ABSTRACT
Ask the typical public or private sector manager to draw a picture of his or her mental model of an organization, more often you will encounter a final result of some version of the classic, pyramid-shaped organizational diagram. In other words, many managers see organization as structure. Here, what structure means can be defined as the way the work or activity is divided up and reporting relationships arranged. This tendency structure in fact is not surprising, given the bureaucratic mind set prevalent in many large organizations. Unfortunately, the reality of organization is far more complicated, and capably guiding organizations through change requires a much more sophisticated understanding of relationships. In other words, "organization is structure" dead for the leader to develop a multidimensional picture of the organization.

Organizational/management science refers to the aid in the form of system theory applied to the organization, organizational sociology, and organizational modeling. System theory came from the natural sciences with the aim of understanding sets of objects, the relationships between those objects, and the relationship between sets of objects and their environments. The solar system and the human body are seen to be systems. System theory has been widely recognized and applied to the study of organizations. System approaches are related to an ideology arising at a particular point in the past 200 years, in which especially values and perceived needs were incorporated into organizational designs and management methods. Incorporating the rise of large and distributed organizations in the mid-19th century to our present concepts of ecological systems, the field of organizational sociology has seen various organizational types and taken into order as a typology including rational, natural, and open systems (Scott, 2003). This paper wants to propose a possible basis for synthesis, and suggest its implications today.
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1. INTRODUCTION
In the 1950s, a new intellectual field, referred to the study of organizations, came into being. It is mostly existed of sociologists, political scientists, psychologists, engineers, management specialists, and economists, it was and is known as organization studies, organization science or organization theory. At the point of departure, organization theory was mainly an American creation and still seem to be like that. A newly established journal Administrative Science Quarterly and three textbooks, March and Simon (1958), Likert (1961) and Blau and Scott (1962) underlined the crystallization of this body of knowledge into an independent field in the United States. Probably more than any other scholar, Richard Scott contributed to the canonization of the field and especially to the systems theory.

Systems theory is a concept that came into being from biology, economics, and engineering, which explores principles and laws that can be generalized across different systems (Yoon and Kuchinke, 2005; Alter, 2007; Dubrovsky, 2004). "A system is a set of two or more elements where: the behavior of each element has an effect on the behavior of the whole; the behavior of the elements and their effects on the whole are interdependent; and while subgroups of the elements all have an effect on the behavior of the whole, none has an independent effect on it (Skyttner, 1996)." In other words, a system comprises of subsystems whose inter-relationships and interdependence getting into equilibrium within the larger system (Martinelli, 2001; Steele, 2003). The history of systems theories includes contributions from such seminal thinkers as Alfred North Whitehead, Ludwig von Bertalanffy, Anatol Rapoport, Kenneth Boulding, Paul A. Weiss, Ralph Gerard, Kurt Lewin, Roy R. Grinker, William Gray, Nicolas Rizzo, Karl Menninger, Silvano Arieti, and, in more recent years, the dynamical systems theorists, the family systems theorists, and those who deal with dissipative structures and holistic paradigms.

The systems thinking dynamics seems to be required to meet the existing challenges are thus imperative to modern organizational success. The path to business success is riddled with uncertainties and turbulence and therefore, leaders have an obligation to look for ways that engender business intelligence that creates values beyond competitors that deliberately advance business performance. Systems thinking are not the first choice of individuals because humans want the easiest and quickest solutions. However, systems thinking reduce uncertainties and establish clear performance indicators.
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2. SYSTEMS PERSPECTIVES

Based on Scott’s (2003) typology of organization theory, the present section looks for traditional organization studies into distinctive systems perspectives according to their view of organizational interactions. In this meaning, studies concerning organizational interactions can be viewed in systems terms either with a rational, natural or open systems perspective. Each of these perspectives suggests number of assumptions about interactional behavior among individuals, work groups or organizations (Ali, 2008).

2.1 RATIONAL SYSTEM PERSPECTIVE

The term "ration" is used here in the narrow meaning of technical or functional rationality. Mannheim (1950) explains such a kind of rationality as a series of actions that cause predetermined goals with maximum efficiency. Rational systems models focus on formal structure as an acute tool for the efficient achievement of specific organizational goals. Two basic assumptions thus aid viewing organizations as rational systems namely: goal specification and structure formalization. While specific goals aim participants with unambiguous criteria for selecting among alternatives, highly formalized structure provide participants with explicit and certain rules and roles relations that manage their interactional behavior.

In organizational interactions, goal specification and structure formalization may be viewed as a test drive to make participants interactional behavior more predictable by standardizing and regulating it. This, in turn, allows stable expectations to be formed by each member of the group as to the behavior of the other member under specific conditions. Such stable expectations are a main precondition to a rational consideration of the consequences of interactions in organizational groups (Simon, 1997). The social cement that gets together and regulates interactions within formal groups is known as the normative structure that includes values, norms, and role expectations. While values are criteria of selecting goals of the behavior, norms are generalized rules managing that behavior, and roles are expectations for specific positions as their location in a system. In any organization, values, rules and roles constitute a relatively coherent and consistent set of prescriptions governing the behavior of participants (Davis, 1949).

In an order, rational models’ view of organizations aligns somewhat with Morgan’s (1986) metaphor of the machine. Here, inter-individual or inter-groups interactions are oriented towards achieving relatively specific goals through exhibiting relatively highly formalized structure (Ali, 2008).

2.2 NATURAL SYSTEM PERSPECTIVE

While rational systems perspective deals with goal specification and structure formalization, natural perspective places more emphasis on goal complexity and informal structure. In this sense, natural system theorists accept that goals can be pluralistic, rather than unitary. They distinguish the stated or official goals from the real or operative ones. When the stated goals are actually being pursued, they are never the only goal governing participants’ behavior. Hence, natural system models presume the existence of certain operative goals that must be met if the system wants to go on to be survived. On the other hand, natural system theorists do not deny the existence of highly formalized structures within organizations, however they do question their impact on the behavior of participants. They argued the existence and materiality of the informal structures as those based on the personal characteristics of specific participants rather than their given position within the formal structure.

Goal complexity and structure informality do participants interactional behavior too complex and unpredictable. The social cement that binds and regulates interactions among informal groups is known as the behavioral structure (Davis, 1949). Homans’(1950) well-known classification of social behavior into activities, interactions, and sentiments suggests the type of elements that create the behavioral structure. Not like the normative structure, investigators in behavioral structure put emphasis on the current behavior that exhibit consistency and constancy, rather than the prescriptions of the behavior. Natural systems models argued that elements constituting the normative structures constrain behavioral structure elements. In other words, organization values, norms and roles can shape, channel and pattern participants’ sentiments, activities and interactions. As criteria for selecting aim of the behavior, values shape participants’ sentiments.
that determine their real goals. Moreover, norms that direct the behavior towards selected goals channel participants’ activities to achieve such goals. Finally, roles pattern interactions among individual participants according to their positions within formal structure. Building upon this, natural systems models see organizations as collectivities whose participants share a common interest in the survival of the system and who engage in inter-individual and inter-group interactions, informally structured, to secure this end (Ali, 2008).

2.3 OPEN SYSTEM PERSPECTIVE
Organization studies that are classified as rational and natural systems perspectives focus primarily on intra-organizational interactions among individual participants or organizational work groups (Burnes, 1996). While rational models emphasize formal rules and roles relations among multilayered positions, natural models place great importance on informal groups and their actual behavior. Both perspectives thus aim to direct participants and groups’ formal and informal interactional behavior towards achieving organizational goals. Nevertheless, rational and natural systems models don’t give care to interactions that emerge between an organization and elements constituting its organizational environment. In addition to intra-organizational interactions, interactions between an organization and its environmental elements receive primary attention by open systems theorists. For organizations to survive, they have to cope with changes existed in these elements by adopting their structures and behavior to these changes (Millett, 1998). In an order, open system perspective sees organizations as systems that are affected with the environments in which they operate. However, an ascendance of open systems view has not meant the disappearance of the earlier rational or natural systems views. Instead of that, they have been updated via combining them with the open systems in multiple ways. By cross classifying rational, natural and open systems perspectives with each other, two groups of systems views are emerged. The first group comprises closed rational and natural systems models. The second group includes open rational and natural systems models (Ali, 2008).

Type I: Closed Rational System Models: All of these theorists portray organizations as "tools to achieve preset ends” and largely ignore the impact of the environment. This includes, Taylor, Fayol, Weber, and early Simon. Type II: Closed Natural System Models: Most of these are from the human relations group, and continued to be focused on internal organizational actions. This type includes theorists like Mayo, Dalton, Barnard, Roy, and Whyte. Type III: Open Rational System Models: When the open system approach was introduced by Simon in the 1940’s, it quickly caught on and spurred the development of multiple theories built on economical, psychological, and sociological backgrounds. This includes bounded rationality, agency theory, contingency theory, comparative structural analysis, and transaction cost analysis. Type IV: Open Natural Systems Models: Recently the open rational models that have dominated since the 60’s are being supplanted by open natural theories. These new, abundant theories challenge the idea that organizations behave rationally. These include Weick’s "organizing" theory, negotiated order, organizational learning, socio-technical systems, strategic contingency, population ecology, resource dependency, Marxist theory, institutional theory, and postmodernism.

3. COMBINATION OF SYSTEM PERSPECTIVES
This section deals with combining levels of the analysis adopted by various organization studies with systems perspectives that dominate their view of organizational interactions. Here, organization studies classified as closed-rational models emphasize number of factors including: specification of positions, tasks, prescription, role definitions, procedural rules and regulations. These factors are used as criteria to direct intra-organizational interactions towards achieving organizational goals. From this standpoint, most of the closed rational models operate primarily at the structural level of analysis to conceptualize and analyze structural features of an organization and their impact on work groups’ interactions Fayol’s (1919) administrative model and Weber’s (1968) model of bureaucracy. Nevertheless, some other closed-rational models utilize social psychological level of analysis that aims on individual participants as they perform tasks or do decisions. These models treat organizational internal environment as context to examine its impact on the performance of individual participants Taylor’s (1911) model of scientific management and Simon’s (1997) model of decision making. On the other hand, closed-national models stress participants’ personal attributes and attitudes rather than their given position within the formal structure. They work primarily at the social psychological level of analysis to describe how features of an organization’s internal

http://www.jimsbr.com
environment affect participants’ attributes, attitudes and consequently their relationships Whyte’s (1959) model of human relations. Still other closed-natural models operate on the structural level of analysis. These models put emphasis on different analytical components that characterize organizational informal structure, such as interpersonal systems of power, communication, status and friendship, and examine their impact on formal systems Mayo’s (1945) model of human relations and Bernard’s (1938) model of cooperative systems.

With appearance of the open systems perspectives, the ecological level has been emerged as a new level of analysis in addition to the former social psychological and structural levels (Scott and Davis, 2007). However, open systems models, whether rational or natural, may work on each of these analytical levels. In this spectrum, open-rational and open-natural models that operate on the social psychological level of analysis emphasize the behavior of individual participants. They presume that environmental demands and organizational response are mediated by decision makers or managers who develop adequate arrangements to cope with environmental changes. Here, open-rational models emphasize the cognitive limitations of decision makers and the role of normative structure components of values, rules and roles to support their rational response to environmental demand March & Simon’s (1958) model of bounded rationality.

On the other hand, open-rational models put great emphasis on the importance of the cognitive processes that aid participants to perceive and react to environmental changes Weick’s (1979) model of organizing. On the other hand, open-rational and open-natural models that operate on the structural level of analysis emphasize a correspondence among structural modifications and environmental challenges Lawrence and Lorsch’s (1967) model of contingency. In open-rational models, structural features of an organization are managed by a several of environmental constraints. Alternatively, open-natural models insist that the state of technology and other environmental conditions pose only broad and general constraints on structural design. Such a given set of circumstances support many adaptive responses and alternative strategies. An effective structure for a given organization is shaped not only by its technology and task environment but by the adopted strategy Hickson’s (1971) model of strategic contingencies.

Finally, open-rational and open-natural models that work on the ecological level of analysis emphasize inter-organizational interactions between an organization and its environmental elements. Hence, open-rational models underline inter-organizational interactions among interdependent organizations working in the same regional or functional fields. They presume that an organization is both open and rational systems via modifying organizational rules and roles relations that govern inter-organizational practices Ouchi’s (1980) transaction cost model. On the other hand, open-natural models stress interactions between an organization and its set or population. They employ sense making processes by that an organization perceive changes in environmental demands and provide suitable actions to react to these changes Hannan & Freeman’s (1977) model of Population Ecology and Pfeffer and Salancik’s (1978) resource dependence model (Ali, 2008).
4. NEW ORGANIZATION LOGIC
The evolution of the organization and management science literature represents a basic change in organization logic over time. The initial organizational logic was based on the closed, rational...
perspective; orderly the logic was based on the natural, open perspective; most recently, a new logic has occurred that assumes an agile, environment-oriented, network system. The differences across these organizational logics are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOGIC I</th>
<th>LOGIC II</th>
<th>LOGIC III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic Control</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Networking and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Orientation</td>
<td>External Awareness and Adaptation</td>
<td>External Positioning Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally Oriented</td>
<td>Internally Oriented Lateral Processes</td>
<td>Externally Oriented Relationships, Partnerships, and Alliances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Relationships &amp; Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic Organizational Design</td>
<td>Contingent Organizational Design</td>
<td>Flexible &amp; Fluid Network Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Designed around Internal Functions</td>
<td>Organization Designed around Externally Oriented Products and Customers</td>
<td>Organization Designed to Effect Positioning in External Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Value-Added Is Management</td>
<td>Value-Added of All Employees</td>
<td>Value-Added of Partnerships &amp; Alliances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Focus</td>
<td>Leadership Focus</td>
<td>Facilitation Focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over time, the organization and management sciences literature has tremendously recognized the shortcomings of generic approaches. Focusing on generic functions can mask the fact that there are, indeed, differing views of organizational effectiveness. Although all organizations have to address some common functions, various organizations will have different emphases and approaches. Different functions and different attributes within each of the functions are likely to be emphasized by different types of organizations facing different internal and external challenges. This recognition has given rise to the identification of new performance functions, such as change management, organizational learning, knowledge management, organizational partnerships and network formation, innovation, and creativity. Organizations have become more differentiated and more and more topics are being addressed in the literature.

5. CONCLUSION
Organization studies are classified into various systems perspectives according to their view of organizational interactions. Basic assumptions that govern individuals, work groups or organizations interactional behavior and their role in accomplishing organizational goals change from one perspective to another. Moreover, organization studies operate at several analytical levels as they examine interactions within and among organizations. In the empirical domain, combining systems perspectives with levels of analysis aids students of organizations to provide new explanations about inter-individuals, work groups and organizations interactional behavior. Studies concerning organizational interactions thus employ a particular combination of systems perspectives and analytical level to achieve their research objectives.

If the study emphasizes inter-individual interactions among participants of organizational work group, social psychological analysis has to be employed to achieve the typical objectives:

A) Examine the impact of the elements constituting organization’s internal environment on the behavior of individual participants.
B) Examine rationality of individual decision makers as they respond to changes in external environmental demand.
C) Examine the impact of internal environmental elements on participants’ attitudes and orderly their interactive relationships.
D) Assist individual decision makers to recognize and react to external environmental changes.

On the other hand, if the study focuses on inter-groups interactions that exist among organizational subunits, structural analysis is employed to achieve the typical objectives:

E) Analyze the components that characterize organizational formal structure and examine their effect on inter-groups’ interactions as they operate tasks.
F) Modify formal rules and roles relations that guide inter-groups’ interactions as they answer to external environmental constraints.
G) Investigate informal work relations and examine their impact on specialties of an organization’s formal structure.
H) Guide organizational work groups to perceive and react to external environmental constraints.

Here, (A), (B), (E) and (F) typical objectives necessitate adopting basic assumptions of rational systems perspective in which goal specification and structure formalization govern organizational interactions and their role in accomplishing organizational goals. On the other hand, (C), (D), (G) and (H) objectives mean adopting basic assumptions of national systems perspectives in which goal complexity and structure informality direct organizational interactions towards achieving organizational goals.

Finally, if the study focus on interactions among an organization and the elements that constitute its external environment, ecological analysis is employed to achieve the typical objectives:

I) Adapt organizational rules and roles relations that manage inter-organizational practices as they respond to changes in external environmental demands.
J) Describe the desired modifications in inter-organizational practices that are needed to deal with changes in external environmental demands using the sense making processes of enacting, selection and retention.

Achieving (I) and (J) typical objectives necessitates adopting basic assumptions of open rational and natural perspectives. This is to demonstrate the linkages between organizational goals and the requirements of other organizations constituting elements of an organizational environment. Here, great emphasis is put on the role of inter-organizational interactions to achieve organizational goals.
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