

УДК 316.722-316.725»20»

doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.30970/VSO.2023.17.13>

THE HISTORY OF ORGANISATIONS STUDIES IN SOCIOLOGY AND OTHER BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

R. Savchynskyi

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

1, Universytetska str., Lviv, Ukraine

orcid.org/0000-0002-0678-1755

savchynskyi@gmail.com

This article delivers an extensive historical and theoretical analysis of organizational studies as a multidisciplinary field, focusing on its evolution within sociology and the behavioral sciences. The narrative traces the origins of organizational thought from pre-industrial societies, where foundational management concepts such as leadership, efficiency, and resource allocation were already present in ancient texts and practices. Influential works from figures like Sun Tzu, Plato, Aristotle, St. Benedict, Machiavelli, and Thomas More are highlighted as early sources of organizational principles, demonstrating that the study of organizations has deep historical roots.

The article goes on to examine the profound impact of the Industrial Revolution, which necessitated systematic approaches to managing increasingly complex organizations and gave rise to classical management theories. It discusses how, in the early 20th century, the field began to solidify with contributions from sociology, psychology, economics, and management, each providing unique perspectives. Sociology introduced the study of bureaucracy and social structure through scholars like Max Weber and Emile Durkheim, while psychology contributed insights into individual behavior and motivation, particularly through the human relations movement.

The evolution of organizational studies is mapped through key theoretical shifts: from classical and bureaucratic models to the behavioral science movement and the emergence of contingency theory in the mid-20th century, which emphasized that effective management depends on organizational context. The article also addresses the influence of postmodernism and critical theory, which challenged traditional assumptions and stressed the importance of power, discourse, and social construction within organizations.

In recent decades, the field has increasingly adopted interdisciplinary and network-based approaches, integrating concepts from multiple disciplines to better understand the complexity of modern organizations. The article identifies persistent gaps, notably the need for more comprehensive, cross-disciplinary

@ R. Savchynskyi

frameworks to address contemporary organizational challenges. It concludes with recommendations for future research, advocating for the continued integration of diverse theoretical perspectives and empirical methodologies to advance both the theory and practice of organizational studies.

Keywords: organizational studies, interdisciplinary, historical development, theoretical perspectives

Organizational studies is a multidisciplinary field that examines the structure, behavior, and performance of organizations. This field has been shaped by the contributions of sociology, psychology, economics, management, and other behavioral sciences. The study of organizations is crucial for understanding how social and economic systems operate, and how they can be improved. Despite the significant progress made in this field, there are still gaps in our understanding of the complex dynamics of organizations. The purpose of this article is to provide a historical overview of organizational studies in sociology and other behavioral sciences.

The research question is: What are the historical developments and main theoretical perspectives in organizational studies in sociology and other behavioral sciences? This question is significant because it allows us to understand how the field has evolved over time, and how different theoretical perspectives have contributed to our understanding of organizations.

The article is structured as follows: The first section provides a historical overview of organizational studies, including its roots in sociology, psychology, economics, and management. The second section discusses the main theoretical perspectives on organizational studies, including classical perspective, bureaucracy, human relations perspective, and others. The third section identifies a gaps in the current understanding of organizational studies, namely the need for a more interdisciplinary approach that integrates insights from sociology, psychology, economics, and management. The fourth section discusses the implications of the findings for the theory and practice of organizational studies. The final section provides recommendations for future research directions.

The theoretical framework of this article is based on the sociological perspective of organizations as social systems. The research approach is historical and analytical, using a literature review to synthesize the existing knowledge on organizational studies in sociology and other behavioral sciences. The research is based on a comprehensive review of the literature, including academic journals, books, and conference proceedings.

In summary, this article aims to provide a historical overview of organizational studies in sociology and other behavioral sciences, highlighting the significance of the topic, defining the research question, outlining the theoretical framework and the research approach, and identifying a gap in the current understanding

that the research addresses. The article contributes to the field of organizational studies by providing a comprehensive and interdisciplinary perspective on the historical developments and main theoretical perspectives in this field.

Organizational studies is a multidisciplinary field that has been shaped by contributions various disciplines, including sociology, psychology, economics, and management. The Industrial Revolution, which took place in the 18th and 19th centuries, led to significant changes in the way organizations were managed. The rise of large-scale factories and bureaucracies created a need for systematic approaches to managing complex organizations. Thinkers like Adam Smith, who pondered economic efficiency, and Charles Babbage, who advocated for a more scientific approach to management, contributed to the early development of organizational studies [1].

Pre-industrial societies had concerns about efficiency, leadership, and resource allocation, which are evident in various historical texts and authors. Here are some examples. Organizational behavior as a formal field of study is relatively recent, but there are several classical works from ancient history, the medieval ages, and the Renaissance that touch upon aspects of organizational behavior and management practices. Here are some examples:

Ancient History: «The Art of War» by Sun Tzu: This ancient Chinese military treatise discusses leadership, strategy, and management principles that can be applied to organizations [2]. «The Republic» by Plato: In this philosophical work, Plato discusses the ideal state and the role of individuals within it, touching upon concepts such as division of labor and specialization [3]. «Politics» by Aristotle: Aristotle's work on political theory includes discussions of governance, leadership, and the role of individuals within organizations [4]. Medieval Ages: «The Rule of St. Benedict»: This monastic rule, written by St. Benedict in the 6th century, outlines the organizational structure and behavior of monastic communities, including principles of leadership, obedience, and community life [5]. «The Book of the Courtier» by Baldassare Castiglione: This Renaissance-era work discusses the ideal courtier and the qualities that make for effective leadership and social interaction within courtly settings [6]. Renaissance: «The Prince» by Niccolò Machiavelli: This political treatise discusses the nature of power and leadership, touching upon concepts such as authority, decision-making, and organizational structure [7]. «Utopia» by Thomas More: In this work, More describes an ideal society with a highly organized social and economic structure, touching upon concepts such as division of labor, specialization, and social order [8].

These works provide valuable insights into the historical roots of organizational behavior and management practices, and they can inform contemporary research and practice in this field. Research on management culture and practices in ancient

Greece, figures such as Thucydides and Democritus, along with institutions like the Delphic Oracle, emphasized information management and data-driven decision-making, highlighting early resource allocation practices. These findings underscore that foundational management principles have deep historical roots influencing modern management evolution [9].

Military management principles: The development of military management principles from ancient to modern times shows a continuous reformulation of core functions and strategies. Some principles have gained prominence, while others have diminished in importance, reflecting evolving organizational needs within military contexts. This evolution illustrates how military management has historically contributed to broader organizational theory and practice.

Indigenous family business management practices: Studies on indigenous African family business management highlight culturally rooted practices often undervalued by Western scholarship. These practices emphasize the integration of African cultural values, belief systems, and social norms, offering effective frameworks for managing organizations within African contexts. Recognizing and incorporating indigenous management philosophies is essential for developing contextually relevant organizational theories [10].

Monetary management and state intervention in pre-industrial Europe: Research into monetary management and state intervention strategies in pre-industrial Europe explores issues such as balance-of-payment constraints, currency stability versus debasement, and mechanisms to increase effective monetary mass. These economic management practices reflect early attempts at coordinating resources and state policies to promote development and competitiveness, illustrating the interplay between economic theory and organizational management [11].

These examples demonstrate that concerns about efficiency, leadership, and resource allocation were present in pre-industrial societies, and historical texts and authors provide valuable insights into the management practices and organizational structures of these societies.

The roots of organizational studies can be traced back to the early 20th century, with the emergence of classical management theories that focused on improving organizational efficiency and productivity. Sociology established the study of organizations as a subfield in the 1930s and 1940s, with scholars such as Max Weber and Emile Durkheim examining bureaucracy and social structure's role in shaping organizational behavior [12]. The sociological perspective highlights the importance of social relations and networks in understanding organizational dynamics. Psychology contributed significantly by focusing on individual behavior and attitudes within organizations, particularly through the human relations movement emphasizing employee satisfaction and motivation. Economics has enriched the field by analyzing resource allocation, incentives, and market structures, exemplified by the theory of the firm and transaction cost economics. Management as a discipline developed

alongside these fields, concentrating on practical applications to improve organizational performance in response to the complexities of modern organizations.

This historical and interdisciplinary foundation sets the stage for understanding the evolution of the field over time, tracing how organizational studies have expanded from classical management theories to incorporate behavioral, sociological, economic, and interdisciplinary perspectives that address the complexity of contemporary organizations.

The field of organizational studies has undergone significant evolution, marked by shifts in theoretical perspectives and research emphases. In the mid-20th century, the behavioral science movement emerged, emphasizing empirical research and scientific methods to understand organizational behavior. This movement, initiated by Elton Mayo and his associates through the Hawthorne studies, highlighted the importance of human factors and worker motivation in organizational performance, moving beyond the earlier mechanistic views of scientific management [13].

During the 1960s and 1970s, contingency theory gained prominence, asserting that organizational behavior and management effectiveness depend on contextual variables. This perspective rejected one-size-fits-all solutions, emphasizing that management practices must be tailored to the specific characteristics of organizations and their environments.

In the 1980s and 1990s, organizational studies were influenced by postmodernism and critical theory, which challenged traditional assumptions by focusing on power relations, discourse, and the social construction of organizational realities. These approaches questioned established norms and introduced more reflexive and interpretive analyses of organizational dynamics [14].

More recently, interdisciplinary approaches have become increasingly important, integrating insights from sociology, psychology, economics, and network theory to provide a richer understanding of complex organizational phenomena. Network theory, in particular, has enabled the analysis of social systems and social capital within organizations, reflecting the growing interest in relational and systemic perspectives [15]. Organizational studies have evolved through diverse theoretical paradigms and disciplinary contributions, underscoring the importance of historical context in appreciating current research and practice in the field.

Building on the historical and theoretical foundations of organizational studies, the field now faces new challenges and opportunities brought about by rapid technological advancements. One of the most significant contemporary forces shaping organizations is digitalization, which is fundamentally transforming organizational behavior, structures, and dynamics.

Digitalization represents a transformative trend reshaping organizational realities. The automation of processes through digital technologies, data-driven decision-making, and the emergence of new organizational forms such as virtual teams and platform-based businesses exemplify the profound ways digitalization is transforming organizations. In this section, we explore the implications of digitalization for organizational behavior and dynamics.

Digitalization is fundamentally changing the nature of work and the skill sets required of employees. The integration of automation and artificial intelligence is diminishing the necessity for routine tasks while simultaneously augmenting the demand for skills like creativity, problem-solving, and emotional intelligence. These technological advancements also enable novel forms of communication and collaboration, such as virtual teams and social networks, thereby altering the ways employees engage with one another and the organization.

Digitalization introduces new challenges to organizational culture and leadership. The implementation of data-driven decision-making can generate conflicts between traditional hierarchical structures and emerging authority systems grounded in expertise and knowledge. Furthermore, digital technologies foster innovation and experimentation, but also introduce new risks and uncertainties.

The pervasive impact of digitalization on organizations carries significant implications for organizational studies. Researchers must elucidate how digital technologies are redefining work, the skills essential for employees, and the dynamics of organizational culture and leadership. Additionally, there is a need to investigate the challenges and opportunities resulting from digitalization and to formulate innovative theories and frameworks that explain its influence on organizational behavior and dynamics [16].

Digitalization is a transformative force reshaping organizational realities. Its multifaceted effects on organizational behavior and dynamics necessitate further research and analysis. By gaining a comprehensive understanding of digitalization's implications, researchers can develop valuable insights and theories to assist organizations in adapting to the challenges and opportunities it creates.

As digitalization marks a pivotal stage in the historical development of organizational management-reshaping structures, processes, and leadership paradigms-it is essential to situate this transformation within the broader context of organizational theory. The evolution of digital technologies has not only introduced new forms of organizing but also challenged and enriched the foundational theoretical perspectives that have guided organizational studies for over a century. Understanding these main theoretical perspectives allows us to appreciate both the enduring questions and the novel challenges that digitalization brings to the field.

The classical perspective emphasizes efficiency, formal structures, and

hierarchical authority, but is often criticized for being overly rigid, mechanistic, and neglecting the human dimension of organizations.

The human relations perspective highlights motivation, satisfaction, and informal group dynamics, yet tends to overlook structural, economic, and external factors, and may be overly optimistic about human nature [17]. Structural contingency theory focuses on the fit between organizational structure and environmental context, but is often seen as too deterministic and inattentive to the dynamic capabilities and agency of organizations. Institutional theory centers on the influence of social norms, values, and legitimacy in shaping organizational forms and practices, though it can be overly deterministic and inattentive to agency, power, and diversity [18]. Symbolic interactionism explores how meaning, interpretation, and communication shape organizational reality, but is often faulted for focusing too much on micro-level interactions and neglecting larger structures and material conditions. Critical theory examines power, conflict, and ideology within organizations, aiming for social change, but can be overly negative, radical, and may neglect positive organizational functions and individual agency [19].

Building upon the comprehensive historical analysis of organizational studies and the examination of theoretical perspectives, we now arrive at the concluding reflections on this multidisciplinary field. This final section synthesizes key insights and outlines promising directions for future research. The historical trajectory of organizational studies reveals its rich interdisciplinary heritage, drawing from sociology, psychology, economics, and management. From classical management theories focused on efficiency to contemporary approaches examining digitalization's impact, the field has continuously evolved to address emerging organizational challenges. This evolution reflects both the changing nature of organizations themselves and the development of new theoretical lenses through which to understand them.

Our analysis identifies several significant gaps in current organizational studies that warrant further investigation. First, despite the field's multidisciplinary origins, there remains a need for more integrated theoretical frameworks that synthesize insights across disciplinary boundaries. While individual disciplines offer valuable perspectives, organizations are complex entities that cannot be fully understood through any single theoretical lens. Second, contemporary challenges such as digitalization, global crises, and social movements demand new conceptual tools. The digital transformation of organizations has fundamentally altered organizational structures, communication patterns, and leadership dynamics, creating both opportunities and challenges that existing theories may inadequately address. Third, organizational resilience in extreme conditions represents a particularly urgent research priority. The recent experiences of organizations operating during the COVID-19 pandemic and in conflict zones like Ukraine highlight the need for deeper understanding of how organizations maintain functionality under severe disruption. Factors such as resource scarcity, infrastructure damage, psychological impacts on employees, and cybersecurity threats pose unique challenges that differ substantially from the «normal disruptions» typically studied in resilience research.

Future research should prioritize several directions to address these gaps. Interdisciplinary collaboration should be strengthened to develop more holistic theoretical frameworks. Studies examining the long-term implications of digitalization on organizational structures, culture, and leadership will be particularly valuable. Additionally, research on organizational resilience in extreme conditions-especially conflict zones-can yield important insights for both theory and practice.

The practical implications of this historical and theoretical analysis are significant. Organizations facing unprecedented challenges can benefit from understanding the evolution of management thought and the diverse theoretical perspectives available. Leaders navigating digital transformation or crisis conditions need frameworks that integrate insights from multiple disciplines and contexts.

In conclusion, organizational studies stands at an important juncture. By building on its rich interdisciplinary heritage while addressing contemporary challenges through innovative research approaches, the field can continue to provide valuable insights into the complex dynamics of organizations in an increasingly uncertain world.

References:

1. Ocampo, L. A., Acedillo, V., Bacunador, A. M., Balo, C. C., Lagdameo, Y. J., & Tupa, N. S. (2018). A historical review of the development of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and its implications for the twenty-first century. *Personnel Review*, 47(4), 821–862. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-12-2017-0383>
2. Chen, C.-Y., & Lee, C.-H. (2012). Sun Tzu's «The Art of War» and implications for leadership: A strategic leadership perspective. *Organizacija*, 45(4), 151-160. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10051-012-0017-1>
3. Plato. (1997). *The Republic* (G. M. A. Grube & C. D. C. Reeve, Trans., 2nd ed.). Hackett Publishing Company. (Original work published ca. 375 BCE)
4. St. Benedict. (1981). *The Rule of St. Benedict* (T. W. Crafer, Trans.). Liturgical Press. (Original work published 6th century)
5. Castiglione, B. (2002). *The Book of the Courtier* (C. S. Singleton, Trans.). Dover Publications. (Original work published 1528)
6. Machiavelli, N. (2003). *The Prince* (R. M. Adams, Trans.). W. W. Norton & Company. (Original work published 1532)
7. More, T. (2003). *Utopia* (R. M. Adams, Trans.). W. W. Norton & Company. (Original work published 1516)
8. Fakidouma, P., Perewari, & Oguara, P. O. (2023). Management culture and practice in ancient civilizations of Sumerian, Egypt, and Greek. *Semantic Scholar*. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/1679259fcc80da1e7a08177bb074c7e05b2c34e9>
9. Yildirim Saatci, E. (2014). Management through the lenses of ancient people. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 4(5), 349–355. <https://doi.org/10.7763/IJSSH.2014.V4.377>
10. Maclean, M., Harvey, C., & Clegg, S. R. (2016). Conceptualizing historical organization studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 41(4), 609–632. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2014.0417>
11. Ochieng, M. (n.d.). Historical development of organizational development (OD). *LinkedIn*. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/historical-development-organizational-millan-ochieng>
12. Tadajewski, M. (2009). The politics of the behavioural revolution in organization

- [illegible]

ІСТОРІЯ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙ У СОЦІОЛОГІЇ ТА ІНШИХ ПОВЕДІНКОВИХ НАУКАХ

Р. Савчинський

Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка
Університетська, 1, Львів, Україна
orcid.org/0000-0002-0678-1755
savchynskiy@gmail.com

Ця стаття містить розлогий історичний та теоретичний аналіз організаційних досліджень як міждисциплінарної галузі, зосереджуючись на її еволюції в соціології та поведінкових науках. У статті простежується походження організаційної думки з доіндустріальних суспільств, де основоположні концепції управління, такі як лідерство, ефективність та розподіл ресурсів, вже були присутні в стародавніх текстах і практиці. Впливові праці таких діячів, як Сунь Цзи, Платон, Аристотель, Святий Бенедикт, Макіавеллі та Томас Мор, розглядаються як ранні джерела організаційних принципів, що демонструє глибокі історичні корені вивчення організацій. Далі в статті розглядається глибокий вплив промислової революції, яка зумовила необхідність системних підходів до

управління дедалі складнішими організаціями та дала поштовх розвитку класичних теорій управління. Обговорюється, як на початку 20 століття ця галузь почала зміцнюватися завдяки внеску соціології, психології, економіки та менеджменту, кожна з яких надала унікальні перспективи. Соціологія запровадила вивчення бюрократії та соціальної структури завдяки таким вченим, як Макс Вебер та Еміль Дюркгейм, а психологія внесла свій вклад у розуміння індивідуальної поведінки та мотивації, зокрема через рух за поліпшення людських відносин. Еволюція організаційних досліджень простежується через ключові теоретичні зрушення: від класичних і бюрократичних моделей до руху поведінкових наук і появи теорії непередбачуваності в середині 20 століття, яка підкреслила, що ефективне управління залежить від організаційного контексту. У статті також розглядається вплив постмодернізму та критичної теорії, які поставили під сумнів традиційні уявлення і підкреслили важливість влади, дискурсу та соціального будівництва в організаціях. В останні десятиліття в цій галузі все частіше застосовуються міждисциплінарні та мережеві підходи, що інтегрують концепції з різних дисциплін для кращого розуміння складності сучасних організацій.

У статті визначено прогалини, зокрема необхідність більш комплексного, міждисциплінарного вивчення сучасних організаційних викликів. У висновках наводяться рекомендації щодо подальших досліджень, в яких виступається за продовження інтеграції різних теоретичних підходів та емпіричних методологій з метою розвитку як теорії, так і практики організаційних досліджень.

Ключові слова: організаційні дослідження, міждисциплінарність, історичний розвиток, теоретичні підходи.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 06.08.2023

Прийнята до друку 14.10.2023