Organization Theory Review

Editorial

There are three main motives of publishing OTR. The first is the foundational diversity of the field. Organization Theory draws from multiple disciplines including, but not limited to, economics, psychology, sociology, philosophy, natural sciences, humanities, art, literature, history, linguistics, complexity sciences, critical theory, social constructionism, symbolic interactions and phenomenology. The two broad opposing theoretical perspectives of Organization Theory, the dominant or dual functionalist and the critical or interpretive or deflective or retro-organization theory discourses, are based on different inclinations towards the foundational knowledge disciplines of the field. The first major objective of OTR is to create synthesis and synergy between the apparently opposing and divergent perspectives of Organization Theory.

The second main stimulus for taking out OTR is to promote contextualization of Organization Theory. Recently there has been an upsurge to contextualize the field around the constructs of culture, society and nation states. OTR's objective is to ascend further and to utilize a higher and whole construct civilization which is like an ocean where all the streams of cultural and national thought merge. This perspective also has the potential to challenge the monotony of globalization and to preserve and promote not only the localized and contextualized knowledge but also to provide an opportunity to learn from different perspectives and paradigms while transcending the national and geographical boundaries.

The third main motive of OTR is to encourage interdisciplinary learning and knowledge creation. The fields of medicine, physics, psychology and sociology are witnessing the emergence of new paradigms in the form of holography, quantum theory, symbolic interpretation and ethnographies. Organization Theory literature is paying isolated and scant attention to these advances. Organizations are made up of human beings who have the capacity to build and create collective and holographic organizational consciousness. OTR seeks to create interdisciplinary links with other knowledge fields so that the post modern organizational individuals, processes, tasks and functions are understood in the realm of holistic knowledge rather than as mere positivistic and empirical constructs.

In nutshell the objectives of OTR can be summarized as creation of contextualized organizational knowledge, its integration and unity with other and different organizational knowledge focusing on qualitative and theoretical routes to knowledge creation and integration of multi-religious, multiphilosophical and multi-cultural knowledge moving from multi-disciplinary to holistic view of Organization Theory.

Foundational diversity of Organization Theory is well represented through the six articles of our first issue. The role of history in defining the present and future contours of OT discourses is the main stimulus in connecting and comparing the management style of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) with the field. The main output of this article, a new theoretical construct Prophetic Organization Theory (POT), has the potential to ignite the imagination of organization theorists to borrow more from less utilized fields of knowledge while they craft new theories and models to help understand and manage the complexity and dynamism of organizations.

The second article proposes a new framework of managing organizational conflict and highlights the role of phronetic embedded leadership in conflict management.

Third article reflects on the principles used for evaluating theoretical contributions and their universal application. Inquiry is done about the impact of cultural and contextual variables in perceiving the value of a theoretical contribution specifically in organizational theory.

Fourth article addresses different objective facets of neuroticism within the close proximity of an organization, which is meant to support human beings with respect to their multi-dimensional needs and studies power of neuroticism on human cognition that contacts individual learning cycle.

Fifth article discusses the responsive process thinking models of two distinctive leadership styles and presents a comparative case study of Microsoft and Apple computers.

Finally, sixth article tends to explore the intentions of higher education students towards performing qualitative research within the domain of social sciences.

Table of Contents