CRITIQUE OF ANTI-ORGANIZATION THEORY BASED ON ITS PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS (FUNDAMENTAL HUMANIST PARADIGM)

Bijan Abdollahi[1],
Bahare Shahriari[2]*[i]

[1]Associate Professor,
University of Kharazmi, Tehran, Iran
[2]Faculty Member in Department of Management,
Payame Noor University (PNU), Iran

Abstract:

The present article examines and criticizes anti-organization theory based on its philosophical foundations, which is found in the fundamental humanism paradigm; that a transient review is done on Borrel and Morgan's sociological paradigms (functionalism, interpretiveism, fundamentalist structuralism and fundamental humanism). The purpose of this article is to review the anti-organization theory and its viewpoint on organizational life and human resources and to describe the quadruple sociological paradigms. This theory acts in its own sphere of thought, and it must be said that it has a new look at the reality of organizational life and human resources. Finally, there is a review of the criticisms raised in the anti-organization theory about the organization's theory, which is in the form of a functional paradigm.

Keywords: anti-organization theory, paradigm, functionalist paradigm, paradigm of fundamental humanism, interpretative paradigm, structural fundamentalism paradigm

1. Introduction

There is a deep connection between theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge. Practical knowledge is a knowledge that immediately leads to action so that man can show his talent and the goals of this knowledge are in the realm of human will; while

---

[i] Correspondence: email shahriaripnu@gmail.com

theoretical knowledge gives man the opportunity to understand the universal aspects of truth and has intrinsic value that deals with the world of truth (Mirza'i Ahrandani, 2014). In addressing the organization's theory from this angle one can find the gap between the philosophical knowledge of the organization's theories on the one hand and the gap between organizational theories and practical knowledge on the other hand. The first gap has caused the confusion of theorists and the formation of contradictory theories, even led to contradictory theories within the theories. In addition, the possibility of theorizing in the field of management and organization has encountered a problem. The second gap leads to defects in theorizing in the benchmark of views with action (Ibrahimpur, 2006). In order to gain a deep understanding, knowledge and critique of the theories in each discipline, including management and organization, it is necessary to study the origins and sources of their thinking, in addition to studying the theories of scientists and scholars of that field. As it is not possible to know a scientific discipline without studying and understanding the theory of that field, it is not possible to recognize the theories of a discipline without knowing the sources and roots from which the theories originated (Mirza'i Ahranjani, 2014).

Obviously, a complete overview of all paradigms in this area is beyond the reach of this article. Therefore, the present article examines the anti-organization theory based on its philosophical foundations, which is found in the fundamental humanism paradigm which a transient review is done on a Borrel and Morgan's sociological paradigms (functionalist, interpretive, fundamentalist structuralism, and fundamental humanism) and given that anti-organization theory is a critical and novel theory, there are also some brief studies in this area. Therefore, an attempt was made to examine the anti-organization theory in the first place and then to examine it in the form of the fundamentalism paradigm of humanism. In the following, we outline the anti-organization theory, the paradigm, and the quadruple sociological paradigms and, finally, criticize this theory.

2. Statement of the problem

2.1 Anti-organization theory
Many of the ideas that have an approach to humanism have only sought to address the defects and demands for reform, rather than representing a coherent theoretical view. The fundamental humanist paradigm must be linked to the study of the organization, but it has not been the case that, as soon as this relationship is established, the anti-organization theory will be formed. The anti-organization theory will be in fundamental contradiction with the contemporary theory of the organization because

the fundamentalist view of humanism is in contradiction with the functionalism point. The anti-organization theory is a critical theory that refers to the following and Table 1 compares the organization's theory and anti-organization theory.

1. **Integrity**: Before understanding the components of the social world, man must understand it in its integrity.

2. **Knowledge**: the force that ultimately creates and sustains the social world.

3. **Alienation:** A cognitive balance between mind and integrity and that separates man from his real existence

4. **Criticism:** Analysis of resources and forms of self-alienation preventing the probability of real human satisfaction (Borel & Morgan, 2014).

Table 1: Comparison of organization theory and
anti-organization theory (Borl and Morgan, 2014)

	Organization Theory	**Anti-Organization Theory**
1. Paradigmatic position	Functionalism	Fundamental humanism
2. The intellectual origin of issues, metaphors and examples	Science	Humanities
3. The focus of conceptual attention (level of analysis)	Organizations	The way of social organization
4. Conceptualization of the Corn Society	The system	Integrity
5. Ontological center	Structures	Knowledge
6. The dominant socioeconomic issue	Lack of satisfaction	General alienation
7. Common term for describing contemporary society	Industrial society; over-industrial society	Capitalism, single-dimensional society, collective rule, administrative fascism and the like
8. The Attitude to the Relationship of Man with Nature	Exploiter / competitive relationship	Compatible
9. The dominant tool of production	Factory-based Industrial technology	Alternative technology (non-urban, small scale, cooperative)
10. Interested in maximizing	Efficiency system change	Human creativity
11. Technology approach	Positive or negative force	Like a negative force
12. Current production status	Scarcity and general combs	Extensive economic surplus in capitalism
13. Maintained dominant manufacturing practices	Work / work force	Industry
14. The dominant mode of human knowledge	Logic	Interpolation
15. Human behavior according to	Purposeful rationality	Value rationality
16. Ethical-political position	Understand: probably system change	Understanding: definitely persuading a whole new entity

The reasons for the anti-organization of this critical theory:

1. This theory considers organizations as a unsustainable ontological position.

2. Insists on the importance of organizing the way that reflects a particular integrity, rather than emphasizing the importance of organizations as analytical units with an objective mid-range that they deserve to justify.

3. Sees the organization as an alienating mediator (the alienation of man from his real existence) that confuses humans in an attempt to understand the nature in which they live

4. Its advances are in contradiction to the advancements of organizational theory, which are based on the functional paradigm.

5. The anti-organization theory considers organizational theory (based on the functionalist paradigm) a theory that confuses our understanding of the importance of organizations in everyday life (the continuity of the gap between human consciousness and integrity).

Various writers have pointed to the various aspects of human reality and consciousness as presented in Table 2 (Borel & Morgan, 2014).

Table 2: The Main Dimensions of Alternative Reasons (Boril & Morgan, 2014)

Author	A concept used to describe the sensitive aspect of reality in the social organization of contemporary capitalism	A concept that is used to describe the sensitive aspect of reality in non-spontaneous ways
Dixon	Industrial capitalism	Alternative technology
Ilyich	Efficiency	Intimacy
Gladdener	Technological self-consciousness	Romance
Rossack	Objective self-awareness	Personal insight
Reich	Self-awareness No. 2	Self-awareness No. 3
Pearsig	Classical Thinking	Romantic way of thinking
Castañeda	Normal reality	Abnormal fact
Habermas	Work	Engagement
Anthony	Work	Art
Mikin	Work	Creativity

According to the above table and the studies of Borel and Morgan, it can be said that intimacy; the creative relationship between individuals and the environment; romanticism; taking into account humanistic ways of using technology; personal insight; to love and affection; and to support workforce, self-awareness No. 2; criticism and self-awareness of No. 3; refers to a kind of cultural revolution without violence and conflict.

2.2 Paradigm

The term paradigm means "showing" that it can be called the "sample and pattern". The business paradigm is a set of rules that outlines boundaries and shows how to deal with how to solve problems and how to succeed within it. The main application of the paradigm should be sought in the field of philosophy and the history of science, recognized by Thomas Cohen, with the book "The structure of scientific revolutions". In Kuhn's thought, the paradigm is a set of concepts, beliefs, preconceptions, theories, rules, measurement tools and their method of application, methodological rules and norms, as well as a set of metaphysical commitments and quasi-moral norms of the scientific community which tells scientists what the problem is and must be searched to answer, and these responses should be formulated in terms of which concepts and terms, and which principles and theories are consistent so that their research leads to the fruitful growth of science normalized. As Ritzer, express the same viewpoint referring to the constructive elements of the paradigm (examples, the concept of the domain of study, theories and tools) (Ritzer, 2001). In summary, the paradigm is the set of beliefs, values, assumptions, methods, and findings of a group of scholars that form scientific logic.

Summarizing Cohen's view in the book The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, the scientific paradigm is as follows:

- What is observed and scrutinized.
- The type of questions that are being asked and the relevance of the answers to the topic is examined.
- How to structure these questions.
- How to interpret the results of scientific research.
- How to implement and guide the empirical study and equipment that is available to conduct empirical studies. (Borel & Morgan, 2014)

Some scholars such as Ritzser and Mastersman, human sciences, consider organizational studies as paradigmatic (Burille & Morgan, 2014; Morgan, 2006; Ritzer, 2001). Among these, organizational studies of the four paradigms of Borrell and Morgan have been numerous and include four ontological components, epistemology, methodology, and attitudes toward humankind.

2.3 Four sociological paradigm

A. Functionalist or Positivist paradigm

This paradigm expresses the view that is rooted entirely in sociology of ordering and from the point of view of objectivity to discuss issues. As a result, we can say that this paradigm is intended to provide explanations of the status quo, social order, synergy,

social integration, correlation, satisfaction of need and action. Functionalist paradigm in its approach is often problematic. And is interested in providing scientific solutions for practical problems. The approach applied by the functional paradigm to the social sciences is rooted in the tradition of socialist positivism. The functionalist approach holds the assumption of the social sciences that the social world consists of relatively precise artifacts and relationships that can be identified, studied, and measured through the approaches taken from the natural sciences (Borl and Morgan, 2014; Parsons, 1951).

B. Interpretive paradigm

Interpretative social sciences are rooted in the philosophical thinking of Max Weber and William Dilthey. Dilthey addresses the distinction between humanities and the natural sciences, the first of which relies on empathic understanding or the understanding of the experiences of everyday life of people, which is rooted in a particular historical situation, and the latter is based on mental explanation, provides a different attitude than positivism communicates. In this approach, on the contrary of positivism is not reality outside of mankind, but in his mind and consciousness. The reality is socially constructed and interpreted through interaction between the actors. Understanding what is original is the viewer's point of view rather than the observer (Delta, 1967; Weber, 1947; Zimmermann, 1970).

C. Radical Structuralism paradigm

Fundamental structuralism in an analysis that emphasizes structural contradictions, domination, conflict and exclusionary practices, is fundamental to radical change, liberation and the possibility of adherence. This paradigm is discussed in the general categories through a view oriented to realism, positivism, determinism, and fundamental law. Those who believe in this theory emphasize the fact that there is a fundamental change in the nature and structure of modern society and they seek to provide explanations for the fundamental interrelationship within the context of the general social formulation. This is the paradigm that Marx turned out to be following Darwin's evolutionary theory and political economy after a decade of active political engagement. Fundamental structuralism seeks to present a critique of the state of affairs in social affairs, and in addition to understanding the world, it is also sought to change it, and the theorists of this approach see the society as one of the opposite elements and seek a solution to social conflict (Ibrahimpour, 2006; Tavasoli, 2005; Azad Ermaki, 2004; Gippson, 2002; Marx, 1975).

Borrell and Morgan (2014) identified a relatively distinct approach to study the organization by examining fundamental structural paradigm: the Marxist structuralist view and the fundamental Webberian view. The first insight inspired by Marx's work constructs its analytical framework on the principles of Marxist political economy. This

approach emphasizes the concept of conflict as a conceptual framework that provides the main means for empirically explaining the current structural transformation process and creates periodic crises that ultimately lead to a complete transformation of capitalist totality. The fundamental Weber approaches to fundamental institutional theory, by looking at Weber as the main source of inspiration, base their analytical framework on the conceptualizations of the political science and emphasize the administrative and political structures rather than the economic infrastructure of society. Accordingly, society is characterized by a conflict of interests and a power struggle that provides the driving force for a broad social change (Borel & Morgan, 2014).

D. Radical Humanist paradigm

The approach to this paradigm has many common features with the interpretive paradigm approaching the social sciences. In view of this, the paradigm also looks at the social world from a viewpoint of nominalism, Anti-Positivist, Voluntarist, and Ideographic but the reference framework of this paradigm emphasizes the viewpoint of society that it adheres to the importance of rejecting or going beyond the limits of existing social arrangements. The main attention of the theorists entering this human paradigm is to liberate human beings from the limits on which the existing social arrangements result from his progress. This paradigm looks at the society as anti-human, and seeks to identify ways in which human beings transcend the limits and spiritual chains that bind them to existing social patterns, thus giving their full potential. The paradigm of radical humanism emphasizes fundamental change, domination, liberation, deprivation and possibility. Apart from Marx's initial work, people like Lukács, Gramsci, Ilyich, Castestana and Ling have worked on this paradigm. Sartor's existential philosophy also belongs to this paradigm.

The fundamental humanist paradigm, according to the definition, refers to the creation of a sociology of fundamental change from a mental perspective. The view of fundamental humanism, according to its mentalistic approach to the social sciences, emphasizes human consciousness. Marx founded the foundation of fundamental humanism. Sartor's existentialist philosophy also belongs to this paradigm. These theorists seek to change the social world through a variety of knowledge and consciousness. (Lukac, 1971; Ling, 1967; Ilyich, 1973; Gramsci, 1971; Castañeda, 1970; Sartre, 1984). The authors who have asked to tell the paradigm about the organization of the story have grounded the anti-organization theory. The paradigm of fundamental humanism is, in principle, based on the inversion of definitions that defines the functional paradigm. So, it's no surprise that the anti-organization theory changes the defining functional organization functionalities in almost all cases, which are explained below (Borel & Morgan, 2014).

Table 3: Four sociology paradigms (Boriel & Morgan, 2014)

Fundamental change

Fundamental Humanism	Fundamental Structuralism
Interpretation	Functionalism

Order

2.4 Critique of anti-organization theory

According to studies on the anti-organization theory, there have been critiques that some of them are mentioned below:

1. Much attention is paid to what Marcuse called the monotonous nature of modern society: society reflects a form of tyranny that is based on the control of factors such as labor, rationality, science and technology, which shapes these human consciousness's and guides. They are keen to show that alternatives are available, such as alternative realistic, alternative cultures, alternative technologies.... (Romanticism) (Marcuse, 1964, 1966, 1968)

2. 2) Their foundations are in conflict with positive sciences. Science is recognized in terms of functionalism as rejected because it has dominated human beings and is not seeking solutions (man is a prisoner of science and rationalist calculus). Anti-organizational humanism comes from the human sciences and focuses on the philosophies that describe the different and unique cultures. (Romance)

3. The concepts of man-made construction are objective products of human consciousness that are considered in the industrial society as anti-humanizing factors that are beyond human control. (Idealism) (Borille and Morgan, 2014)

   There are also criticisms of the issues discussed above, including:

1. The first two issues represent the romanticism and the last issue of idealisticism, which seeks to find alternative alternatives of the present time, which can be said to have optimistic views but are similar to Marx's communist insights.

2. This optimistic impression is based on the assumption that shortage is no longer a problem. The lack of thought is part of the ideological domination system in which human beings live.

3. Subversion is the concept of a deficiency that enables human salvation to enable it to live in harmony with nature, while avoiding the physical deprivations associated with returning to the former modes of life (freeing from existing life practices social).

   Also, the anti-organization theory has criticized the factors that are discussed below:

- The concept of purposeful rationality, which is a dominant and highly valued way of knowing in organizational textures.

- The rules and control systems that control rational action.
- The roles that surround human activities in precisely defined areas.
- The language of organizational life that reflects the distortion of communication.
- The ideological mechanisms through which the worker is accustomed to accepting language, roles and workplace instructions (lack of creativity).
- Emphasizing the worship of technology as a liberating factor.
- Objectivity, in the same way as concepts, such as work, leisure, shortage, and usefulness, have shackled the ambiguity of the relationship between workers and the world in which they live (Borel & Morgan, 2014).

3. Conclusion

The anti-organization theory seeks, through critique, to reveal the self-alienation reflected in the organizational lifestyle to point to the desirability of alternatives to social reality. On the other hand, adopting the paradigm of fundamental humanism involves the rejection of the organization's theory in the form of a functionalist paradigm as a raw, wrong and unpleasant political set. The acceptance of fundamental humanism requires the acceptance of another paradigm, the rational universe, and, in fact, the acceptance of an alternative fact lacking the limits of the organization's theory, which in principle, the man is not a prisoner of science and rational calculus. Anti-organizational humanism comes from the human sciences and focuses on the philosophies that describe the different and unique cultures. Also, the anti-organization theory regards technology as an agent of liberty and emphasizes awareness of number 3, namely, a kind of Cultural Revolution without violence and conflict, which is referred to in this article. However, with a deeper look at the anti-organization theory, we find that this theory is a coherent theory that is able to maintain itself, because it is based on a completely different tradition. The anti-organization theory is not based on functionalism's viewpoint and can operate in its own sphere of thought, and it must be said that it has a new look to the reality of organizational life and human resources.

References

1. Azad Armaki. Taghi (2004), Theories of Sociology, Soroush, Tehran
2. Borille Gibson, Morgan. Garrot, (2014), Sociological and Sociological Theories and Organization Analysis, Translation: Nowruz. Mohammad Taghi, Publishing SAMT, Tehran

3. Castanda, C. (1970), *The Teaching of Don Juan: A Yacqui Way of knowledge.* Harmondsworth: Peguin.

4. Dilthey, W. (1967), *Selected Writings* (ed. H. P. Rickman). London: Cambridge University Press.

5. Ebrahim Pour. Habib (2006), The Philosophical Foundations of Organizational and Management Theories with Functional and Structuralist Approach, Management Culture, Qom, No. 13

6. Gibson, Bill. (2002), *"An Essay on late Structuralism"*, Vermant University Press. www.uvm.edu

7. Gramesci, A. (1971), *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (eds. Quinton Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith). London: Lawrence and Wishart.

8. Illich, I. (1973), *Tools for Conviviality.* London: Fontana/Collins.

9. Khaleqi. Amir Hossein (2012), An Investigation of Multidisciplinary and Sub-Paradigmatic Approaches to Organizational Studies, Development Management Process, Tehran, No 2

10. Laing, R.D. (1967), *the Politics of Experience.* New York: Ballantine.

11. Lukacs, G. (1971), *History and Class Consciousness.* London: Merlin. (First published 1923)

12. Marcuse, H. (1964), *One Dimensional Man.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

13. Marcuse, H. (1966), *Eros and Civilization.* Boston: Beacon.

14. Marcuse, H. (1968), Industrialisation and Capitalism in the Work of Max Weber', *negations: Essays in Critical Theory*, op. cit.

15. Marcuse, H. (1968), *Negations: Essays in Critical Theory.* London: Heinemann.

16. Marx, K. (1975), *Early Writings* (trans. R. Livingstone and G. Benton). Harmondsworth: Penguin. (This contains Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts, 1844)

17. Mirzai Aharenjani, Hassan. (2014), The Philosophical Foundations of Organization Theory, Tehran, SAMT.

18. Morgan, G. (2006), *Images of organization*. Thousand oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.

19. Parsons, T. (1951), *the Social System*. London: Tavistock; Glencoe, Ill: Free Press.

20. Ritzer, G. (2001), Explorations in Social Theory, From Metatheorizing to Rationalization. London: SAGE Publications.

21. Sartre, J. P. (1948), *Existentialism ad Humanism* (trans. P. Mairet). London: Methuen.

22. Tavasoli. Ghulam Abbas (2005), Sociology Theories, SAMT, Tehran

23. Webber, M. (1947), *the Theory of Social and Economic Organization* (trans. A. Henderson and T. Parsons), Glencoe, Ill: Free Press.

24. Zimmerman, D.H. (1970), the Practicalities of Rule Use, in J. D. Douglas, ed., *Understanding Everyday Life,* op. cit.