

## **MODERN PARADIGMS OF MANAGEMENT AND THEIR APPLICATION TO GENERAL AND SECURITY MANAGEMENT**

**Col. Miroslav TALIJAN\***, Ph.D.

University of Defence, Military Academy, Serbia

**Col. Rade SLAVKOVIC**, Ph.D.

University of Defence, Military Academy, Serbia

**Col. Mile JELIC**

University of Defence, Military Academy, Serbia

*Regardless of the origin, organizational theories have made a great contribution to understanding and solving organizational issues. Much of the thesis and conclusions can be found in the contemporary theories of organization. The first theories have given ground for the emergence and development of newer theories. Therefore, we can say that their application in modern practice of general and security management is also different.*

*Based on some characteristics of organizational theories, the conclusion can be made about their application in specific circumstances, namely the division between those which serve us for forming and directing the organization activity and those that can help us in making decisions in specific security situations, where faster decision making processes are needed based on the factors of the environment. It can be argued that all theories are still applicable, but some have greater application in specific situations than others.*

*In modern management science, in addition to the development of the existing theories of management, new concepts and approaches in management are developed as well, some of which become the modern paradigms (Greek paradigm - model, pattern, form). These concepts and approaches include: Management in the New Society, Changes Management, Chaos Theory, Total Quality Management, Business Process Reengineering, Knowledge Management, Learning Organization, Theory of cultural harmony, and others. Specifically, in this paper, the authors show the basics of modern paradigms of management and highlight the need and possibilities of their use in the function of development of existing theories and establishment of new management theories, and their implementation in order to improve practice of general and security management.*

**Keywords:** management; security management; modern paradigms of management.

---

\* e-mail: [bjor4s@gmail.com](mailto:bjor4s@gmail.com)

In the organization (company), when the owner was no longer able to personally monitor the activities of each worker, he was forced to task the best, outstanding workers to perform management activities, and to give them for that purpose some authorities and analogue power and influence.

At the same time, management becomes the object of study - thoughtful skill, which people learn. There are many theories from that period explaining how managers should do their job. At the end of the 19th century the first business schools were established in the USA, and later in France. It seems that the knowledge from that period is still unavoidable source and necessary for innovation of management, establishment and development of theories and improvement of practice of its new types, including *security management* as well. This, of course, implies the same relation to the later created theories up to modern paradigms of management.

Therefore, presentation of and discussion about these key sources through analysis of the first questions / 1 / Some of the most important theories of organization and management that have laid the foundation of the modern management, follow in the further text. Then, through the analysis of the second question /2 / New concepts and approaches in management and the possibilities of their application in general and security management are presented.

### **Some of the most important theories of organization and management that have laid the foundation of the modern management**

Research of the history of management, the emergence of the first management theory and education of managers suggest that this form of management activity was applied as far back as in ancient civilizations, so the entire practice and theory of management, from that period until today, can be classified in five periods. *The first* period consists of all valuable resources and experiences from the field of management (planning, organizing, leading, control) derived from the ancient civilizations up to 1880. *The second* period is a period between 1880 and 1930 when the role of management becomes very important. Industrial production, of enormous proportions for that time, caused the employment of large numbers of people and creating of organizations that required professional managers to run them. With the advent of the factories, owner was no longer able to personally monitor all aspects of production, that is activities of his employees, so he was forced to delegate these tasks to specially trained people. They were the first professional managers in the industry. In this period of rapid industrial development, with the emergence of large industrial enterprises, classical organizational school - "scientific" management was developed. *The third* period is between 1930 and 1950, and in organizational theory it has been

designated as "school of human relations," neoclassical school, behavioural direction. It is characterized by the fact that a human, individual and group, motivation of workers are approached with greater interest and understanding. *The fourth* period lasted from 1950 until the last decade of the 20th century. During this period, up-to-date theoretical experiences are systematized and generalized. In the theory of organization and management the system approach is introduced, there are also situational and contingency theories emerging, difficulties of managing institutions and organizations of tomorrow are explored, the internationalization of management is indicated, etc. *The fifth* period may be termed "Management in the New Society." It began at the end of the last and beginning of the 21st century. Because, as Peter Drucker said, "there is no doubt that the new society is already growing up, around us," and within it, also the management in that - New Society. The main feature of that emerging society is knowledge, and the basis of development is *knowledge economy* and, consequently, with the management based on knowledge.

*Classic management as a basis of development and establishment of the theory and practice of general and security management*

Classical Management School is divided into two areas, scientific and administrative.

*Scientific Management School.*- In early days, management was considered to be an art, a gift that was given to some but not all people. At the same time, statements that there must be some scientific basis which is applicable to the management emerged as well.

The first major step in defining management as a science has been made by *Frederick Taylor* (1856-1917). Working as an engineer, he studied the organization trying to advance it. He created a whole approach of monitoring management through standardization and job design.

Four *preconditions* for his approach are: /1/ scientific selection of people, /2/ training of personnel on scientific basis, /3/ motivation of personnel, and /4/ integration of a person into his job. He argued and demonstrated that the fulfilment of these preconditions considerably increase productivity, and workers do more than the mere mechanical performance. Their wages will rise simultaneously with the profit.

Taylor has set the following *principles (general principles) of scientific management*: *The first principle* is based on an assessment of daily personnel performance. *The second principle*: "all the intellectual work should be removed from the plant and performed in the planning department ...". *The third principle* is to control the performance and realization of tasks. He developed methodology in detail and established *the process of scientific*

*management* in practice – in the steel works Midvale (USA). The steps of this methodology are: *First*, to select the workers who have the highest level of qualification for the specified task. *Second*, to study thoroughly the basic moves and operations that each worker should perform during the task. *Third*, to study, using a stopwatch, the time needed to perform each move or operation. Based on these findings, the shortest possible time for performing all moves should be determined. *Fourth*, all unnecessary and slow moves should be eliminated. *Fifth*, after the removal of all unnecessary moves, the fastest and most effective series of moves should be determined.

The essence of introduction of the scientific management process in the steel works Midvale (U.S.), was formulated by Taylor as the “honest daily effect”, that is, all the work that an employee performs daily, at the maximum speed, without disturbing his health, that is, without shortening his active life.

Taylor's approach assumes that man is purely an economic unit, so it is necessary to determine the economic interests of working people - money.

*Administrative Management School* - Second classical management school, so called *administrative*, dealt with the role and functions of managers. It was thought to be easy to determine the most effective methods for performance when fully is known the nature of managers' work. *Henry Fayol* (1841-1925), executive director of a coal mine in France, was one of the first representatives of this idea. Based on his experience, Fayol saw management with five *basic functions* that are still used today: /1/ planning, /2/ organizing, /3/ personnel policies, /4/ management and /5/ control. Fayol found six *key entrepreneurial activities* /1/ technical, /2/ commercial, /3/ financial, /4/ security, /5/ accounting and /6/ managerial<sup>1</sup>. Fayol defined fourteen *general management principles*: /1/ *division of work*, that is directing an individual or group to certain specialized activities, /2/ *authority* (power) implies the right of giving orders, and it is inseparable from the responsibility of the one who gives orders, /3/ *Discipline*, which is determined by agreement between employer and employee, /4/ *Unity of commanding* - the system without doubled commanding lines. One order issuing authority - one executor, /5/ *Unity of planning* includes unique plan for groups of activities that have a common goal, /6/ *Subordination of individual interests to the general interest* of a company. This principle Fayol consider the most difficult management area, /7/ *Payment for the work* should be acceptable to workers and a company, /8/ *centralization* of management functions is essential for the efficiency of decision making process, /9/ *pyramid structure* of management: from the top to the base of an organisation, /10/ *System*: the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Activities in industrial company* by Fayol: Heinz Weihrich, Xarold Koohtz, Management, Mate d.o.o, Zagreb, 1998, p. 37.

right person at the right position, /11/ *Fairness* implies courteous and fair treatment of managers towards employees, /12/ "running-in" time for employees should be long enough for them to fully understand the work to be performed and to successfully integrate into the organization, /13/ *initiative* of all employees is highly desirable, but in the framework of the discipline and controlled by managers and /14/ *Esprit de corps (corporate spirit)* implies harmony of organization and development and stimulation of teamwork. These principles were adopted in many companies. In recent times (from 60's of the 20th century) they are criticized because they are not subject to changes that are occurring rapidly. This theory can be applied in organizations with highly hierarchical, pyramidal structure of management, and modern organizations are based on more flexible and less centralized models of management structure.

Henry Fayol's understandings are important for improving the organization and functioning of security (primarily corporate) and security management. Particularly important are his findings as follows: *One of the five main functions of a company is a security function, and there is no functioning of an enterprise, neither its security activity, without management, realized on the relevant principles by capable managers.*

The major premise for necessary innovating of corporate security clearly follows from the above stated: not all corporate security tasks can be delegated or ceded for a fee, according to the principle of outsourcing or otherwise, nor all security services conditioned by challenges, risks and threats to corporate security can be bought in market of security industry. Because, these are the basic tasks without which a company- corporation cannot exist. It is inevitable that "with" and/or "in" the top management of corporations there is security management.

In addition to the above mentioned, the fact important for general and security management is that Fayol recognizes, presents the significance and content of all words, that is terms in this syntagm. This concerns general management, but also management of all the major functions of a company, including in the security function. This means that in his paper *Administration industrielle et generale (General and Industrial Management)* are the beginnings of theoretical thinking not only about management but also about other types of management, including security management.

One of the most important representatives from this school is the creator of the theory of bureaucracy, *Max Weber (1864-1920)*<sup>2</sup>. Weber's

---

<sup>2</sup> There are other, not less important representatives of the classic school: Gant Frenk and Lilien Gilbert, Harington Emerson and others. For more information: Heinz Weihrich, Harold Koonz, *Management: A Global Perspective*, McGraw-Hill, Inc. 1993.

bureaucratic, rational approach to the organization is not explicitly placed in the classic theory of organization, but Weber is considered its representative, because he was under the influence of the same social circumstances, and, like other followers of this theory, he paid very little attention to person, and far more to the organization. And still today Weber's theory is rooted in the organization and management in public administration. Weber particularly studied the relationship between function and personality, that is position and the holder of the position. He has a strong influence on defining authority in a company. He distinguishes a legitimate, traditional and charismatic authority. Weber's theory is most criticized because it has a motivation-reducing effect on employees. Adherence to the procedures has become an end by itself, one is neglected as a person, while managers have too much power. However, the study of this theory is important from the view of management in a strictly hierarchical structures, and therefore in the public administration bodies (where the army and police organically belong), as bureaucracy is one of the main characteristics of public administration. The elements of Weber's bureaucracy are: /1/ division of work whereby the authority (power) and responsibility are clearly defined and validated for each member of the organization; /2/ positions or functions should be organized hierarchically, /3/ all members of the organization should be selected on the basis of qualifications and education; /4/ managers should be appointed, not elected; /5/ administrative managers should work for set salaries and be a "career" employee; /6/ administrative manager should not be the owner of the organizational units he runs; /7/ manager should do his job according to the clearly defined rules, he should be disciplined and controlled<sup>3</sup>.

From the above mentioned it can be concluded: *First*, the classical school of management overemphasizes the formal organization and rigid hierarchies, resulting in reduction of efficiency in the functioning of the organization. *Second*, its theorists point profit in foreground and as a primary objective, ignoring person as a human being with his needs, expectations and hopes. This technician approach is caused, among other things, by the professional orientation of most theorists who were mostly engineers. *Third*, the classical school of management has given a set of principles, some of which, such as the existence of objective, the division of work with specialization, coordination, authority and responsibility, have practical value even in today's organizations, including the security institutions.

---

<sup>3</sup> Miroslav M, Talijan, Momcilo, Talijan, *General and Security Management*, Higher Internal Affairs School, Banja Luka, 2011, pp. 109-110.

## **Views of neoclassical (behaviourist) school of management and application of motivation theories to humanization of management**

The behaviorist schools were more concerned with the worker than with his work tasks. In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century the behaviorists' interest in increasing productivity was as high as the interest of those who belonged to the classical school. However, the behaviorists thought that the key to productivity was within the worker himself, not in his job or position. Through sociological, psychological and organizational research they sought the way to motivate the worker and thus increase productivity. The behaviorists believed that the man was so called "vital machine" and that the leadership had to take care of each individual worker. If a company spent so much time greasing and maintaining presses, lathes and other inanimate machines, then it would be quite logical to spend at least as much time, energy and attention to the people, those vital machines, in order to prevent them from getting out of order.

*Elton Mayo* (1880 – 1949) was a representative of the *Human Relations Theory*. He insisted on satisfying employees' social need, notably on establishing of good human relationships and on the feeling that all employees were important actors in any organization. The management had to be concerned with employees' personal problems and to work on avoiding conflicts. A number of the *Work Motivation Theories* developed drawing on the classical and neo-classical management theory. They were mainly focused on workers and their individual abilities.

The theories aiming at explication of motivational behavior of the people at work can be divided into two groups: *Content Theories* of work motivation and *Process Theories* or *Expectations Theories*.

The first group of Content Theories starts from the assumption that the basis for motivation is people's needs that are transformed into internal motives producing specific forms of work behavior. These theories seek to provide an answer as to why people behave in a certain way or why they work the way they do. The second group of the Process Theories is concerned, in the first place, with the question: How do the employees choose to behave at work in a certain way and how do they assess whether that behavior is good for them?

*Theory of Hierarchy of Motives and Needs.*- The theory of motives and needs hierarchy, created by Abraham Maslow (1908-1970), a distinguished American psychologist, scholar and the main proponent of humanist psychology, advocates a radically new style of people management which may provide for a positive development of each individual, institution, region and society as a whole. He stresses that human needs make the basis for motivation. According to this theory, the man works in order to meet some of

his needs, in other words, it is a need that motivates him to work. Maslow proposes the following needs structure with the hierarchy of needs based on their importance and the intensity of their appearance in human mind. The *first group* includes *physiological needs* – natural needs (sleep, food, air, water, etc.), which if not met may endanger human biological existence. The *second group* has to do with safety at work, in the family and society. The *third group* includes *social needs*. The man is a social being, and once his biological and safety-related needs are met, he aspires to fulfil the desire to belong to a group, to communicate, socialize and to love and be loved by the family members or someone else. The *fourth group* contains the needs for being esteemed, for status and prestige, that is to say, needs that are expressions of human ego (desire for power, independence, and success). By satisfying these needs, the man gains a feeling of self-confidence, value and power, the feeling that he is needed and useful in this world. The failure in doing so, results in a feeling of inferiority, weakness, hopelessness and being not needed. The *fifth group* has to do with the need for self-actualization. The essence of these needs is the possibility of achieving recognition and realization of individual's qualities and abilities.

Abraham Maslow thought that human potentials were largely underestimated and poorly explained. He believed that all human beings pursue self-realization. However, the so called higher level needs: social belonging, self-estimation and self-actualization – the needs for achieving personal sense, spiritual and psychological growth, according to Maslow, can only be met if the basic needs for survival and safety have been met.

*Two Factor Motivation Theory.*- Two factor motivation theory was established by Frederick Herzberg. The essence of this theory is that all factors of work motivation and job satisfaction can be divided into two groups. The *first group* includes those factors that result in a lack of dissatisfaction and all other factors up to those that create satisfaction. Those are: job, recognition, promotion and development prospects, etc. They are named as motivating factors or work content factors. The *second group* includes a set of factors extending from those that may cause dissatisfaction to those that do not cause dissatisfaction. These factors are: physical conditions of work environment, social conditions of work environment (leadership and management system, human relations, etc.), safety at work, wage scale, business policy, and similar. They are named contextual (factors of work environment).

Only the factors from the first group can have a positive effect on motivation (hence increase in productivity), while regulation of the factors from the second group can eliminate, or at least reduce, dissatisfaction, but



fails short of inducing satisfaction. The main objection to this theory has to do with subjectivity of the results, due to the applied methodology: methodology of critical event. On the positive side, this theory points out the importance of not only clearly psychological factors but also of other factors such as physical and social conditions of work environment. It has stimulated a lot of research making managers across the world use Herzberg’s ideas to build their job enrichment schemes that have yielded certain results. These schemes mostly focused on increase of employee responsibilities for planning, performance and control of work; enhancement of employee autonomy and enabling the employee to perform a complete task so that he can experience fulfilment, growth and development through his work.

*Process Theories of Work Motivation* - These theories aim at providing an explanation for psychological mechanisms and processes underlying the initiation of the motivation cycles, or, to put it in simple terms, to explain *how* motivated behaviour is created. The theories are called ‘process’ theories, ‘expectations’ theories, or ‘instrumental’ theories of work motivation. They are also known as VIE theories, which is an acronym made of the first letters of the main concepts: valence, instrumentality and expectations. Those theories are based on the premise that people choose among possible forms of behaviour those forms that are to ensure one or more desired outcomes: prestige, income, new prospects, promotion, etc.

These theories hold that employees would be motivated to improve their work behaviour if they believed that their efforts would bring desired outcomes, which depending on each individual, may differ – from building career to securing a better or more prestigious job, which is, anyway, the focus of managers’ expectations and efforts. Dozens of various models of these theories have been defined, but in this paper, considering length constraints, we shall mention only some of the theories and their creators and point to their essence.

*Expectation theory* by Victor Vroom<sup>4</sup> is a leading theory in the group of the Process Motivation Theories. It starts from the assumption that people are motivated in different ways to achieve specific goals, especially, if they believe that their goals are valuable for them, and if they perceive that what they are doing may lead to the attainment of the goals.

Three variables: valence, instrumentality and expectations lie in the heart of Vroom’s theory.

The motivating force (M) in Vroom’s model of motivation is equal to the sum of products of valences of all outcomes of work behaviour (B) multiplied by the force of expectation that they will result in the consequences that the employee desires (E):

---

<sup>4</sup> V. Vroom, *Work and motivation*, New York, John Wiley and sons, 1964.

$$M = \alpha E \times B$$

Although one may criticize this theory for seeing the man as excessively rational being that keeps assessing his behaviour and actions in a rational way, managers can put Vroom's model in practical use if they follow some rules derived from the theory: *Firstly*, clear goals should be set and maintained within the institution, accompanied by a clear relation between efforts and rewards. *Secondly*, undesired outcomes of work behaviour, such as removal from the position, dismissal, penalization, exposure to risks – should be eliminated, or at least reduced as much as possible. *Thirdly*, it should not be forgotten that employees may have very different needs, which if met through their work will lead to positive motivation.

Provided that these strategies are implemented, managers can count on an increase in work motivation of their employees, higher rate of job satisfaction and loyalty of associates, which is what security management, also, aims at.

*X-Theory.*- The tenants of X-theory are basically the same as the tenants of Taylor's theory: the man, by his nature, is indolent, he works not more than he has to, he does not have any ambition and does not like responsibilities. The man is also egocentric and indifferent to the goals of the institution where he works. Therefore, it is the management who is responsible for organization of people and means, their guiding, control and motivating in order to achieve the economic objectives of the organization. Douglas McGregor<sup>5</sup> argues that the principles defined in this way by, as he called it, X theory are wrong (principles of Taylorism) and that this theory take causes for consequences. The described state of people's work motivation does not stem from human nature, but is rather a consequence of the situation where the man happens to be – a weak organization. Leadership and managing are reduced to control, punishment, enforcement, and as such, they have become inadequate and insufficiently stimulating.

*Y Theory.*- According to Y theory, people are motivated, capable of development, able to take responsibility and direct their behaviour towards the goals of the organization. The manager's task is to enable people to realize and develop their positive characteristics. In application of Y theory, as an independent motivation theory, McGregor suggests the following: /1/ decentralization of decision making system; /2/ enrichment and "refining" of routine jobs; /3/ employees' participation in decision making and consultative management. Y Theory has the same goal as X theory: to motivate people to achieve the goals of the organization. The difference is that Y theory seeks to accomplish it in a more humanistic way, respecting the employee as a person and activating his individuality.

---

<sup>5</sup> Douglas McGregor, *The Human Side of Enterprise*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co, 1960.

However, it may be a bit naïve to believe that all people are capable of behaving in the desired way *in appropriate work conditions* and expect that in such conditions they will always behave in a responsible way. Nevertheless, employees will be more loyal to their organizations and will work more and better if *they are treated well*. Consequently, the starting point in building and managing organizational behaviour is that there are no real reasons why the work environment should not be *pleasant and productive*.

The contemporary ideas about organizational behaviour are based on the assumption that there is not only one, the best approach to motivating people in the most effective way, as there is no leadership style that will ensure the best results, and that it cannot be decided in advance whether major organizational decision should be made by groups or individuals. There are no simple answers when human behaviour in organizations is in question since the processes at work are very complex. Behaviour in work environment is the result of influence of a number of forces, which is in theory denoted as *contingent approach* or orientation.

Contingent approach, or orientation, starts from the understanding that specific behaviour *depends* on the existence of *specific conditions* – hence the name of this approach.

*Other theories of motivation.*- There is a number of various motivation theories. One of the most famous, which was the basis for creation of different variants of motivation theory, is *Festinger’s theory of cognitive dissonance*. C. Corman also provides a concept according to which people’s behaviour at work depends on the representation they have about themselves and their abilities. If a person has representation of himself as a very productive person, he will try to behave that way in practice. Another factor is also important here: the need to win distinction, achieve success and prove oneself.

*Z theory.*- Z theory was originated in 1980’s and its tenants are largely applied in Japanese companies. Quality assurance circles, fault-free production, just in time supply of production lines are some of the elements of the phenomenon known as *the art of Japanese management*. The key factor of motivation is the possibility of creative engagement of all employees through innovation groups (for improvement of work conditions and production).

The following may be concluded regarding the behaviourist management theories: *First*, to a large extent, they contribute to socialization of employees and work process. The neo-classical approach integrated the social system of the organization with technical and work systems. *Second*, those approaches became poles apart in relation to the prevailing scientific approaches to management which focused primarily on production. *Third*, this school of management and its theory of human relations draw on the

body of knowledge of other social sciences, in the first place sociology, psychology, anthropology and other disciplines integrating them into organization and work. More humane relations and better motivation in work process considerably improve work productivity. Because of that, managers have to know how to put into practice the postulates of this school.

*General organizational theory and their contribution to the development of management*

Over the last decades of 20<sup>th</sup> century there were some efforts in the theory of management to constitute a general theory of organization and management that would be universal and acceptable to all systems. Unlike scholars of classical and neo-classical (behaviourist) schools, who favoured mostly qualitative approach, the proponents of general organizational theory argued for a quantitative universal approach to studies of management in all organizational systems.

Creation of general management theory on the basis of the general system theory and cybernetics was accomplished in such a way that organizational models, simplified and less complex than those existing in real organizations in specific fields of human activities, were created and designed and then studied in real organizations and in various fields of human activities. Research into such organizational models revealed the first organizational regularities and general characteristics of management. It was possible to apply those general rules and regularities to different kinds and areas of organized human activities, i.e. in real models of the organization, where specific kinds and approaches in organization and management theory were identified, such as systemic, cybernetic and situational approach.

*Systemic approach.*- Introducing of certain regularities from the general system theory into the organization enabled new results in the area of management and wider knowledge about organization theory to emerge. The systemic approach implies multifaceted observations of organizational systems and their structural elements from within, while taking into consideration the impact of environment on the observed system. The object of study is the structure of the system in an organization, links and relations between the elements within the system, their interrelation and interdependency, and interaction of the system with its environment. This systematic insight into the organization, where the system is not viewed as isolated, but the impact of the environment is taken into consideration instead, has improved management, i.e. considerably enhanced functioning, moving and development of the organization.

The following system properties are especially important for understanding of the systemic approach: /1/ interaction; /2/ entropy; /3/ regulation; /4/ hierarchy; /5/ differentiation; /6/ equivalent; /7/ functioning; /8/ state; /9/ movement and /10/ system behaviour.

*Cybernetic approach.*- The scientific area of cybernetics has considerably contributed to the improvement of management and its optimisation in complex organizational systems, such as security institutions.

Through studying systems and their complexity and constant dynamism, based on the postulates of mathematics and logics, the cybernetic approach has pointed to general regularities in management processes. According to this approach, management should ensure that the established organizational goals may be attained and the stability of the organization secured, and, in the conditions of dynamic changes, prevent its disorganization. In dynamic conditions and continuous changes in the environment, information is critical for management actions both internally and externally; it is crucial for functioning, development, even survival of the organization. Management relies on the information relating to the object of management and the environment, based on which decisions are made and implemented.

By controlling output values, comparing them to the desired value, and intervening on the input values, managing bodies achieve the established or desired goal of the system and maintain its stability, prevent it from breaking apart and secure its functioning.

*Situational approach.*- Situational approach is a relatively new approach in organizational theories. It emerged in the late sixties and beginning of seventies of 20<sup>th</sup> century. This theory includes the phenomena of situation as critical factors for functioning of organizational practice and management in the concrete organization. It clearly posits that there is no ideal organization, and the methods and principles according to which an organization is organized are not universal for all organizations, but are dependent on the situation imposed by concrete conditions.

According to this approach, decentralization is not always necessary better than centralization, explicit goals may not always be good; strict control can be sometimes appropriate; the same organization under different conditions may need different management action; the same goal can be reached in different ways; and organizational changes are viewed in causal relationship according to the principle: if A then X, if B then Y, which implies the existence of variants of the solution that may match each variants of the problem.

Upon summarizing what has been presented concerning the general organizational theories, one may conclude that *systemic approach* can

improve the capabilities of the whole organization in such a way that more complex organizational problems can be solved through modelling, simulation and application of computer technology. Such problems can often be found in a security organization.

The systemic approach enables the management to choose the right course of action to achieve the organizational goals. Problems are solved by means of constructed mathematical models containing all factors of the problem.

With *Cybernetic Approach*, by using computers, changing values of variables and through computer application, the effect of a certain change can be established and the solution to the problem formulated.

*Situational approach* requires management's reactions pertaining to the situation that are always new and different from case to case. Managers are expected to take a flexible approach, and to have active, systematic and prudent attitude in every situation. The main motto of the situational approach is "it all depends". Thus, when this approach is used appropriately, managers should first look into the factors conditioning the situation and then make decision on the course of action. Only responsible and competent management can apply the theory of situational approach since it necessitates assessment of the environmental factors that are not only complex but also dynamic and that can change every day.

*In sum*, we may say that organizational theories, regardless of the period when they were originated, have made a great contribution to understanding and solving organizational problems.

A great part of their tenants and conclusions can be found in the contemporary organizational theories. The first theories provided the basis for emergence and development of new theories. Thus, their application to the contemporary practice of general and security management may be somewhat different.

Based on some characteristics of organizational theories the conclusion about their application to the concrete conditions can be drawn, or more precisely, the division can be established between those used for forming and guiding organizational activities and those that can help us in making decisions in concrete security situations, where decisions based on the prevailing factors in the environment have to be made quickly. All these theories are still applicable, but some of them are applied more than the others in concrete situations.

In this part, we have dealt with some of the most important theories of organization and management that laid foundations for contemporary management. As a matter of course, in addition to these theories there are other theories that draw their knowledge and principles from the presented theories.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adizhes, I., *Управљање променама*, Adizhes, Novi Sad, 2005.
- Wren A., Daniel Dan, Voich Jr., *Менаџмент, Процес структура и понашање*, II издање, ПС Грмеч-Привредни преглед, Belgrad, 2001.
- Douglas McGregor, *The Human Side of Enterprise*, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co, 1960.
- Danah Yohar, Ian Marshall, *Духовни капитал, богатство за одрживу будућност*, HESPERIAedu, Belgrad, 2008.
- Draker P., *Управљање у новом друштву*, Novi Sad, Adizhes, 2005.
- Maslov A., *Психологија у менаџменту*, Novi Sad, Adizhes, 2004.
- Talijan M., Miroslav K., *Специфичности руковођења антитерористичким снагама*, disertacije doctorat, War Academy, Belgrad, 2008.
- Talijan M., Miroslav K., *Безбедносни менаџмент у супротстављању тероризму и борби против тероризма*, ВИЗ, Belgrad, 2010.
- Talijan M., Miroslav K., Slavkov Rade, *Подручја одбрамбене делатности као предмет истраживања безбедносног менаџмента*, Зборник радова, Симнод, Мо Ва, Belgrad, 2011.
- Danah Yohar, Ian Marshall, *Духовни капитал, Богатство за одрживу будућност*, HESPERIAedu, Belgrad, 2008.