

***Islamic Education Management as Educational Governance: Revisiting Classical Organization Theory through Epistemic and Institutional Reconstruction***

**Okky Trisna Sanjaya, Hasnida**  
Universitas PTIQ Jakarta, Indonesia  
Email: [veranisa.nasution@gmail.com](mailto:veranisa.nasution@gmail.com)

***Abstract***

*Classical organizational theory represents an early systematic framework for understanding structure, authority, and managerial practices. Rooted in the industrial era, its core principles—rationality, hierarchy, specialization, and control—continue to influence organizational governance today. However, existing studies tend to focus on comparing classical theory with modern paradigms, with limited attention to how its assumptions persist and adapt within contemporary, value-laden organizational contexts, including educational institutions. This article presents a conceptual review that reexamines the contributions of classical thinkers and evaluates their continued relevance through a synthesis with modern theoretical developments. The analysis reveals both continuity and limitations, particularly in explaining informal dynamics and ethical complexity. Nevertheless, classical theory remains essential as a conceptual foundation for understanding authority, accountability, and institutional coherence. Thus, it serves as a reflective basis for analyzing educational governance, especially within the context of Islamic Educational Management, which is oriented toward values and knowledge.*

**Keywords:** *Organizational Governance, Epistemic Reconstruction, Classical Management Theory, Authority Structures, Institutional Legitimacy, Islamic Education Management.*

***Abstrak***

Teori organisasi klasik merupakan kerangka awal yang sistematis untuk memahami struktur, otoritas, dan praktik manajerial. Berakar dari era industri, prinsip utamanya—rasionalitas, hierarki, spesialisasi, dan kontrol—masih memengaruhi tata kelola organisasi hingga kini. Namun, kajian yang ada cenderung hanya membandingkan teori klasik dengan paradigma modern, tanpa banyak menelaah bagaimana asumsi tersebut bertahan dan beradaptasi dalam konteks organisasi kontemporer yang sarat nilai, termasuk lembaga pendidikan. Artikel ini menyajikan tinjauan konseptual yang mengkaji ulang kontribusi pemikir klasik serta mengevaluasi relevansinya melalui sintesis dengan perkembangan teori modern. Hasil analisis menunjukkan adanya kesinambungan sekaligus keterbatasan, terutama dalam menjelaskan dinamika informal dan kompleksitas etika. Meski demikian, teori klasik tetap penting sebagai dasar konseptual dalam memahami otoritas, akuntabilitas, dan koherensi kelembagaan. Dengan demikian, teori ini relevan sebagai landasan reflektif dalam menganalisis tata kelola pendidikan, khususnya dalam konteks Manajemen Pendidikan Islam yang berorientasi nilai dan pengetahuan.

**Kata Kunci:** *Tata Kelola Organisasi, Rekonstruksi Epistemik, Teori Manajemen Klasik, Struktur Otoritas, Legitimasi Kelembagaan, Manajemen Pendidikan Islam.*



## A. Introduction

The study of organizations has evolved through a series of theoretical paradigms, each responding to the socio-economic challenges of its era. Classical organization theory, which emerged during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, constitutes the intellectual backbone of modern management science. It sought to render organizations as rational systems governed by rules, formal hierarchy, and the scientific pursuit of efficiency. As Lussato notes, “the birth of scientific management and the classical school arose from the need to rationalize industrial work and to impose order upon the emerging complexity of modern enterprise.”<sup>1</sup> This rationalization, according to Lussato, was not merely technical but epistemological it introduced a method of thinking that equated managerial control with scientific objectivity. Beyond its relevance to industrial and corporate settings, classical organization theory also provides a critical analytical lens for examining governance structures in educational institutions, including those operating within Islamic educational contexts. In many madrasah and Islamic schools, organizational challenges such as rigid hierarchies, excessive administrative compliance, and tensions between authority and pedagogical autonomy cannot be adequately understood without reference to foundational assumptions about rationality, control, and formal authority. From this perspective, Manajemen Pendidikan Islam extends beyond technical administration or instructional leadership; it involves the governance of knowledge, authority, and institutional purpose. Revisiting classical organization theory therefore enables a deeper interrogation of how educational institutions are structured, how power and responsibility are distributed, and how managerial rationality shapes educational aims, accountability, and ethical orientation.

The classical theorists Frederick Winslow Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber developed distinct yet complementary perspectives. Taylor emphasized task optimization through scientific analysis; Fayol proposed universal principles of administration applicable to all organizations; and Weber introduced the concept of bureaucracy as a rational-legal system of authority.<sup>2</sup> Together, these theorists codified the essential grammar of management planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling forming what Saxena describes as “the traditional framework of management thought based on structure, hierarchy, and rule-bound efficiency.”<sup>3</sup>

The historical importance of classical theory cannot be overstated. It institutionalized management as a profession and provided the intellectual scaffolding for subsequent developments such as human relations, behavioral, and contingency theories. Yet, over a

---

<sup>1</sup> B Lussato, *A Critical Introduction to Organisation Theory* (Macmillan, 1976).

<sup>2</sup> H Fayol, “General and Industrial Management,” 1916.

<sup>3</sup> P K Saxena, *Organisation Theory and Behaviour* (Global India Publications, 2021).

century later, the question persists: to what extent do the principles of classical organization theory remain relevant in understanding contemporary organizations? This question is not merely historical; it interrogates the enduring tension between structure and flexibility, control and creativity, centralization and autonomy.

The purpose of this paper is threefold: first, to revisit the foundational assumptions and key tenets of classical organization theory; second, to trace its evolution and critique across later theoretical developments; and third, to assess its contemporary relevance as a conceptual baseline for organizational governance, including its implications for the management of educational institutions.

Drawing upon Lussato's critical exposition of organizational rationality and control Lussato,<sup>4</sup> Saxena's synthesis of classical administrative principles,<sup>5</sup> and recent peer-reviewed scholarship on contemporary organizational transformations,<sup>6</sup> this conceptual review positions classical organization theory not as a prescriptive managerial doctrine, but as an analytical framework for examining authority structures, rationality, and accountability in complex organizational settings.

Within this conceptual orientation, revisiting classical organization theory is particularly relevant for examining educational institutions, where governance structures, authority relations, and rational-administrative logics play a central role in shaping organizational practice. Educational organizations including madrasah and Islamic schools are not merely pedagogical spaces but institutional systems governed by formal structures, decision-making hierarchies, and accountability mechanisms. As such, managerial rationality, bureaucratic coordination, and control hallmarks of classical theory continue to influence how educational purposes are articulated, implemented, and evaluated. By foregrounding classical organization theory as a foundational analytical lens, this article prepares the ground for a broader discussion on educational governance, highlighting how enduring assumptions about structure and authority inform contemporary debates on management, accountability, and institutional coherence in educational settings. This governance-oriented reading resonates with broader critical scholarship on Islamic educational and institutional reform, which highlights the interplay between authority, knowledge, and institutional design in Muslim societies.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Lussato, *A Critical Introduction to Organisation Theory*.

<sup>5</sup> Saxena, *Organisation Theory and Behaviour*.

<sup>6</sup> J Aguirre, "Classical to Post-Bureaucratic Models: Organizational Transformation," *Revista Venezolana de Gerencia* 26, no. 94 (2021): 448–466; Prashant Kumar and Michael Jay Polonsky, "An Analysis of the Green Consumer Domain within Sustainability Research: 1975 to 2014," *Australasian Marketing Journal* 25, no. 2 (2017): 85–96; N Noponen, J Posada, and K Kellogg, "Taylorism on Steroids or Enabling Autonomy?," *A Systematic Review of Algorithmic Management. Human Relations* 76, no. 5 (2023): 745–770.

<sup>7</sup> M Akyol, *Reopening Muslim Minds: A Return to Reason, Freedom, and Tolerance* (St. Martin's Press, 2017); A T Kuru, *Islam, Authoritarianism, and Underdevelopment: A Global and Historical Comparison*

## **B. Research Method**

This study adopts a conceptual review design to synthesize the foundational ideas of classical organization theory and assess their relevance within contemporary organizational scholarship. Unlike systematic or scoping reviews, this approach emphasizes analytical depth, theoretical integration, and critical interpretation rather than exhaustive coverage. Given the breadth of classical theory across decades and intellectual traditions, a conceptual lens is well suited to examine its enduring assumptions and transformations. The review follows an interpretive-analytical orientation, drawing on canonical works of early organizational thinkers and integrating them with contemporary theoretical and empirical contributions to trace continuities, identify core assumptions, and situate classical ideas within the evolution of organizational thought.

The analysis focuses on key constructs such as rationality, hierarchy, specialization, efficiency, authority systems, and formal structure that define the classical paradigm. Sources were selected based on theoretical relevance, scholarly impact, and contemporary significance, including foundational works and recent studies that reinterpret classical assumptions. The analytical procedure consists of three stages: extraction of foundational constructs, comparative mapping with subsequent paradigms such as human relations, contingency theory, and systems theory, and critical synthesis to evaluate strengths, limitations, and enduring relevance. This iterative process enables the development of an integrated conceptual narrative that bridges historical depth with present applicability.

This review does not aim to provide an exhaustive historical account or a systematic evaluation of all contributions to classical theory. Instead, it prioritizes conceptual clarity, theoretical integration, and the identification of continuities and boundaries. Empirical data, statistical meta-analysis, and sector-specific case studies fall outside its scope. Rigor is maintained through triangulation across sources, time periods, and disciplinary perspectives, while analytical validity is strengthened through critical comparison, thematic integration, and alignment with established standards of conceptual scholarship. Reflexive consideration of conceptual biases and historical context further enhances the robustness of the analysis.

## **C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **1. Classical Organization Theory as an Analytical Framework**

Classical organization theory endures not simply as historical knowledge but as a foundational analytical framework that shapes how scholars conceptualize organizations. Although emerging in a specific industrial context, its assumptions structure, hierarchy,

---

(Cambridge University Press, 2019); F Malik, *All That We Lost: The Colonized Mind and the Decline of the Islamic Education System* (Routledge, 2021).

rationality, and efficiency continue to influence how organizational problems are framed and solutions proposed. Classical theory offers the conceptual architecture that enables researchers to discuss division of labor, authority relations, coordination mechanisms, and administrative functions in systematic terms.

Taylor, Fayol, and Weber each contributed a component of this architecture: Taylor provided the micro-level logic of production, Fayol the macro-level principles of administration, and Weber the sociological grounding of authority and legitimacy. Together, they constructed what Lussato calls “the geometry of organization” a rationally ordered framework where every position, task, and decision fits into an overall schema designed to optimize collective functioning.<sup>8</sup>

Even modern organizational analysis relies on classical categories whether to critique, refine, or expand them. Contemporary theories such as contingency theory, institutional theory, and systems theory still assume the necessity of structure, coordination, and compliance mechanisms, ideas first formalized in classical work. When modern scholars discuss “span of control,” “standard operating procedures,” “task specialization,” or “formal authority,” they invoke conceptual tools directly inherited from classical thought.

In this respect, classical organization theory is not merely a historical school but a conceptual infrastructure. It provides the vocabulary and categories through which organizational studies became an academic field. This foundational role explains why, despite critiques, the classical paradigm remains a referential baseline.

## **2. Continuities and Transformations: How Classical Assumptions Persist**

While organizational environments today differ from early industrial settings, core classical assumptions persist in modified forms. The principle of division of labor, for instance, still underlies job design and workflow management. Although modern organizations emphasize cross-functional teams, agile roles, and lateral collaboration, the underlying logic of specialization remains important for efficiency and knowledge development. Research in management journals Kumar, continues to identify specialization as a predictor of performance, though moderated by coordination mechanisms.<sup>9</sup>

Similarly, the scalar chain Fayol’s formal hierarchy persists despite widespread rhetoric about flattening structures. Digital-era firms such as Google or Amazon retain multiple layers of authority, though they use data flows and dashboards to replace

---

<sup>8</sup> Lussato, *A Critical Introduction to Organisation Theory*.

<sup>9</sup> Kumar and Polonsky, “An Analysis of the Green Consumer Domain within Sustainability Research: 1975 to 2014.”

visible hierarchy with algorithmic oversight. The form changes, but the function remains rooted in Fayol's scalar principle: to ensure predictability, accountability, and direction.

Weberian bureaucracy also continues to shape modern governance. Weber's emphasis on rules, impersonality, and merit-based recruitment appears in contemporary compliance standards, ISO certifications, and audit processes. Even "agile" and "post-bureaucratic" organizations rely on bureaucratic frameworks for stability. As Aguirre argues, the modern organization is best understood as "a hybrid," combining bureaucratic rationality with flexible modes of coordination.<sup>10</sup>

Digital transformation has not eliminated bureaucracy; rather, it has produced digital bureaucracy algorithmic decision-making, standardized workflows in ERP systems, and automated reporting procedures. Scholars note that data governance frameworks mirror classical control systems, even amplifying Taylorist surveillance.<sup>11</sup> Thus, the trajectory of classical theory is not linear obsolescence but transformation. Its core logic efficiency, accountability, and rationality adapts to new technologies and institutional expectations.

### 3. Critiques, Limitations, and Theoretical Boundaries

Despite its enduring influence, classical organization theory has theoretical boundaries that limit its explanatory power in contemporary contexts. Several critiques have been consistently raised since the mid-twentieth century.

#### a. Mechanistic view of human behavior

Classical theorists generally reduce human motivation to economic incentives or compliance with rules. Taylor's belief that workers are primarily motivated by financial rewards reflects this mechanistic model. Later research, however, demonstrated the complexity of human motivation intrinsic satisfaction, social belonging, self-actualization, and psychological safety.<sup>12</sup> The classical focus on control often neglects creativity, autonomy, and emotional labor, which are now recognized as essential in knowledge-intensive work.

#### b. Overemphasis on formal structure

Classical theory primarily analyzes formal authority and codified procedures. Yet modern organizations contain extensive informal networks coalitions, knowledge-sharing communities, and tacit norms that influence performance more than formal charts. Organizational sociologists such as Barnard and later Mintzberg

---

<sup>10</sup> Aguirre, "Classical to Post-Bureaucratic Models: Organizational Transformation."

<sup>11</sup> Noponen, Posada, and Kellogg, "Taylorism on Steroids or Enabling Autonomy?"

<sup>12</sup> A H Maslow, "A Theory of Human Motivation," *Psychological Review* 50, no. 4 (1943): 370–396; E Mayo, *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization* (Macmillan, 1933).

show that coordination emerges through both formal and informal mechanisms. Classical theory, by focusing on the former, cannot fully explain emergent dynamics or informal leadership.<sup>13</sup>

c. Environmental determinism and rigidity

Classical theorists rarely consider environmental volatility or uncertainty. Their models assume stable contexts where routines can be standardized and optimized. Contemporary research in contingency theory demonstrates that effectiveness depends on alignment between structure and environment.<sup>14</sup> Similarly, systems theory highlights interdependence and adaptive capacity concepts that exceed classical determinism.

d. Technological complexity beyond classical models

While Taylor and Fayol understood technology as machinery, modern organizations operate with integrated digital ecosystems: AI, big data, and global networks. Classical principles cannot fully account for technological mediation of power, communication, and coordination. For example, algorithmic management blurs the boundaries between hierarchy and automation, challenging Weber's notion of authority based on human authority.

e. Limited applicability to creative, knowledge, and service work

Classical models were designed for repetitive manual labor. In contrast, modern organizations rely on problem-solving, creativity, emotional intelligence, and innovation. Tasks are less decomposable, and performance is less measurable. Thus, concepts such as "one best way" lose validity, while flexible, participatory models gain prominence. Despite these limitations, the critiques themselves presuppose classical categories authority, efficiency, and specialization as analytical baselines. Thus, even within its boundaries, classical theory shapes the discourse.

#### **4. Integrative Perspective: Classical Theory's Place in Modern Organizational Thought**

Instead of viewing classical organization theory as obsolete, contemporary scholars increasingly adopt an integrative perspective. This approach recognizes classical theory as foundational while emphasizing the need to contextualize and supplement it with insights from other paradigms.

---

<sup>13</sup> C I Barnard, *The Functions of the Executive* (Harvard University Press, 1938); H Mintzberg, *The Structuring of Organizations* (Prentice-Hall, 1979).

<sup>14</sup> T Burns and G M Stalker, *The Management of Innovation* (Oxford University Press, 1961).

a. Complementarity with Human Relations and Behavioral Sciences

Human relations theory focuses on motivation, leadership style, and group dynamics areas that classical theory underemphasized. However, the integration of classical structure with human relations insights produces balanced organizational models. For instance, a clear hierarchy (classical) combined with participative leadership (behavioral) yields more adaptive performance.

b. Alignment with Contingency and Systems Thinking

Systems theory reinterprets classical principles within a framework of interdependence. Instead of a rigid hierarchy, systems thinking highlights flows, feedback loops, and boundaries. Contingency theory further argues that classical principles remain valid but must be tailored to environmental conditions. For example, high specialization may suit stable industries but hinder fast-moving sectors.

c. Classical Logic in Contemporary Organizational Design

Modern organizational forms matrix, network, agile, and platform organizations retain classical logic in various ways: 1) Matrix organizations modify the unity of command but still rely on formal authority and coordination roles. 2) Agile teams emphasize autonomy, yet operate within structured sprints and standardized processes. 3) Platform organizations use algorithms as bureaucratic rules to govern interactions. These examples reflect not the rejection of classical principles but their reinterpretation.

d. The Normative Value of Classical Theory

Classical organization theory offers normative clarity in an era of managerial ambiguity. Its principles provide benchmarks for evaluating organizational coherence: 1) Does the structure support accountability? 2) Are roles clearly defined? 3) Are procedures consistent and fair? 4) Is authority legitimate?

These questions remain central in auditing, HRM, compliance, and administration. Classical theory's simplicity and logical coherence make it a stable reference point for managerial practice.

e. The Enduring Relevance of Rationality

Weber's rational-legal model remains the backbone of modern administrative law, public service, and corporate governance. Even as organizations pursue flexibility and innovation, rationality provides predictability and fairness. Lussato

notes that bureaucracy “remains the guardian of order” a role increasingly important in the digital age, where transparency and accountability are public demands.<sup>15</sup>

f. Reassessing Efficiency in Modern Contexts

Though efficiency has been criticized as reductionist, it remains a core organizational objective now reframed within sustainability, well-being, and ethical constraints. Efficiency in classical theory emphasized speed and output; modern interpretations integrate resource stewardship, environmental impact, and social responsibility. Thus, classical theory does not disappear; it evolves. Its categories become more complex, enriched by psychology, sociology, and technology studies.

Viewed collectively, these integrative reinterpretations underscore that classical organization theory continues to function as a foundational framework for examining organizational governance, particularly in institutions where authority, accountability, and rational coordination remain central to institutional legitimacy.

## 5. Reframing Classical Principles as Diagnostic Tools

Rather than viewing classical principles as prescriptive formulas, they can be reinterpreted as diagnostic instruments for analyzing organizational structure and authority. Concepts such as hierarchy, specialization, coordination, and formal authority provide a baseline for assessing organizational coherence. Managers and researchers can use these concepts to identify structural gaps, ambiguous reporting lines, unclear responsibilities, or misaligned spans of control. In this respect, classical ideas function as evaluative criteria rather than rigid prescriptions.

a. Integrating Classical Logic with Flexibility and Adaptation

Integrating classical organizational logic with flexibility and adaptation is not merely a structural challenge but an epistemic and institutional one. While classical theory emphasizes rational coordination, standardized procedures, and hierarchical accountability, contemporary organizations particularly educational institutions operate within environments shaped by plural values, professional autonomy, and evolving social expectations. The task, therefore, is not to abandon classical rationality, but to reconstruct how it is applied: aligning formal structures with institutional purposes, recalibrating control mechanisms to support learning rather than mere compliance, and ensuring that adaptability does not erode accountability. This integrative challenge foregrounds the need to reconsider how governance rationality mediates between efficiency, legitimacy, and value-driven organizational aims.

---

<sup>15</sup> Lussato, *A Critical Introduction to Organisation Theory*.

Modern organizations require adaptability, collaborative structures, and rapid responsiveness traits that the classical model does not prioritize when applied without sensitivity to institutional purpose and normative context. The challenge moving forward is to balance classical rationality with adaptive mechanisms. This may involve combining clear hierarchical accountability with decentralized decision-making, or integrating standard procedures with spaces for innovation and experimentation. Such hybrid designs preserve the strengths of classical clarity while mitigating rigidity.

b. Reconsidering Authority in an Era of Distributed Power

Reconsidering authority in contemporary organizations requires attention not only to the structural distribution of power, but also to the sources of legitimacy that sustain it. While classical organization theory locates authority primarily within formal hierarchies, modern institutions increasingly operate through expertise-based influence, professional norms, and knowledge-driven coordination. In educational organizations, authority is rarely exercised through command alone; it is mediated by pedagogical credibility, institutional trust, and shared understandings of purpose. From a governance perspective, the challenge is to reconcile formal authority with epistemic legitimacy ensuring that decision-making structures remain accountable while respecting professional autonomy and the integrity of knowledge practices.

Classical theory places authority within formal hierarchy, yet contemporary organizations distribute power through teams, networks, and digital systems. The next step implies a need to redefine authority beyond formal positions, acknowledging expertise-based influence, knowledge legitimacy, algorithmic governance, and collaborative leadership as coexisting sources of organizational authority. Classical authority remains important, but must coexist with these new sources of organizational power.

c. Reinterpreting Efficiency for Contemporary Values

Reinterpreting efficiency in contemporary organizations requires moving beyond narrow metrics of output optimization toward a broader consideration of institutional purpose and value alignment. While classical organization theory equated efficiency with standardization, speed, and control, modern governance frameworks increasingly recognize that efficiency must be evaluated in relation to what an institution seeks to achieve and whom it ultimately serves. In educational institutions, efficiency that undermines learning quality, professional judgment, or

ethical commitments risks eroding institutional legitimacy. Accordingly, modern organizational values including sustainability, employee well-being, inclusion, and ethical governance necessitate a multidimensional understanding of efficiency that integrates classical concerns for optimization with contemporary commitments to social responsibility and humane institutional design. Viewed in this way, efficiency reflects not only economic performance but also ethical orientation and institutional accountability.

d. Addressing Classical Limitations through Complementary Paradigms

Beyond structural efficiency and adaptive capacity, contemporary organizational analysis is increasingly foregrounding ethical considerations as integral to governance, rather than as supplementary concerns. Classical organization theory has often been criticized for its instrumental treatment of human actors; however, its enduring relevance lies in providing a framework through which ethical accountability, human dignity, and institutional responsibility can be systematically examined and addressed. In organizational contexts where human development, professional judgment, and moral trust are central such as educational institutions ethical orientation becomes a defining criterion of effective governance. This perspective invites a reconsideration of management not merely as coordination of tasks, but as stewardship of institutional values and human potential.

From this ethical standpoint, the limitations of classical theory particularly its mechanistic psychology, rigid structure, and limited sensitivity to informal dynamics necessitate systematic theoretical supplementation rather than outright rejection. Behavioral insights offer tools for understanding motivation, culture, and emotions; systems theory provides frameworks for complexity and interdependence; and institutional perspectives illuminate norms, legitimacy, and meaning-making processes. The emerging agenda, therefore, calls for the deliberate integration of classical organizational logic within broader theoretical ecosystems, allowing governance structures to remain rational and accountable while becoming more responsive to human, ethical, and institutional realities. Concerns regarding authority, legitimacy, and ethical governance in educational institutions have been extensively discussed within contemporary Islamic

management and leadership scholarship, emphasizing the need to balance organizational rationality with moral accountability.<sup>16</sup>

e. Developing Analytical Literacy in Management Education

One practical implication involves management education. Classical theory is often taught as historical background, despite its ongoing relevance. The next step is to teach classical principles as analytical competencies rather than relics. Future managers should learn how to interpret organizational structures, diagnose coordination problems, and understand authority systems using classical concepts, while also recognizing their limits. Analytical literacy rooted in classical logic enhances practical decision-making.

f. Revisiting Bureaucracy as Ethical Infrastructure

Contemporary debates often frame bureaucracy negatively, associating it with rigidity and inefficiency. However, in environments marked by algorithmic opacity, platform governance, and fragmented accountability, classical bureaucracy offers a valuable ethical function ensuring transparency, fairness, and procedural legitimacy. The “now what” implication is to rehabilitate certain bureaucratic principles as safeguards against arbitrary or automated decision-making.

g. Encouraging Multi-Paradigm Organizational Research

Finally, the field must move toward multi-paradigm analysis, in which classical assumptions are examined alongside insights from human relations, systems logic, and critical perspectives. Future research should explore how classical concepts manifest in digital environments, hybrid work structures, and emerging forms of authority. This approach preserves the conceptual depth of classical ideas while engaging emerging organizational realities.

## D. Conclusion

The reassessment of classical organization theory undertaken in this study demonstrates that its foundational constructs rationality, hierarchy, specialization, authority, and administrative coordination continue to hold significant analytical value for understanding organizational governance. Although the socio-technical conditions that shaped these ideas differ markedly from contemporary realities, the conceptual architecture they established remains central to how institutions organize authority, structure accountability, and pursue

---

<sup>16</sup> A J Ali, *Islamic Perspectives on Management and Organization* (Edward Elgar Publishing, 2017); S M Moghimi, *Principles and Fundamentals of Islamic Management* (Emerald Publishing Limited, 2019).

collective purpose. Classical principles persist not as prescriptive formulas, but as underlying logics that inform organizational diagnosis and governance-oriented analysis.

At the same time, contemporary organizational environments expose the limitations of classical thinking, particularly its mechanistic assumptions about human behavior, environmental stability, and structural rigidity. These constraints do not invalidate classical theory; rather, they underscore the necessity of epistemic reconstruction through complementary perspectives, including behavioral, systems, contingency, and institutional approaches. Within educational contexts where governance intersects with ethical responsibility, professional judgment, and human development such integration becomes especially critical.

From this perspective, Islamic Education Management may be understood as a form of educational governance that seeks to align organizational structures, authority relations, and accountability mechanisms with educational purpose and ethical orientation, operating within complex institutional environments as discussed in contemporary debates on Islamic educational reform and management (Memon & Alhashmi, 2018; Tan & Suleiman, 2021). By revisiting classical organization theory as a diagnostic and reflective foundation rather than a managerial blueprint, this article contributes a conceptual framework through which Islamic educational institutions can be analyzed as value-laden, knowledge-centered organizations operating within complex institutional environments.

### Referensi

- Aguirre, J. "Classical to Post-Bureaucratic Models: Organizational Transformation." *Revista Venezolana de Gerencia* 26, no. 94 (2021): 448–466.
- Akyol, M. *Reopening Muslim Minds: A Return to Reason, Freedom, and Tolerance*. St. Martin's Press, 2017.
- Ali, A J. *Islamic Perspectives on Management and Organization*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2017.
- Barnard, C I. *The Functions of the Executive*. Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Burns, T, and G M Stalker. *The Management of Innovation*. Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Fayol, H. "General and Industrial Management," 1916.
- Kumar, Prashant, and Michael Jay Polonsky. "An Analysis of the Green Consumer Domain within Sustainability Research: 1975 to 2014." *Australasian Marketing Journal* 25, no. 2 (2017): 85–96.
- Kuru, A T. *Islam, Authoritarianism, and Underdevelopment: A Global and Historical Comparison*. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Lussato, B. *A Critical Introduction to Organisation Theory*. Macmillan, 1976.
- Malik, F. *All That We Lost: The Colonized Mind and the Decline of the Islamic Education System*. Routledge, 2021.
- Maslow, A H. "A Theory of Human Motivation." *Psychological Review* 50, no. 4 (1943): 370–396.
- Mayo, E. *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. Macmillan, 1933.
- Mintzberg, H. *The Structuring of Organizations*. Prentice-Hall, 1979.
- Moghimi, S M. *Principles and Fundamentals of Islamic Management*. Emerald Publishing Limited, 2019.

Noponen, N, J Posada, and K Kellogg. "Taylorism on Steroids or Enabling Autonomy?" *A Systematic Review of Algorithmic Management. Human Relations* 76, no. 5 (2023): 745–770.

Saxena, P K. *Organisation Theory and Behaviour*. Global India Publications, 2021.