160.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making Social Science Matter*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, J. (2010). Studying leadership critically: A psychosocial lens on leadership identities. *Leadership*, 6(1), 47–65.

- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ*. Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. Bantam Books.
- Grigoriou, A. (2013). *Value-Based Integrity Management and Bureaucratic Organizations: Changing the Mix*. Max Weber Studies.
- Hatchuel, A., & Segrestin, B. (2018). A new academic discipline for managerial action and design. *European Management Review*, 15(1), 5–20.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. Sage Publications.
- Jørgensen, T. B. (2012). *Bureaucracies Remember, Post-Bureaucratic Organizations Forget*. Public Administration Review.
- Kotter, J. P. (2014). *Accelerate: Building Strategic Agility for a Faster-Moving World*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Authentic leadership: A positive developmental approach. *Positive Organizational Scholarship*, 241–258.
- Mintzberg, H. (2009). Rebuilding companies as communities. *Harvard Business Review*, 87(7/8), 140–143.
- Monteiro, P., & Adler, P. S. (2022). Bureaucracy for the 21st century: Clarifying and expanding our view of bureaucratic organization. *Academy of Management Annals*, 16(1), 251–290.
- Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of Organization*. Sage.
- Nicolini, D. (2012). *Practice Theory, Work, and Organization: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Örtenblad, A., Putnam, L. L., & Trehan, K. (2016). Beyond Morgan's eight metaphors: Adding to and developing organization theory. *Human Relations*, 69(4), 875–889.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2011). *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis - New Public Management, Governance, and the Neo-Weberian State*. Oxford University Press.
- Raelin, J. A. (2016). Imagine there are no leaders: Reframing leadership as collaborative agency. *Leadership*, 12(2), 131–158.

Riggio, R. E., & Reichard, R. J. (2008). The emotional and social intelligences of effective leadership: An emotional and social skill approach. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(2), 169–185.

Rindova, V., & Srinivas, S. (2025). Meaning and strategy: Connecting meaning-making to strategic action. *Strategic Management Journal*, 46(1), 9–22.

Rosete, D., & Ciarrochi, J. (2005). Emotional intelligence and its relationship to workplace performance outcomes of leadership effectiveness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(5), 388–399.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185–211.

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. Basic Books.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. Doubleday.

Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 381–403.

Starbuck, W. H. (2005). How much better are the most prestigious journals? The statistics of academic publication. *Organization Science*, 16(2), 180–200.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. Harper & Brothers.

Tohidian, I., & Rahimian, H. (2019). Bringing Morgan's metaphors into context: A review and application in organisational research. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 32(1), 80–94.

Tsoukas, H. (2005). *Complex Knowledge: Studies in Organizational Epistemology*. Oxford University Press.

Tsoukas, H., & Chia, R. (2002). On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational change. *Organization Science*, 13(5), 567–582.

Ulrich, D., & Beatty, D. (2001). *The HR Scorecard: Linking People, Strategy, and Performance*. Harvard Business School Press.

Wajcman, J. (2017). Automation: Is it really different this time? *British Journal of Sociology*, 68(1), 119–127.

Walter, F., Cole, M. S., & Humphrey, R. H. (2011). Emotional intelligence: Sine qua non of leadership or folderol? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 25(1), 45–59.

Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Free Press.

Zhou, L., & Wong, A. (2008). The effect of service quality on customer satisfaction in Starbucks China. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 14(3), 437–456.

Zuffo, R. G. (2021). Taylor is dead, hurray Taylor! The “human factor” in scientific management. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2021(1), 11234.