

Metaphorical Approach to Organization: As The Focus of Intersecting Spectrums

MohammadHosseinRahmati(PhD)¹, SayedMojtabaHosseiniFard²

¹University of Tehran, IRAN ²Shahed University, IRAN

ABSTRACT

Metaphorical approach is one to simplify complex concepts in management and organization field. In line with different metaphors presented by various scholars such as Morgan, Barrel, Robbins and Hatch, a new metaphor is presented in this study called "Organization as the focus of intersecting spectrums". In order to achieve this, a review is made on the theories and models with the objective of explaining different organizational aspects. Then, by a holistic view of Aristotelian logic, one of separated two-scale values, Buddhist logic, one of adjacent two-scale values, and fuzzy logic, as the fundamental of the issue, the position of spectrum approach in organization and management texts is proposed as well as the new metaphor. The article ends with the applications, discussion and conclusion of this new metaphor

KEYWORDS: Organization, Spectrum, Fuzzy Logic, Aristotelian logic, Metaphorical Approach

INTRODUCTION

Management science continuously seeks to find solutions to better identify, analyze and manage organization in such a way that many scholars in the field believe that it should be named "organization science" rather than "management science" (Mirzai Ahranjani, 2007: 18). Regarding the ultimate goal of science, which is prediction and illustration of phenomena (Chalmers, 2005: 18), the first step towards an efficient optimized way of managing organization, is to understand it properly. In other words, identifying different aspects of organization, its nature, components and factors affecting it shape the first stage of serving the science of organization and management. In this alignment, intellectuals and scholars of the field have put significant attempt, which lead to provide the jungle of theories, as Koontz put it (Koontz *et al.*, 1988: 66-67).

Among these studies' findings, there are more comprehensive theories that aim at illustrating organizational components, which prove themselves as having more capability in illustrating organization. Some of these outstanding theories are as follows: open systems theory, Lewit diamond, 7S theory, Hatch's five-looped model, Kotter's coherence dynamics system, Weisbord's six-box model, Nadler and Tushman's Congruence model, Burke-Litwin Model of Organizational Performance & Change, and metaphors which are significant in terms of the development they have made in management science. Metaphors have a significant importance among the mentioned models. They describe organization in a brief and concise way and represent its major aspects. Here in this paper, we are firstly to have a brief review on some theories and metaphors that illustrate the concept of organization and secondly to present a new metaphor using fuzzy logic.

1. Open systems theory

Open systems theory describes organization as a system that includes interdependent elements interacting with a larger environment. In fact, system theory is based on a presumption that considers organization as a systematic whole and uses data analysis to make decisions and to resolve problems (Koontz & others, 1988: 59; Barnard, 1947: 65-70; Keon, 1986: 456-459; Schermerhorn, 1996: 35-40; Kordnaij, 2005, 40-44).



Figure 1. Organization as a system (source: Cole, 1990 also Hellreigel and Slocum, 1989: 61)

2. Leavitt 's diamond, a model of organization

Leavitt introduced four internal elements for organization. However, he does not consider environment as an independent separate element. The elements of this model are shown in figure 2.



Figure 2. Leavitt's organizational system model (Burke, 2002:180)

3. **7S model**

The 7S is a framework for the analysis of organization, which was introduced by McKinsey and Company consultants (Athose & Pascal, 1981: 83-84). The elements of this model are shown in figure 3.



Figure 3. 7S Model (Athose & Pascal, 1981: 83-84) & (Grieves, 2010 : 190)

4. Hatch's five-looped model

Hatch's five-looped model conceptualizes organization as having dimensions of technologies, social structures, cultural structures, and finally, physical structures, which interact within the borders a specific kind of environment. This model represents organization as consisting of five interconnecting loops surrounded by an environment and having mutual effects on that environment. There are links between these loops none of them is a complete concept and each of them have something in common with others (Hatch, 2010, 35-37).



Figure 4. Hatch's five-looped model (Source: Hatch, 2010, 35-37)

5. Kotter's coherent dynamics system

Kotter's *coherent* dynamics system includes seven elements entitled for describing organization. One of the major specifics of this model is the vital role of the major organizational processes such as information gathering, communication, decision-making and material and energy transformation. Another important point about this model is that it considers effectiveness from three perspectives, namely short-term, middle-term and long-term. This model is represented in figure 5.



Figure 5. Kotter's cohering dynamics system (Source: Kotter, 1980: 282)

6. Weisbord's six-box model

Weisbord's six-box model includes a mixture of knowledge and experience for change managements. This model is based on the open system models that, stresses on the importance of the relationship between organization and its environment, and emphasis on certain actions that should be taken in organizations in order to bring an overall flexibility for the organization as well as maintaining the certain level of organizational performance. As Weisbord he believes, the effectiveness of an organization depends on six specifications and the quality of their interrelationships. Each of the specification should be taken into account from two viewpoints: formal and informal (Weisbord, 1978: 430-447).



Figure 6. Weisbord's six-box organizational model (Weisbord, 1978: 430-447) & (Burke et al, 2009: 260)

7. Nadler and Tushman's Congruence Model

Nadler and Tushman's congruence model describes organization as a mold or a process that takes inputs from the environment and delivers outputs using its employees, groups and equipments. The level of organizational effectiveness, according to this model, depends on the level of congruence between an organization and its environment and between the four major components of organization, namely people, duties, formal organization and informal organization (Nadler and Tushman, 1980: 261).



Figure 7. The Nadler-Tushman congruence model for diagnosis organizational behavior (Nadler & Tushman, 1980: 261) & (Randall, 2004: 56) Burke-Litwin Model of Organizational Performance and Change

Burke-Litwin Model of Organizational Performance and Change considers two types of development, namely development-oriented change, and change of reactions to the incremental short-term advancements. It is a model with 12 interconnected elements whose data is obtained from the external environment and its outputs are achieved from employees' and the overall organization's performance. Feedback loops are seen in both directions. Organizational performance has mutual influence with environment. The rest ten components represent the process of rendering outputs using the inputs and shows different levels of the process. The components of the model are shown in a vertical order to represent the causal and relative interchange between them, in which the position of each component shows the importance of that component.



Figure 8. The Burke – Litwin Model of Organizational Performance & Change (Burke, 2002: 195-221) & (Burke, 1992: 528) & (Palmer et al, 2006: 114)

8. What is Metaphor?

The metaphor indicates a synthesis, the state of which is "defined as 'symbolic' by the priority conferred on the initial moment of sensory perception" (Kohzadi & Fatemeh, 2011: 2478).

9. use of metaphor

It shouldn't be forgotten that management is not the first science utilizes metaphor. In other words use of metaphor and metaphorical approach is useful and common in other fields. Some examples are given as following:

1. Social Behavior of Animals

Particle swarm optimization (PSO) optimizes an objective function by undertaking a population-based search. The population encompasses of potential solutions, named particles, which are metaphor (birds in flocks) (Ghatei, 2012: 2336).

2. Public Policy Making

Public decision making as a complicated subject; make, researchers and analysts use networks they use this metaphor which can identify important aspects of policy-making process (Emami et al, 2012: 2625).

3. Brand Making

Also several researchers have focused on the personification of a brand as a metaphor, because it is the best way to conceptualize the complexity of a concept reflected in brand personality aspects (Gharibpoor & Amiri, 2012: 4469).

4. Education

Combination of Culture and Organization is the new idea that these two concepts have no idea on. Education is a metaphor neither for order and organization, while elements of culture are neither regular nor with the order (Ghorbani, 2012: 2981).

5. LITERATURE AND NOVELS

The nature of Miss Havisham's environment in the "Great expectations" a metaphor for entrapment in a society that its function depends on women's complicity with their own imprisonment (Anoosheh, 2012: 2396).

One use of metaphors is an approach to discuss about the entity of organization. There is a continuous and growing favor in the use of metaphors in organizational science. This interest has been showed in recent years by an increase in the volume of theoretical and empirical work that explores the role of metaphor in organizational field as well as by developments on metaphor theory and analysis in cognitive, linguistic and discourse work (Cornelissen, *et al.*, 2008a: 2). Presentation of the metaphor *organization as the focus of intersecting spectrums* is another step toward recognition of organization as it is.

Premises and scientific foundations of metaphorical approach Metaphorical approach to understand the nature of organization

Using metaphors as a tool for understanding organization was found by theorists in the discipline of management, some of which are Morgan's metaphors that describe organization as resembling a brain, a machine, a sort of culture, a dominance tool, political systems, varying flows, spiritual prison, etc. (Morgan, 1986, 1-13). Hatch (2010) also described organization via similarities to painting canvas, jazz, and organism. Robbins (2003) also described organization by metaphors such as rational phenomena, open systems, weak relations systems, information processing units, etc. Furthermore, in the case of social capital, capital is used metaphorically and this metaphor offers a wide range of entailments that can be useful in theorizing the relationships between organizational entities (Andriessen and Gubbins, 2009: 3).

Commentaries on the role of metaphor in organization research are abundant these days and coincide with a frenzy of new metaphors that have emerged in organizational theory and research in recent years, e.g. chaos, jazz, organizational identity, and organizational theatre (Cornelissen, 2004: 2). All these show that this tool has gained legitimacy to be used for describing organization. However, any metaphor describes some certain aspect and a particular level of organization abstractly. In order to know organization better, we have to consider as many metaphors as possible in a holistic view and gave unity to them in respect to their internal relationships (Alvani, 2009, 50).

A good metaphor is one that triggers those parts of mind that other understanding tools have failed to illuminate. Proper metaphors develop our minds and trigger our imagination to produce insights into phenomena. They create cognitional lines between mental concepts and scopes (Nerlich and Clarke, 2003: 490; Sargent *et al*, 2011: 315–317). In addition, metaphors make sophisticated issues and phenomena clearer by emphasizing on their key points in order to introduce them to human mind. In fact, human mind understands the unknown phenomena on the basis of the known things. Metaphor helps human mind wherever language fails to make a phenomena understandable (Frost, 1985: 158; Patriotta & Brown, 2011: 35-36; Moerman & van der Laan, 2011: 12-14).

Therefore metaphorical thought emerges from initial metaphors and evolves over time which is a viewpoint that is more alive to changes in the social structure of organizations than the traditional view of stable 'root' categories of metaphorical thought that overcome organization theory (Cornelissen and Kafouros, 2008b: 3).

Aristotelian logic

Traditionally, human has used values such as "good and bad", "true or false", "long or short", "white or black", "zero versus one", "young versus old", etc. however, in fact, a specific boundary could not be defined for such words. Even in many sciences such as mathematics and logic, is it assumed that there are well-defined borders within which every issue could be considered.

The history of two-scale system goes back to as late as Aristotle age. According to Aristotelian logic, any phenomenon as X is either A or *non-A*. This logic is the base of classical mathematics. Scientists hence analyzed their environments using this logic. Maybe they were suspicious about whether a particular phenomenon is true or false. However, they were certain that the reality is limited to either of the two states, true or false.

This logic ruled the way of human thinking for more than two thousand years and penetrated the way we speak, learn and act. The main problem with Aristotelian logic is that this logic sacrifices accuracy for the sake of simplicity. In fact, working with a set of zeros and ones is far simpler than working with fractions. To use two scale system, we have to ignore the middle states of phenomena.

Although one can mention many examples for which Aristotelian logic is applied correctly, it should be noted that we must not generalize what works for special cases to all phenomena. In our wods, most of those things that seem correct are "relatively' correct and there are always some levels of "uncertainty" for the correctness/incorrectness of real phenomena (Azar and Faraji, 2002, pp 1-3).

The implications of Aristotelian logic in organization and management

Example 1: Imagine that an organization's employees are evaluated as the analysis unit. Inside the organizations, one can only face with those people who are a member of the organization. In other words, all people could be classified into two categories:

The first category consists of those who are contracted with the organization and are working as its staffs, while the second category consists of those people who are outside the organization and are not considered as employees. In other words, according to *A category* and *non-A category*, one can say that those who are not among the employees of the organization, i.e. *category A*, are among the people who are outside of the organization, i.e. *category non-A*.

Example 2: According to Robbins' theory, we can use three indicators to explain the structure of an organization namely formality, centralization and complexity. Should we describe it based on Aristotelian logic, we would have to say that the structure of such organization is characterized as being either of a very high level of centralization or of a very low one. In other words, according to this logic, one can neither claim that centralization is of various levels such as high, middle and low nor claim that an organization has only one of the two states of centralization, and nor both (Robbins, 2003: 68-77).

Buddhism logic

Buddha lived in five centuries before Christ and two centuries before Aristotle. Buddha's mental philosophy suspected two-scale value system. His first step in his believing system was to avoid white and black globe and removing this two-value system. Buddha believed that the world was full of contradictions; a world of *things* and *non-things*. Unlike Aristotle logic that said we were facing with either A or *non-A*, Buddhism logic says we have both A and *non-A*.

In fact, Buddha argued that we must see the world as it seems. There are either red flowers or non-red flowers in the world. In other words, *A* and *non-A logic* countered *A* or non-A logic (Azar and Faraji, 2002, p 5).

The implications of Buddhism logic in organization and management

Example 1: although we can divide people into two categories of *female (A)* and *male (non-A)*, both categories could attend in the organization. In other words, there are male and female employees in the organization simultaneously.

Example 2: if we divide the employees into those with high education, i.e. holding BA or upper degrees as the *A category*, and those without high education, i.e. high school and below, as the *non-A category*, we can find both categories in the organization who are working with each other simultaneously. This logic will be clearer if we can transfer the unit analysis from organizational level to a level as higher as the universe.

Fuzzy logic

Fuzzy logic is a highly important type of logic that stands firmly in front of Aristotelian binary logic. In fact, the set that had two members as zero and one turned out to have an infinite number of members having a value between zero and one. In this way, fuzzy logic is closer to the way human really thinks (Akutagawa, 2004: 3)

Therefore, fuzzy logic is an approach according to which real phenomena are not simply black or white but they are somewhat "grey". Real phenomena are always fuzzy, that is "uncertain" and "inaccurate". Science traditionally tend to show the grey realities in mathematical white and black terms and hence made them appear either white or black. While there is not any definitely correct or definitely incorrect phenomenon in the world, science with its mathematical tools gave a similar description for global phenomena. Here, science fell down the mistakes (Azar and Faraji, 2002, p 3).

The implications of Fuzzy logic in organization and management field

Example 1. McGregor, the classic management theoretician, provided Y and X theory for employees based on Aristotelian logic. A manager, who looks at his/her employees optimistically or pessimistically, would have abstract judgments and, on this basis, he/she would apply a special and abstract style to treat his/her employees. For example, a manager who considers his/her employees as of Y type would be having a positive attitude toward them, would show a confidence-oriented treatment, would only see their virtues and would draw no picture other than their goodness. However, no doubt the same manager's realistic attitude toward his/her employees will enable him/her to recognize employees' relative weak and strong points and his/her treatment would be more realistic (Faizi, 2010, 274-275).



Figure 9. McGregor's theory seen as a Spectrum

Example 2. Assume that you have organized a training course for a number of your employees. If you ask male staff to raise their hand in the class, the hands of male employees will be aroused and female employees' hands will remain down. In this case, the category of male category is normal and its members are totally the member of normal category. Now, if you ask female staff to raise their hand in the class, the hands of female employees will be aroused and male employees' hands will remain down. Here, one can observe Aristotelian logic (A/non-A). However, if you ask them whether they are satisfied by their jobs or not, their hands will go up and down and then they will become stable, however, most of them will be somehow curved. Only a few of them will keep up their hands with assurance or do not keep up them at all. However, most of them would be put among these two conditions. Hence, the category of *satisfied employees* is no longer an Aristotelian category, since a number of individuals are "relatively" satisfied by their job, i.e. not totally satisfied. This is a fuzzy category, in which the employees are titled as satisfied. Now, if you ask another question and ask those who are not satisfied with their job to raise their hands, most of the raised hands for the previous question would get down, and then, would become steady in a somehow curved manner. It shows another fuzzy category in which the employees are titled as dissatisfied. Here, some people who were satisfied by their job relatively are also among dissatisfaction category. Now, Buddhism rule is relatively established both satisfaction category. Now, Buddhism rule is relatively established both satisfaction and dissatisfaction categories. Figure 10 shows this example graphically.

In the second example, dissatisfied employees show a "fuzzy category". In new mathematics, fuzzy refers to those categories with elements relatively belonged to that category (Azar and Faraji, 2002, p 4).



Figure 10. Comparing Aristotelian logic with Buddhism and fuzzy logic in terms of spectrum

In the turnout of 20th century, two events led to the rise of "Fuzzy logic", or "ambiguity logic, which means argument capability with fuzzy categories. The first event was paradoxes described by Bertrand Russell in relation with Aristotelian logic. Bertrand Russell created logical foundations for this logic, but never continued it. Regarding Aristotelian logic, he said: "Habitually, traditional logic assumed that accurate symbols are applied. So, it is not possible to use it in maternal life and it is only valid for a metaphysical life."

The second event was the discovery of "uncertainty principle" by Heisenberg in quantum physics. Heisenberg's quantum uncertainty principle gave a termination to our blind beliefs of certainty in sciences and scientific facts or at least weakened such beliefs. Heisenberg showed that even brain atoms are unreliable. Even with perfect information, you cannot say something to which relied totally. He proved that even in physics, the correctness of propositions is subject to levels and ranks.

In this line, rationalists founded multi-value logics as an extension of two-value system to avoid inflexibility. In 1930, the first tri-value logic was founded by Lukasiewicz – a Polish logician. Then, other logicians including Bochvar, Klieene and Heyting represented other tri-value logics. In this logic, the propositions are scaled with three values, namely 0, $\frac{1}{2}$ and 1. Therefore, they show the facts better than Aristotelian logic. However, it is clear that tri-value logic is also far from reality. Thus, *n*-valued logics were presented by logicians such as Lukasiewicz.

It is obvious that the larger a positive integers is selected as n, the closer to reality is the categorization of propositions, where the correctness level of each proposition could be a rational number between 0 and 1.

The more complete logic is to assume that any proposition could possess a real number between 0 and 1, which is called Lukasiewicz's standard logic. In fact, the value of these propositions in this logic is a spectrum between correctness and incorrectness or between 0 and 1.

Fuzzy logic is also a multi-value logic. In this logic, there are infinite shadows of grey between black and white rather than correctness or incorrectness, white or black and 0 or 1. The major difference between Fuzzy logic and multi-value logic is that in Fuzzy logic, reality and even the nature of things could be imprecise. In Fuzzy logic, one can use statements such as "completely right", "somewhat" and "seldom". Therefore, Fuzzy logic provides a natural language with a fully flexible system (Rubens, 2006: 20).

Spectrum attitude

With seconds of thinking, one can easily realize that the content of Fuzzy logic is to pay attention to "spectrum-like" nature of phenomena in the universe and, consequently, in the organization. In other words, in Fuzzy logic, one considers the society as a spectrum in which all members are placed on a point of this spectrum. It is useful to mention some examples in real world to remove its ambiguities.

The implications of spectrum attitude in the universe

Example 1. organisms in the universe from cells to huge animals are on a spectrum in terms of size. One can even draw this spectrum for complex levels of organisms' activities such as reproduction and breeding. In other words, we can see each member of the society on different points over various spectrums. In fact, each member of the mentioned society is an intersecting point of various spectrums.

Example 2. we can observe various colors as a spectrum. Computer technology today has made it easier to apprehend colors spectrum via simulation and made it clear that any color can be placed at one single point of this color spectrum.

Example 3. we can regard various countries as the points of a spectrum in terms of different aspects, such as developments in Information Technology and Communications (ICT), nanotechnology advancements, accessibility to fundamental cells, etc., or even by applying economic indices such as GNP or GDP. Here, one can consider these countries as separate points on the mentioned intersecting spectrums where each country is an intersection focus of the mentioned dimensional spectrums.

The implications of spectrum attitude in the organization and management

In management studies and research, spectrum-like organizational phenomena are mentioned in many cases; some of them are as follows:

a. The approach of competitive values in analyzing organization effectiveness, which is introduced by Robbins, uses spectrum as a tool to measure and understand effectiveness by investigating and collecting 30 scales for organization's effectiveness in three intersecting dimensions, namely *control and flexibility, paying attention to individual or organization* and *considering possibilities or goals*. In this approach, depending on the location of the organization on the mentioned three points, a tri-dimensional shape is drawn, which may become close to Robbins' four suggested models, namely *open systems model, human relations model, rational goal model* and *internal process model* (Robbins, 1997, pp 67-75).

b. Elsewhere, Robbins has implicitly pointed out to the spectrum shape of these factors in order to describe organizational structure and determine organization's position in terms of formalization and centralization. For instance, Robbins notes about the scope of formality that: "The level of formalization among organizations differs and one can also find levels of differentiation in this term within a single organizations" (Robbins, 1977, p 90). He also emphasizes this belief regarding centralization/decentralization (Robbins, 1977, p 103). We may interpret his idea in this way that centralization and formalization are imaginable in one spectrum and we can find fewer organizations that locate on either exact sides of the spectrum. Organizations shape a spectrum along with each other. Changing in centralization and formalization levels will move organization's position along the spectrum.

c. Boulding has, deliberately or not, classification systems based on a spectrum. By considering some general rules for systems, he categorized them in nine levels, the first of which is frameworks. Other levels include clockworks, thermostats, cells, plants, animals, human beings, social organizations and, finally, unknown world or transcendental systems (Boulding, 1978).

d. In behavioral science researches, researchers apply spectrums, i.e. scales, when they are not able to put their polls on a basis of double-choices according to Aristotelian logic. In this line, one can point to Likert, Thereston, meaning differentiation, Gutman, Bugardos, etc. (Sarmad, 1999, p 154). Noteworthy, many researchers have used these spectrums, especially Likert's spectrum, in organization and management researches.

e. In an overall comprehensive perspective, one may draw Koontz's jungle of theories based on a spectrum. In other words, reviewing and apprehending various aspects of organization, we can shape organization and management theories as consisting of different spectrums, *e.g.* in terms of human exploitation versus human excellence in organizations (Koontz *et al.*, 1988: 66-67).

f. Despite huge amount of research done in knowledge management in organizations, the term has not yet properly defined, while many management theories as well as technologies and applications claim to be included by knowledge management. Theoretical bases presented in this regard often provide a single-dimensional perspective towards this multidimensional issue. Spectrum approach to knowledge management is presented to help organization understand the domains of knowledge management alternatives, as well as its applications and their needed technologies. This approach provides a perspective which is based on two factors of *comprehensiveness* and *complexity* while providing some tools and techniques presented in theoretical bases of the issue.

g. In a negotiation process, all sides attempts to achieve their own interests. This means that the sides neglect other sides' interests in favor of their own interests. Although negotiators attempt to agree upon something that best renders their interests, their underlying interests are generally wide and many alternatives could satisfy them. Positions that effective managers discover in negotiation processes could be considered and depicted on a spectrum basis (Rezaian, 2010: 111; Carrel and Bazerman, 1988: 352).

h. Marsch classifies pressure groups into two divisions: first, those groups who use their power to achieve their personal goals-interests. Second, those who use their power to realize social goals. He notes about pressure groups' positions in decision makings that "their positions, which are consistent with their personal and social interests, are put on spectrums in one side of which there are one groups' own interests with the interests of the other group on the other side (Smit, 1989: 2-3).

This approach provides a framework by which one could adjust his/her concentration on knowledge management and base his/her main direction about knowledge management on it (Beni, 2007, 33-42).

Conclusion

By considering the above-mentioned introduction, scientific bases and concepts, we can design a new metaphor for investigating and recognizing organization. Observing from each perspective, we can analyze organization in a spectrum framework. In other words, Morgan's multidimensional organization could be considered as the same as the focus of concentration and intersection points of various spectrums. Perhaps there is a question for student's and researchers of organization & management: observing these spectrums (formality, centrality and complexity in organization structure), how somebody can imagine organization. Of course, this question can be asked about all other spectrums of organization. We can look for the answer of this question and similar questions in the metaphor which is described in this article. About the spectrum metaphorical approach, some important points should be mentioned as follows:

- Considered from any aspect, the universe is on a spectrum. It means that everything in the universe is on a spectrum and one can draw a spectrum for the universe from each perspective.
- Like Boulding's classification of systems, which is hierarchical, we may consider a system as a point for a higher system and as a spectrum for lower systems. This realizes a spectrum hierarchy.
- It is possible to introduce various spectrums typologically, *e.g.* those spectrums with certain beginning and end, those spectrums that have only a beginning or an end, and those spectrums which go beyond two points beginning end points. The issue requires further studies and analysis by more researchers.
- Given the stagnation that the field of organization and management has been facing for years, where many minor issues
 are referenced to theories as old as 50 to 60 years, leading the scientific community of organization and management field
 to theorization requires abandoning some feelings. For example, feelings such as fear of critics, being afraid of criticizing
 connoisseurs and opposing the scientific community and so on must be avoided. Instead, it is necessary to institutionalize
 scientific morale, theorizing culture and scientific critics in the scientific community.

Concluding Comments

- 1. Although spectrum vision has no new scientific or philosophical basis, introducing such basics as a metaphor is a new approach to organization recognition.
- 2. The spectrum assumption is also true for organization. When considering an aspect of organization, e.g. in terms of formalization or centralization, that organization is a single point of the spectrum in the organizational society (see figure 11), which shapes another spectrum internally. It means that drawing spectrums among organizational units is also possible. This is shown (see figure 12).



Figure 11. Organizations' structural formalization spectrum



Figure 12. Structural formalization spectrum for organizational units (A)

- 3. By applying this vision about the organization, it is not necessary to mention spectrum drawing in every discussion. Many affairs such as formalization, power and human orientation in management and organization theories are explainable and justifiable in the framework of spectrums.
- 4. "Organization will be as a spectrum" if we look at it from a single perspective. "Organization will be as a focus of intersecting spectrums" if we look at it from various perspectives. It means that in the mental space, organization is a place in which various spectrums cross and the intersection of them realizes a tri-dimensional space, which is the factual organization. This space resembles the space of atoms' orbital in which the possibility of electrons' existence is very high. The size and domain of this space is subject to change according to organizational developments (see figure 13).



Figure 13. The tri-dimensional space shaped by the intersection of spectrums in organization

- 5. Environmental changes and transformations will only shift organization's position on these spectrums and one can explain the dynamics of the organization more simply via this vision. In other words, given the possibility of reviewing and recognizing organizational spectrums and depicting their routes, it is possible to predict and plan the next movement of the organization.
- 6. Contemplating the issue, we can improve the implications of this metaphor and the contributions it can make to organization's recognition. What provided here is to be only a small slice of a huge and comprehensive plan.
- 7. This article may be criticized in the sense that it does not provide a new discussion and renders a mere illustration of an existing fact we face many instances of which every day. The answer lies in shedding lights on the dark sides of some kind of attitude, which is of its own value. This criticism is the same as if to say Newton's discovery of gravity was not valuable, merely because what Newton did was introducing something that already existed before his discovery. All discoveries follow this rule.

REFERENCES

- 1. Akutagawa, S.; Otsuki, M.; Kitagawa, Y., (2004), *Hubrid control system with word conference on Earthquake*, Vancover, B. C., Canada.
- 2. Alvani, Seyed Mahdi, General Management, Ney Publications, eight editions, 1995
- 3. Andriessen, Daniel and Gubbins, Claire, (2009), *Metaphor Analysis as an Approach for Exploring Theoretical Concepts: The Case of Social Capital*, Organization Studies, 30 (8), pp 845–863.
- 4. Anoosheh, Sayed Mohammad, 2012, "Charles Dickens's Miss Havisham: Her Expectations and Our Responses", *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2 (3): 2395-2399.
- 5. Athose, Anthoney G. & Pascal, Richard T. (1981), *the art of Japanese management*, application for American executive, New York.
- 6. Azar, Adel and Hojat Faraji, Fuzzy Management science, Iran Studies and Productivity Publications, first edition, 2002
- 7. Barnard, Chester I (1947), the function of the executives, Cambridge, mass: Harvard university press.
- 8. Binney, Daniek, (2007), the knowledge management spectrum understanding the km landscape, journal of knowledge management, Vol. 5, No. 1.
- 9. Bulding, K. E. (1978), general system theory, in shafritz, classics of organization theory, III moore publihing Co.
- 10. Burke, Warner W. & Litwin (1992), *Causal model of organizational performance and change*, Journal of management, 18 (3), pp 523-545.
- 11. Burke, Warner W. (2002), organizational change, theory and practice, sage publication, Inc.

- 12. Burke, Warner W., Lak, Dal G., Mirepaine, Jill W., (2009), organizational change: A Comprehensive Reader, US: Jassey-bass.
- 13. Chalmers, Alan., Science and Its Fabrication, translated by Saeid Zibakalam, 5th ed., Tehran: SAMT, 2005.
- 14. Cole, G. A. (1990), Management, theory and practice, 3rd. Ed. England, D. P. Pub. Ltd.
- 15. Cornelissen, Joep P. and Kafouros, Mario, (2008b), *The Emergent Organization: Primary and Complex Metaphors in Theorizing about Organizations*, Organization Studies, 29 (07), pp 957–958.
- Cornelissen, Joep P. and Oswick, Cliff and Christensen Lars Thøger and Phillips, Nelson, (2008a), Metaphor in Organizational Research: Context, Modalities and Implications for Research – Introduction, Organization Studies, 29 (01), pp 7–21.
- 17. Cornelissen, Joep P., (2004), What Are We Playing At? Theatre, Organization, and the Use of Metaphor, Organization Studies, 25 (05), pp 705–726.
- 18. Emami, Mostafa; Nazari, Kamran; Fardmanesh, Haniyeh, 2012, "Chaos Theory and its Complexity and Role in the Analyzing of Policy Networks (with a Look at Future Orientations in Policy-Making Process)", *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2 (3): 2624-2630.
- 19. Faizi, Tehereh., Fundamentals of Organization and Management, Tehran: Payame Noor, 2010.
- 20. Frost, P. J, (1985), Organizational Culture, London: SAGE Publications.
- 21. Gharibpoor, Mahshid & Amiri, Farham, 2012, "The Relationship between Personality Traits and Virtual-web Based Service Brand Personality (SEM Method in Google Context)", *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2 (5): 4467-4476.
- 22. Ghatei, Sajjad; Tigh Panahi, Farzad; Hosseinzadeh, Mojtaba; Rouhi, Mohammad; Rezazadeh, Iman; Naebi, Ahmad; Ghatei, Zahra and Rahim Pasha Khajei, 2012, "A New Hybrid Algorithm for Optimization Using PSO and GDA", *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2 (3): 2336-2341.
- 23. Ghorbani, Saber, 2012, "The Investigation of Various Features of Organizational Culture", *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2 (3): 2981-2984.
- 24. Grieves, Jim, (2010), Organizational Change: Themes & Issues, published in united states by Oxford University Press Inc, New York.
- 25. Hatch, Mary Joe., *organization theory Modern, Symbolic, and Postmodern Perspectives*, translated by Hasan Danaifard, Tehran: Mehraban Publications, 2010.
- 26. Hayes, John, (2005), *the theory and practice of change management*", translated by Asadollah Kordnaeij and Saba Sarmadi, Tehran: Mehraban Publications, 2010.
- 27. Hellreigel, Don and Slocum, John W. Jr. (1989), "Management ", 5rd. Ed., Addosion Wesley Pub. Co: <u>http://www.Aber.ac.uk/media/documents/s4b/semiotic.htm</u>.
- 28. Keon, Tomas L (1986), a retrospective review of barnard's: the function of the executives, in allen c. bluedor (ed), special book review section on the classics of management, academy of management review, vol 11.
- 29. Kohzadi, Hamedreza & Azizmohammadi, Fatemeh, 2011, "Allegorical Interpretation of Reading in the Light of Paul de Man", *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 1 (11): 2476-2481.
- 30. Koontz, Harold & others (1988), Management, 8 th ed, New York: mcgraw-hin, Inc.
- 31. Kotter, J. P. (1980), an integrative model of organizational dynamics, in E.E. lawler, D.A. Nadler and C. Commann (eds), organizational assessment. New York: wiley, pp 279-299.
- 32. Moerman, Lee; van der Laan, Sandra, (2011), Accounting for long-tail asbestos liabilities: Metaphor and meaning, Accounting Forum 35, pp: 11–18.
- 33. Morgan, Gareth, (1986), images of organization, Thousand Oaks: SAGE publication.
- 34. Moshabaki, Asghar., Organization Visage, Management School of University of Tehran's Publications, first edition, 2004
- 35. Nadler, D.A. and Tushman, M.L. (1980), a congruence model for organizational assessment, in E.E. lawler, D.A. Nadler and C. Commann, Organizational assessment. New York: wiley, pp 261-278.
- 36. Nerlich, B. S. Johnson; Clarke, David D., (2003), the first *designer baby*, the role of narratives, clich's and metaphors in the year 2000 media debate, Sinence as Culture, Vol 12, No 4.

- 37. Palmer, Lan., Dunford, Richard., Akin, Gib, (2006), Managing Organizational Change: A Multiple Perspectives Approach, New York: McGrow-Hill.
- 38. Patriotta, Gerardo; Brown, Andrew D., (2011), Sensemaking, metaphors and perf ormance evaluation, Scandinavian Journal of Management, No. 27, pp 34-43.
- 39. Randall, Julian, (2004), Managing Change / Changing Managers, New York: Routledge.
- 40. Robbins, Stephen., *Organization Theory*, translated by Seyed Mehdi Alvani and Hassan Danaei Fard, Safar Publications, first edition, 1997
- 41. Rubens, N. O., (2006), the application of fuzzy logic to the construction of the Ram king functions of information retrieval system, computer modeling and new technologies, Vol 10, No 7.
- 42. Sargent, Leisa D.; Bataille, Christine D.; Vough, Heather C.; Dean Lee, Mary, (2011), *Metaphors for retirement:* Unshackled from schedules, Journal of Vocational Behavior, No. 79, PP 315-324.
- 43. Sarmad, Zohreh.. et al, Methodologies of Behavioral Sciences, second edition, Tehran: Agah Publications, 1999
- 44. Schermerhorn, John R.jr (1996), management, 5 th ed, New York: john wiley & Sons, Inc.
- 45. Scott, Richard., *Organizations; Rational, Natural and Open Systems*, translated by H. Mirzai Ahranjani and Flora Soltani, Tehran: University of Tehran, 1995.
- 46. Smit, N.Craig, 1989, "Pressure Groups: A Management Introduction", Management Decision, Vol 25, No 5, pp 22-27.
- 47. Stephen P. Robbins, organizational theory: structure, design & application, (2003), 3rd Ed., N.J.: prentice-hall.
- 48. Vares, Seyed Hamed., Organization Visage in Morgan's view, Management Knowledge Journal, 14 volumes, No. 52, spring 2002.
- 49. Weisbord, M.R. (1978), organization six places to look for trouble without a theory, Group & organization studies 1, pp 430-447.