Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Systems Perspectives in Organization and Management Research: An Integrative Review and Roadmap for Meaningful Use

Jonathan H. Westover *

Posted Date: 30 March 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

Keywords: systems theory; complexity; emergence; organization theory; multi-level analysis; interdependence; nonlinearity; epistemology

Article

Systems Perspectives in Organization and Management Research: An Integrative Review and Roadmap for Meaningful Use

Jonathan H. Westover

Nexus Institute for Work & AI, Catalyst Center for Work Innovation; jonathan.westover@uvu.edu

Abstract

Systems perspectives offer a powerful alternative paradigm for understanding social phenomena as dynamic wholes characterized by emergent outcomes arising from interdependent interactions among diverse elements across multiple levels of analysis. Despite growing interest in systems thinking within organization and management (OM) research, much of its application remains ceremonial rather than meaningful, limiting the field's capacity to address complex, interconnected organizational challenges. This integrative review distinguishes three main types of systems perspectives—foundational, structural, and substantive—and examines how each can be leveraged to conceptualize phenomena, empirically investigate or simulate them, and develop theoretical explanations for their dynamics and outcomes. We trace the intellectual heritage of systems thinking and critically assess both its contributions and limitations, engaging substantively with critiques concerning cross-domain isomorphism, metaphorical overreach, ideological dimensions, and the obscuring of power relations. We identify conditions under which systems perspectives are most relevant, offer practical diagnostic frameworks and operational guidance for meaningful use across different epistemological traditions, and address the relationship between systems perspectives and adjacent theoretical traditions including institutional theory, organizational ecology, and practice theory. We acknowledge that systems research, like all research, serves particular interests and operates within specific epistemological commitments that shape what can be seen and said. By moving from ceremonial invocation to substantive engagement with systems perspectives, OM research can develop richer theoretical explanations and more effective practical interventions for the complex organizational phenomena that define our era.

Keywords: systems theory; complexity; emergence; organization theory; multi-level analysis; interdependence; nonlinearity; epistemology

---

Introduction

The study of organizations and their management has long grappled with a fundamental tension between analytical precision and holistic understanding. Traditional approaches to organizational research, grounded in linear, reductionist paradigms inherited from classical science, have yielded important insights into discrete phenomena such as individual motivation, team dynamics, and structural design (Pfeffer, 1982). Yet these approaches increasingly appear inadequate for addressing the complex, interconnected challenges that characterize contemporary organizational life—challenges such as digital transformation, climate adaptation, systemic inequality, and pandemic response (George et al., 2016). In an era defined by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity, scholars and practitioners alike are recognizing the need for frameworks that can account for the dynamic, emergent, and multi-level nature of organizational phenomena (Uhl-Bien & Arena, 2018).

Systems perspectives offer precisely such a framework. By portraying social phenomena as dynamic wholes in which emergent outcomes arise from interdependent interactions among varied types of elements spanning multiple levels of analysis, systems thinking provides an alternative

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

paradigm that challenges the linear assumptions dominating organization and management (OM) research (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Rather than decomposing phenomena into isolated variables and seeking unidirectional causal relationships, systems perspectives direct attention to patterns of interaction, feedback loops, and the ways in which local behaviors aggregate into macro-level outcomes that cannot be predicted from knowledge of individual components alone (Anderson, 1999).

The intellectual roots of systems thinking in organizational scholarship run deep. From the pioneering work of Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1968) on general systems theory to the sociotechnical systems tradition developed at the Tavistock Institute (Trist & Bamforth, 1951), from cybernetic approaches to organizational control (Ashby, 1956) to contemporary applications of complexity science (Maguire & McKelvey, 1999), systems perspectives have repeatedly emerged as alternatives to mechanistic organizational models. Yet despite this rich heritage and periodic surges of enthusiasm, systems thinking has never fully displaced linear approaches as the dominant paradigm in OM research. Indeed, much contemporary invocation of systems language remains superficial—what might be termed *ceremonial* rather than *meaningful* use—as scholars invoke systems vocabulary while retaining fundamentally linear analytical approaches.

Defining Ceremonial Versus Meaningful Use

The distinction between ceremonial and meaningful use is central to this review and warrants precise definition. *Ceremonial use* of systems perspectives occurs when researchers:

- Invoke systems vocabulary (e.g., emergence, complexity, feedback, nonlinearity) in framing or discussion sections without operationalizing these concepts in research design or analysis
- Acknowledge systemic complexity in theoretical motivation while formulating hypotheses that assume linear, unidirectional causation
- Cite systems-oriented literature for legitimacy without engaging substantively with its conceptual or methodological implications
- Use systems metaphors evocatively without specifying the structural features or dynamic processes implied by those metaphors

Meaningful use, by contrast, involves:

- Defining system boundaries explicitly and justifying inclusion and exclusion of elements
- Specifying feedback structures, including identification of reinforcing and balancing loops and their hypothesized dynamics
- Operationalizing emergence through appropriate multi-level designs that can detect properties at higher levels that are irreducible to lower-level aggregates
- Employing methods capable of detecting nonlinear relationships, temporal dynamics, or configurational patterns
- Developing theoretical explanations that account for recursion, mutual causation, and path dependence

This distinction is not binary but exists on a continuum. Research may exhibit meaningful engagement with some systems concepts while treating others ceremonially. Our aim is to help scholars move toward greater meaningfulness across all dimensions of systems-based research.

We should note at the outset that these criteria for meaningful use reflect particular epistemological commitments—primarily realist and positivist orientations that assume systems exist as observer-independent realities amenable to accurate representation. As we discuss later, meaningful engagement with systems thinking from interpretivist or critical perspectives would involve different criteria and practices. We offer guidance for multiple epistemological positions while acknowledging that no single framework can fully transcend its own assumptions.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

Positioning This Review

Several prior reviews have addressed related topics, including complexity theory and organization science (Anderson, 1999), network perspectives in organizational research (Borgatti & Foster, 2003), multi-level theory (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000), and dynamic capabilities (Teece, 2007). This review extends and integrates prior work in several ways.

First, we offer an *integrative typology* that distinguishes foundational, structural, and substantive systems perspectives, providing conceptual scaffolding that clarifies relationships among diverse systems-oriented approaches. Prior reviews have typically focused on single perspectives (e.g., complexity, networks) without situating them within a broader typology.

Second, we focus specifically on the *gap between invocation and application*—the ceremonial versus meaningful distinction—providing diagnostic criteria and practical guidance that prior reviews have not emphasized. While Anderson (1999) noted that complexity concepts were often loosely applied, we develop this observation into a systematic framework for assessment and improvement.

Third, we *critically engage with limitations and critiques* of systems perspectives, addressing concerns about cross-domain isomorphism, metaphorical overreach, ideological dimensions, and the obscuring of power relations. Prior reviews have tended toward advocacy; we aim for balanced assessment that acknowledges what systems perspectives cannot do as well as what they enable.

Fourth, we *connect systems perspectives to adjacent theoretical traditions*—including institutional theory, organizational ecology, dynamic capabilities, and practice theory—clarifying complementarities and tensions. This positioning helps readers understand where systems perspectives fit within the broader landscape of organizational scholarship.

Fifth, we *engage with recent methodological advances*—including computational social science, machine learning approaches, and advanced longitudinal network methods—that were unavailable or nascent when prior reviews were published.

Sixth, we *address epistemological diversity*, recognizing that systems perspectives can be engaged from realist, interpretivist, and critical standpoints, with different implications for research practice in each tradition.

Overview of the Review

The remainder of this article proceeds as follows. We begin by tracing the intellectual heritage of systems thinking and its trajectory within OM research, establishing the historical context for our analysis. We then present our typology of systems perspectives, elaborating the distinguishing features and contributions of foundational, structural, and substantive approaches, including attention to internal epistemological tensions. Next, we examine the use of systems perspectives across research activities—conceptualization, empirical investigation, and theoretical explanation—with concrete examples of meaningful use, detailed operational guidance, and attention to validation challenges. We then address the relationship between systems perspectives and adjacent theoretical traditions. Subsequently, we critically examine limitations and critiques of systems perspectives, engaging substantively with ideological as well as methodological concerns. We address the conditions under which systems perspectives offer distinctive value, and offer practical diagnostic frameworks and guidance for meaningful application across epistemological traditions. We conclude by articulating an agenda for advancing systems-based OM research while acknowledging the interests and limitations that shape any such agenda.

Historical Foundations and Intellectual Heritage

Origins of Systems Thinking

Systems thinking emerged as a self-conscious intellectual movement in the mid-twentieth century, though its conceptual antecedents extend much further into human history. The recognition that wholes possess properties irreducible to their parts appears in diverse philosophical traditions, from Aristotelian holism to various indigenous knowledge systems emphasizing interconnection and relationality (Capra & Luisi, 2014). However, the formal articulation of systems theory as a scientific framework is typically traced to the work of biologist Ludwig von Bertalanffy, whose *General System Theory* (1968) sought to identify isomorphic principles applicable across physical, biological, and social systems.

Bertalanffy's contribution involved articulating concepts that could describe structural similarities across domains: the notions of open versus closed systems, of steady states maintained through dynamic processes, of hierarchical organization, and of equifinality (the capacity of systems to reach similar end states from different initial conditions through different pathways). His work inspired the founding of the Society for General Systems Research in 1954 and launched an interdisciplinary movement seeking conceptual unification across the sciences.

Bertalanffy and his collaborators argued that phenomena across domains share fundamental structural similarities—patterns of organization, feedback, and dynamic equilibrium—that transcend disciplinary boundaries. This quest for transdisciplinary unity was both ambitious and controversial, attracting adherents who saw potential for conceptual integration and critics who questioned whether genuine isomorphism existed across radically different types of systems (Lilienfeld, 1978). As we discuss in our critical assessment section, this foundational debate about cross-domain applicability remains relevant today.

Concurrent with Bertalanffy's work, the cybernetics movement pioneered by Norbert Wiener, W. Ross Ashby, and others developed complementary frameworks emphasizing feedback, control, and information processing. Wiener's (1948) *Cybernetics* established the mathematical foundations for understanding feedback control, drawing on wartime research on anti-aircraft systems. Ashby's (1956) *Introduction to Cybernetics* developed key concepts including requisite variety—the principle that effective control requires variety in the controller matching variety in the system controlled—that would later inform organizational design thinking. Cybernetic concepts such as negative feedback loops, requisite variety, and self-regulation offered powerful tools for understanding how systems maintain stability in the face of environmental perturbations. These ideas would exert substantial influence on organizational theory, particularly through their application to questions of organizational design and control.

Systems Thinking Enters Organizational Scholarship

The translation of systems concepts into organizational scholarship occurred through multiple channels during the 1950s and 1960s. One influential stream emerged from the Tavistock Institute in London, where researchers including Eric Trist, Fred Emery, and Ken Bamforth developed the sociotechnical systems perspective. Their classic study of British coal mines demonstrated how technical and social subsystems jointly shaped organizational performance, and how changes to one subsystem reverberated through the other (Trist & Bamforth, 1951). This work established the principle of joint optimization—designing technical and social systems in concert rather than subordinating human organization to technological imperatives—that would inform subsequent decades of work design research (Cherns, 1976).

A second major stream flowed from the application of open systems theory to organizations. Katz and Kahn's *The Social Psychology of Organizations* (1978), first published in 1966, provided a comprehensive framework for understanding organizations as open systems that import energy from their environments, transform inputs through throughput processes, and export outputs while maintaining dynamic equilibrium. This perspective directed attention to organizational boundaries, environmental exchange, and the feedback processes through which organizations adapted to external conditions. Open systems thinking became foundational to contingency theory, which sought to specify how organizational structures should vary according to environmental and technological characteristics (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967).

The Complexity Science Turn

After a period of relative quiescence during the 1970s and 1980s, when contingency theory evolved into more static structural frameworks and institutional theory shifted attention toward symbolic and cognitive dimensions of organization (Meyer & Rowan, 1977), systems perspectives experienced a resurgence through engagement with complexity science. Beginning in the late 1980s and accelerating through the 1990s, organizational scholars discovered the Santa Fe Institute and related centers developing the "sciences of complexity"—including chaos theory, complex adaptive systems, dissipative structures theory, and agent-based modeling (Anderson, 1999).

Complexity science offered several conceptual and methodological advances that reinvigorated systems thinking in organizational research. First, it provided sophisticated mathematical and computational tools for studying nonlinear dynamics, emergence, and self-organization—phenomena that earlier systems theorists had described qualitatively but struggled to formalize (Kauffman, 1993). Second, complexity science directed attention to systems operating in dynamic regimes between rigidly ordered and fully random states, where complex adaptive behavior and innovation were theorized to flourish (Brown & Eisenhardt, 1998). Third, agent-based modeling enabled simulation of how micro-level interactions among heterogeneous agents could generate emergent macro-level patterns, offering a methodological approach consistent with systems ontology (Gilbert, 2008).

The complexity turn produced influential applications across organizational domains, including work on organizational adaptation and change (Brown & Eisenhardt, 1998), leadership in complex systems (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007), knowledge creation and innovation (Fleming & Sorenson, 2001), and inter-organizational networks (Borgatti & Foster, 2003). Yet complexity-inspired research also attracted criticism for sometimes privileging evocative metaphors over rigorous application, importing concepts from natural science without adequate attention to the distinctive properties of social systems, and generating theoretical propositions that proved difficult to test empirically (Maguire & McKelvey, 1999).

Current Status: Persistent Gap Between Rhetoric and Practice

Contemporary OM research exhibits an ambivalent relationship with systems perspectives. On one hand, systems language permeates the field: scholars routinely invoke concepts such as emergence, feedback, interconnection, and complexity when framing research problems and interpreting findings. Journals increasingly publish work engaging with systems dynamics, multi-level phenomena, and computational approaches to organizational complexity (Kozlowski et al., 2013). On the other hand, close examination often reveals that systems invocations remain superficial.

This pattern of ceremonial use reflects several constraints. The methodological infrastructure of the field—including regression-based statistical approaches, experimental designs, and qualitative case methods—was developed primarily for testing linear relationships, making it challenging to operationalize genuinely systemic phenomena (Davis et al., 2007). Publication norms, shaped by expectations for clean demonstrations of causal effects, can conflict with acknowledgment of feedback, recursion, and equifinality (Bettis et al., 2014). Tenure and promotion systems reward productivity in established research paradigms, creating disincentives for the methodological experimentation that meaningful systems research requires.

A Typology of Systems Perspectives

To facilitate meaningful engagement with systems thinking, we distinguish three main types of systems perspectives that operate at different levels of abstraction and serve distinct purposes in research (see Table 1 for summary). *Foundational perspectives* establish core ontological and epistemological premises for understanding phenomena as systems. *Structural perspectives* specify particular configurations and relationships among system elements. *Substantive perspectives* apply systems thinking to specific organizational domains. These types are not mutually exclusive; rather, they nest hierarchically, with substantive applications drawing on structural frameworks that in turn operationalize foundational premises.

Table 1. Typology of Systems Perspectives.

Type	Focus	Key Concepts	Representative Scholars	Primary OM Applications	Key Limitations/Challenges
Foundational	Ontological and epistemological premises	Holism, emergence, feedback, nonlinearity, self-organization	von Bertalanffy, Ashby, Kauffman, Prigogine, Ulrich	Meta-theoretical framing; paradigmatic orientation	Internal epistemological tensions; cross-domain transfer questions
Structural	Configurations and relationships among elements	Nodes and ties, levels and nesting, technical-social interaction, ecosystem architecture	Borgatti, Kozlowski, Trist, Jacobides	Network analysis, multi-level research, sociotechnical design, ecosystem strategy	Boundary specification challenges; level-of-analysis ambiguities
Substantive	Domain-specific applications	Varies by domain	Domain-specific scholars	Organizational learning, change, strategy, leadership, sustainability	Domain-specific operationalization; generalizability questions

Foundational Perspectives

Foundational perspectives articulate the core assumptions and conceptual vocabulary that distinguish systems thinking from alternative paradigms. They address ontological questions about the nature of social reality and epistemological questions about how such reality can be known.

Before discussing specific foundational perspectives, we must acknowledge that they embody different—and sometimes conflicting—epistemological commitments. General systems theory and early cybernetics emerged from positivist traditions seeking universal laws. Complexity theory incorporates elements of both positivism (in its mathematical formalizations) and emergentism (in its recognition that higher-level properties may not be reducible to lower-level laws). Second-order cybernetics and critical systems thinking explicitly challenge objectivist assumptions by incorporating the observer into the system and emphasizing the perspectival nature of all systems descriptions. These tensions are not fully resolvable; researchers must navigate them reflexively rather than assuming seamless integration.

General Systems Theory

General systems theory, as articulated by Bertalanffy (1968) and elaborated by Boulding (1956), provides perhaps the broadest foundational framework. It posits that phenomena across domains exhibit isomorphic structural properties, including hierarchical organization, boundary conditions, feedback processes, and equifinality. Organizations, in this view, are instances of a more general class of open systems characterized by exchange with environments, internal differentiation, and dynamic equilibrium maintenance.

Key concepts for OM research:

- *Openness*: Organizations exchange matter, energy, and information with environments
- *Hierarchy*: Systems nest within systems across multiple levels
- *Equifinality*: Different initial conditions and paths can lead to similar outcomes

- *Homeostasis*: Systems maintain stability through self-regulating processes

Epistemological orientation: General systems theory tends toward realism and positivism, assuming that systems exist independently of observers and that isomorphic principles can be discovered across domains.

Methodological implications: General systems theory directs attention to boundary specification, environmental exchange, and equilibrium-seeking dynamics. Research designs should specify system boundaries explicitly, examine environmental inputs and outputs, and consider how systems maintain or restore equilibrium.

Complexity Theory

Complexity theory encompasses multiple related frameworks—including complex adaptive systems theory, chaos theory, and dissipative structures theory—united by attention to nonlinear dynamics, emergence, and self-organization (Kauffman, 1993; Prigogine & Stengers, 1984). Where classical systems theory emphasized equilibrium and homeostasis, complexity approaches highlight how systems can undergo phase transitions, exhibit sensitive dependence on initial conditions, and generate novel structures through far-from-equilibrium processes.

Key concepts for OM research:

- *Nonlinearity*: Effects not proportional to causes; small changes can produce large effects
- *Emergence*: System-level properties arising from component interactions that cannot be predicted from component properties alone
- *Self-organization*: Spontaneous emergence of order without central direction
- *Sensitive dependence*: Small differences in initial conditions can produce dramatically different outcomes
- *Adaptive landscapes*: Metaphorical representations of fitness possibilities that shift as systems evolve

Epistemological orientation: Complexity theory incorporates realist elements (systems have real properties) but acknowledges limits to predictability and control. Some complexity theorists embrace ontological emergence (higher-level properties are genuinely novel), which challenges reductionist assumptions.

Methodological implications: Complexity theory suggests that linear methods may miss essential dynamics. Researchers should consider nonlinear modeling approaches, simulation methods that can capture emergence, and longitudinal designs that track system evolution through potential phase transitions.

A note on contested concepts: Some complexity concepts have attracted criticism for imprecision or metaphorical overreach. The notion of operating at "the edge of chaos," for example, derives from computational models with specific mathematical properties that may not translate directly to social systems. Researchers should use such concepts carefully, specifying what they mean in organizational contexts rather than relying on evocative but vague formulations.

Cybernetics

Cybernetics and its second-order successor developed by scholars including Heinz von Foerster and Humberto Maturana emphasize information, feedback, and circularity. First-order cybernetics, associated with Ashby (1956) and Wiener (1948), focused on feedback control mechanisms through which systems regulate themselves relative to goals. Second-order cybernetics extended this framework to include the observer within the system, recognizing that understanding of systems is always partial and perspectival (von Foerster, 2003).

Key concepts for OM research:

- *Negative feedback*: Counteracting loops that maintain system stability
- *Positive feedback*: Amplifying loops that drive growth or decline
- *Requisite variety*: Controllers need variety matching that of systems they regulate

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

- *Autopoiesis*: Self-producing systems that maintain identity through ongoing processes
- *Observer inclusion*: Recognition that observers are part of the systems they study

Epistemological orientation: First-order cybernetics retains objectivist assumptions; second-order cybernetics moves toward constructivism, recognizing that systems descriptions are observer-dependent constructions rather than objective representations.

Tension with other perspectives: Cybernetics emphasizes purposive control and goal-seeking behavior, which stands in tension with complexity theory's emphasis on emergent self-organization without central direction. Researchers should be clear about which orientation informs their work, as they generate different research questions and methodological approaches.

Methodological implications: Cybernetics emphasizes identification and mapping of feedback structures. Research should trace circular causal chains, distinguish stabilizing from amplifying dynamics, and—following second-order cybernetics—acknowledge the researcher's position within the phenomena studied.

Critical Systems Thinking

Critical systems thinking, associated with scholars such as Werner Ulrich and Michael Jackson, incorporates normative and political dimensions often neglected in functionalist systems approaches (Ulrich, 1983; Jackson, 2000). Critical systems thinkers argue that systems boundaries are not naturally given but socially constructed, and that boundary choices inevitably privilege some stakeholders while marginalizing others.

Ulrich's (1983) *critical systems heuristics* provides a structured approach for examining boundary judgments. The framework poses questions about sources of motivation (who benefits?), sources of control (who decides?), sources of knowledge (who knows?), and sources of legitimacy (who is affected but not involved?). These questions can be asked both descriptively (what is the case?) and normatively (what ought to be the case?), enabling systematic examination of whose perspectives are included and excluded in systems conceptualization.

Key concepts for OM research:

- *Boundary critique*: Examination of how system boundaries include some perspectives and exclude others
- *Power relations*: Attention to how systems concepts can naturalize existing power arrangements
- *Emancipatory intent*: Commitment to using systems thinking to challenge oppressive arrangements and expand human possibilities, drawing on critical theory traditions
- *Methodological pluralism*: Recognition that different systems methods suit different purposes and contexts

Epistemological orientation: Critical systems thinking challenges the objectivism of other foundational perspectives, arguing that all systems descriptions are value-laden and politically consequential. This orientation aligns with critical realism and critical theory traditions.

Methodological implications: Critical systems thinking suggests that researchers should reflexively examine their own boundary choices, consider whose perspectives are centered and whose are marginalized, and employ participatory approaches that include diverse stakeholders in systems conceptualization.

Navigating Epistemological Tensions

Researchers drawing on multiple foundational perspectives will encounter tensions that cannot be fully resolved:

Tension	Perspectives Involved	Implication for Research
Equilibrium vs. far-from-equilibrium	General systems theory vs. complexity theory	Clarify whether stability or transformation is the focal phenomenon

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 30 March 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

Control vs. emergence	Cybernetics vs. complexity theory	Specify whether purposive direction or spontaneous ordering is theorized
Observer-independence vs. observer-inclusion	First-order approaches vs. second-order cybernetics	Acknowledge epistemological positioning; consider reflexive methods
Functionalism vs. critique	Most systems perspectives vs. critical systems thinking	Examine power implications of systems framing; consider whose interests are served

These tensions need not preclude multi-perspective research, but they require explicit acknowledgment and navigation. Researchers should be clear about their primary epistemological commitments and explain how they address tensions when drawing on perspectives with different assumptions.

Structural Perspectives

Structural perspectives operationalize foundational premises by specifying particular configurations of system elements and relationships. They provide intermediate-level frameworks that can guide conceptualization and analysis of organizational phenomena.

Before discussing specific structural perspectives, we address a cross-cutting issue: level of analysis. Systems perspectives are inherently multi-level, but this raises questions that researchers must address:

- *Is an organization a system, or is it embedded in systems?* The answer is both: organizations can be analyzed as systems containing subsystems (individuals, teams, units) and as elements within supersystems (industries, economies, societies). Researchers must specify which level(s) are focal.
- *Can concepts scale across levels?* Some systems concepts (e.g., feedback) apply relatively consistently across levels; others (e.g., agency, intentionality) may operate differently at different levels. Researchers should not assume seamless scalability.
- *How should researchers handle fractal or scale-free properties?* Some systems exhibit similar structural properties at multiple scales; others do not. Empirical examination rather than assumption is required.

We develop four structural perspectives in depth given their particular importance for empirical research.

Network Perspectives

Network perspectives conceptualize systems as configurations of nodes connected by ties or relationships (Borgatti & Foster, 2003; Borgatti et al., 2009). Network analysis has become a major research tradition in organizational scholarship, applied to phenomena including inter-organizational alliances, knowledge transfer, innovation diffusion, and informal organization.

Key concepts:

- *Network structure*: Overall configuration including density, centralization, clustering
- *Node position*: Actor location including centrality, brokerage, peripherality
- *Tie characteristics*: Relationship features including strength, multiplexity, reciprocity
- *Structural holes*: Gaps between unconnected actors that create brokerage opportunities
- *Small worlds*: Networks combining local clustering with short average path lengths

Methodological approaches: Network analysis provides both conceptual vocabulary and formal mathematical tools. Methods range from descriptive network visualization to sophisticated statistical approaches including exponential random graph models (ERGMs) for cross-sectional networks and stochastic actor-oriented models (SAOMs) for longitudinal network dynamics (Snijders et al., 2010). Recent advances include relational event models for fine-grained temporal analysis and multilevel network models for examining nested network structures.

Example of meaningful use: Obstfeld's (2005) study of innovation in organizations exemplifies meaningful network-based systems research. Rather than simply measuring network position and correlating it with innovation outcomes, Obstfeld theorized the *process* through which brokerage generates innovation—*tertius iungens* orientation, or the tendency to introduce disconnected contacts. The research specified mechanisms connecting network structure to outcomes, moving beyond static structural analysis toward dynamic process understanding.

Multi-Level Perspectives

Multi-level perspectives address the hierarchical nesting of systems within systems that characterizes organizational phenomena (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000; Kozlowski et al., 2013). Organizations are simultaneously wholes containing subsystems (individuals, teams, departments) and parts of supersystems (industries, markets, societies). Multi-level theory addresses how constructs manifest at different levels, how phenomena at one level emerge from dynamics at lower levels, and how higher-level contexts shape lower-level processes.

Key concepts:

- *Levels of analysis*: Distinct hierarchical strata at which phenomena can be observed
- *Composition*: Higher-level constructs formed through aggregation of similar lower-level contributions
- *Compilation*: Higher-level constructs formed through combination of diverse lower-level contributions
- *Emergence*: Higher-level properties arising from lower-level dynamics that are not reducible to those dynamics
- *Top-down effects*: Contextual influences of higher levels on lower-level phenomena
- *Cross-level effects*: Relationships between constructs at different levels

Types of emergence: Kozlowski and Klein (2000) distinguish emergence processes important for research design:

- *Composition emergence*: Collective constructs reflect shared individual properties (e.g., team ability as aggregate of individual abilities)
- *Compilation emergence*: Collective constructs reflect configural combination of individual properties (e.g., team diversity)
- *Process emergence*: Collective constructs arise through interactive dynamics over time (e.g., team mental models)

Methodological approaches: Multi-level methods include hierarchical linear modeling (HLM), multilevel structural equation modeling, and random coefficient models. These methods partition variance across levels, examine cross-level effects, and can test specific emergence hypotheses. Appropriate use requires careful attention to measurement at each level, adequate sample sizes at higher levels, and theoretical justification for cross-level relationships.

Example of meaningful use: Chen, Kirkman, Kanfer, Allen, and Rosen (2007) examined how team empowerment emerges from individual empowerment and how both levels affect performance. The research distinguished individual-level and team-level empowerment constructs, theorized the emergence process connecting them, and employed multilevel methods to test both within-level and cross-level relationships. This exemplifies meaningful multi-level systems research that moves beyond simple aggregation.

Sociotechnical Systems Perspectives

Sociotechnical systems perspectives specifically address the joint constitution of organizations by technical and social subsystems. Building on Tavistock foundations, contemporary sociotechnical approaches examine how technological artifacts and human organizing practices mutually shape each other, with neither reducible to the other (Leonardi, 2012; Trist & Bamforth, 1951).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

Key concepts:

- *Joint optimization*: Designing technical and social systems together rather than subordinating one to the other
- *Responsible autonomy*: Work group self-regulation within boundaries
- *Minimal critical specification*: Specifying only what is essential, leaving room for adaptation
- *Sociomateriality*: Constitutive entanglement of social and material elements

Methodological approaches: Sociotechnical research typically employs qualitative case studies, action research, and design-oriented methods. Longitudinal designs are important for capturing the mutual adaptation of technical and social elements over time. Recent developments include computational approaches to studying sociomateriality through digital trace data.

Example of meaningful use: Leonardi's (2011) study of automotive engineering examined how technology and organizing practices co-evolved through reciprocal influence. The research traced how material features of simulation technology shaped engineering workflows while engineering practices in turn influenced technology development. This exemplifies meaningful sociotechnical analysis that captures mutual constitution rather than treating technology as independent variable.

Ecosystem Perspectives

Ecosystem perspectives extend systems thinking beyond organizational boundaries to encompass broader configurations of actors, institutions, and resources (Jacobides et al., 2018; Thomas et al., 2014). Business ecosystem concepts examine how organizations coevolve within competitive-cooperative communities; platform ecosystem research investigates how digital platforms orchestrate value creation across distributed participants.

Key concepts:

- *Ecosystem structure*: Configuration of actors, relationships, and institutions
- *Modularity*: Decomposition into separable components with defined interfaces
- *Complementarity*: Value creation through combination of distinct contributions
- *Orchestration*: Coordination of ecosystem activities by focal actors
- *Coevolution*: Mutual adaptation of ecosystem participants over time

Methodological approaches: Ecosystem research employs diverse methods including qualitative case studies, network analysis, simulation, and longitudinal designs. Recent work emphasizes the importance of multilevel analysis that captures both actor-level and ecosystem-level dynamics.

Example of meaningful use: Adner's (2017) work on ecosystem dynamics exemplifies meaningful engagement by specifying structural features that shape ecosystem performance and developing theoretical propositions about ecosystem evolution. Rather than using "ecosystem" as evocative metaphor, this work defines ecosystem boundaries, specifies interdependencies among components, and theorizes emergent dynamics.

Substantive Perspectives

Substantive perspectives apply systems thinking to specific organizational domains or phenomena, drawing on foundational and structural frameworks while developing domain-specific concepts and propositions. Table 2 summarizes key substantive applications with more developed treatment than a simple listing.

Table 2. Substantive Applications of Systems Perspectives.

Domain	Systems Contribution	Key Concepts	Representative Works	Illustrative Research Questions
Organizational Learning	Reveals how feedback structures create learning traps and capability dynamics; explains why	Feedback delays, stocks and flows, reinforcing loops, mental models	Senge (1990); March (1991); Repenning & Sterman (2002)	How do feedback delays between action and outcome affect learning? What

	organizations fail to learn despite intention			structures create competency traps?
Organizational Change	Explains emergence of radical change from incremental beginnings; illuminates unintended consequences and path dependence	Emergence, amplification, nonlinearity, sensitive dependence, path dependence	Plowman et al. (2007); Tsoukas & Chia (2002)	How do small changes accumulate into transformation? Why do change efforts produce unintended consequences?
Strategy	Addresses coevolution of capabilities and environments; explains value creation in ecosystems; captures dynamic competitive interaction	Dynamic capabilities, coevolution, ecosystem dynamics, fitness landscapes	Teece (2007); Jacobides et al. (2018); Levinthal (1997)	How do capabilities and competitive environments coevolve? What ecosystem structures enable value creation?
Leadership	Shifts focus from individual leaders to leadership as emergent, distributed phenomenon; addresses enabling conditions rather than heroic action	Complexity leadership, emergence, distributed influence, adaptive space	Uhl-Bien et al. (2007); Lichtenstein et al. (2006)	How does leadership emerge in complex adaptive systems? What enables adaptive versus administrative leadership?
Sustainability	Addresses wicked problems resisting decomposition; illuminates systemic intervention points; examines social-ecological system dynamics	Wicked problems, leverage points, systemic intervention, resilience	Ferraro et al. (2015); George et al. (2016); Whiteman et al. (2013)	How can organizations address grand challenges? Where are leverage points for systemic change?

Given space constraints, we elaborate three domains to illustrate how systems perspectives generate distinctive insights.

Organizational Learning

Systems perspectives on organizational learning emphasize feedback structures, stocks and flows, and reinforcing dynamics. Senge's (1990) popularization of the "learning organization" drew heavily on system dynamics approaches developed by Forrester (1961), directing attention to how mental models, feedback delays, and systemic structures shape organizational learning capacity.

More technically sophisticated applications have used system dynamics modeling to examine learning dynamics. Repenning and Sterman (2002) modeled capability traps—situations where short-term pressures undermine long-term capability development through reinforcing feedback loops. Their analysis showed how "firefighting" dynamics emerge: short-term problem-solving consumes resources needed for systemic improvement, which generates more problems requiring firefighting. This exemplifies meaningful systems application by specifying feedback structures, demonstrating nonlinear dynamics through simulation, and generating counterintuitive insights about intervention design.

March's (1991) exploration-exploitation framework, while not always framed as systems research, engages systems dynamics by examining how learning processes in one domain (exploitation of existing knowledge) can crowd out learning in another (exploration of new possibilities), creating self-reinforcing traps that constrain organizational adaptation.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 30 March 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

Organizational Change

Systems perspectives on change emphasize emergence, nonlinearity, and path dependence, offering alternatives to planned change models that assume linear implementation of designed interventions (Tsoukas & Chia, 2002). Complexity-informed change approaches emphasize enabling conditions for emergence rather than detailed planning and control.

Plowman et al.'s (2007) study of radical change in a religious organization exemplifies meaningful complexity-based change research. Rather than merely invoking complexity metaphorically, the research traced how small changes accumulated and amplified through feedback processes, ultimately producing radical transformation that no single actor intended. The analysis identified specific mechanisms—including positive feedback through media attention and organizational restructuring—through which emergence occurred. This work demonstrates how qualitative process research can capture emergent dynamics that cross-sectional designs would miss.

Strategy

Systems perspectives on strategy address the coevolution of organizations and their competitive environments, the dynamics of capability development, and value creation within ecosystems. Teece's (2007) dynamic capabilities framework, while sometimes operationalized in linear fashion, fundamentally addresses systemic questions: how do sensing, seizing, and reconfiguring capabilities interact? How do capabilities and competitive environments coevolve?

Levinthal's (1997) simulation-based work on adaptation on rugged landscapes exemplifies meaningful systems engagement in strategy research. By modeling organizations as entities searching fitness landscapes that shift as competitors also adapt, this work captures essential systemic properties—interdependence, coevolution, path dependence—that verbal theorizing struggles to formalize. The computational approach enables exploration of dynamics that would be difficult to observe empirically.

Jacobides et al.'s (2018) work on ecosystem strategy extends systems thinking to inter-organizational configurations, examining how firms create and capture value within broader systems of complementary actors. This perspective moves beyond dyadic relationships to address the emergent properties of multi-actor systems.

Systems Perspectives Across Research Activities

Having distinguished types of systems perspectives, we now examine how they can be employed across core research activities: conceptualization, empirical investigation, and theoretical explanation. For each activity, we specify how systems perspectives differ from linear approaches, provide concrete examples of meaningful use, and offer detailed operational guidance.

Conceptualization

Conceptualization—the process of defining, bounding, and characterizing phenomena—represents the most fundamental research activity where systems perspectives exert influence. Systems thinking shapes conceptualization by directing attention to wholes and relationships rather than variables and entities, by emphasizing dynamics and process rather than static states, and by recognizing emergence and levels rather than assuming simple aggregation.

Defining Phenomena as Systems

A first conceptual move involves characterizing the phenomenon of interest as a system—a configuration of interdependent elements that together exhibit properties not reducible to individual components. This framing directs attention to what elements constitute the system, what relationships connect them, what boundaries distinguish system from environment, and what emergent properties characterize the whole (Meadows, 2008).

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 30 March 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

Concrete example: Consider research on organizational innovation. A linear approach might conceptualize innovation as an outcome variable influenced by antecedent factors such as R&D investment, human capital, and organizational structure. A systems conceptualization would instead characterize the innovation system as including actors (inventors, managers, users), resources (knowledge, funding, equipment), processes (experimentation, selection, diffusion), and relationships among these elements. This reconceptualization directs attention to how innovation emerges from interactions within the system rather than treating it as a discrete output.

Boundary Specification Strategies

Specifying system boundaries is among the most consequential—and challenging—conceptual decisions in systems-based research. Boundaries determine what is inside the system (and thus subject to analysis) and what is outside (treated as environment or context). Poor boundary choices can lead to models that miss crucial dynamics or that are too complex to analyze.

Strategies for boundary specification:

1. *Phenomenon-driven boundaries*: Define boundaries based on the phenomenon to be explained. Include elements that directly participate in generating the phenomenon; treat as environment those that influence the phenomenon from outside.
2. *Interaction-based boundaries*: Draw boundaries where interaction intensity drops off. Elements that interact frequently and intensely belong within the same system; those with sparse interaction may be treated as separate systems or environment.
3. *Control-based boundaries*: Include within boundaries those elements that can be influenced by actors within the system; treat as environment those that affect but cannot be affected by the focal system.
4. *Stakeholder-based boundaries*: Following critical systems heuristics (Ulrich, 1983), consider whose perspectives are represented by different boundary choices. Examine who benefits, who decides, who provides knowledge, and who is affected but not involved.

Boundary challenges and responses:

Challenge	Description	Response Strategy
Permeability	Elements move across boundaries; boundaries are porous	Acknowledge permeability; model flows across boundaries; consider whether boundary location should shift
Contestation	Stakeholders disagree about appropriate boundaries	Make boundary choices explicit; examine implications of alternatives; consider participatory boundary-setting
Scale	Phenomena operate at multiple scales simultaneously	Define primary level of analysis; examine cross-level dynamics; consider multi-level or nested designs
Dynamics	Appropriate boundaries may shift over time	Use longitudinal designs; allow boundaries to evolve; document boundary changes

Sensitivity analysis: For any boundary choice, researchers should consider how conclusions might change under alternative boundaries. This can be done through explicit modeling of alternatives or through qualitative consideration of what including or excluding particular elements would change.

Identifying Feedback Structures

Systems conceptualization attends particularly to feedback loops—circular causal chains through which outputs influence inputs. Identifying feedback structures illuminates dynamics that linear conceptualization misses.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

Operational guidance for identifying feedback:

1. For key constructs, ask: Does this construct influence other constructs that subsequently influence it?
2. Trace causal chains to identify loops; distinguish reinforcing loops (same-sign effects around the loop) from balancing loops (odd number of negative effects)
3. Consider temporal dynamics: How quickly does each link in the loop operate?
4. Identify potential delays that may affect system behavior
5. Map feedback structures using causal loop diagrams

Concrete example: In studying organizational reputation, a systems approach would identify reinforcing loops: reputation attracts high-quality employees and customers, which improves performance, which strengthens reputation. It would also identify potential balancing loops: strong reputation raises expectations, which makes it harder to exceed expectations, which may weaken reputation. These feedback structures generate dynamics—such as reputation momentum and reputation traps—invisible to linear conceptualization.

Recognizing Emergence and Levels

Systems conceptualization acknowledges that phenomena at higher levels emerge from but are not determined by lower-level dynamics, and that higher-level contexts constrain but do not determine lower-level behavior.

Types of emergence (following Kozlowski & Klein, 2000):

- *Composition*: Collective properties that are isomorphic across levels (e.g., team ability as aggregate of individual abilities). Emergence is relatively simple; aggregation captures the phenomenon.
- *Compilation*: Collective properties that combine diverse individual properties in configural ways (e.g., team diversity). Emergence involves combination rather than aggregation.
- *Discontinuous emergence*: Collective properties that arise through nonlinear dynamics and are not predictable from lower-level properties (e.g., organizational culture). Emergence involves transformation rather than aggregation or combination.

Operational guidance for conceptualizing emergence:

1. Specify the levels involved (e.g., individual, team, organization)
2. Articulate the construct at each level, noting whether it is isomorphic across levels or takes different form at different levels
3. Theorize the emergence process: Is it composition, compilation, or discontinuous emergence?
4. Consider what properties of the higher-level construct are irreducible to lower-level properties

Empirical Investigation and Simulation

Systems perspectives present distinctive challenges and opportunities for empirical investigation. The phenomena that systems perspectives illuminate—emergence, feedback, nonlinearity, multi-level dynamics—strain conventional methods designed for testing linear relationships among discrete variables. We discuss established approaches and recent methodological advances.

System Dynamics Modeling

Developed by Jay Forrester at MIT and elaborated over subsequent decades, system dynamics provides tools for representing and simulating feedback systems (Forrester, 1961; Sterman, 2000). System dynamics models specify stocks (accumulations), flows (rates of change), and feedback relationships, enabling simulation of system behavior over time under varying conditions.

When to use system dynamics:

- Phenomena involving feedback loops with significant delays

- Questions about policy resistance or unintended consequences of interventions
- Interest in behavior over time rather than cross-sectional relationships
- Sufficient domain knowledge to specify stock-flow structure

Operational guidance for system dynamics:

1. Define system boundary and time horizon
2. Identify key stocks (accumulations that characterize system state)
3. Specify flows (rates of change in stocks) and what drives them
4. Map feedback loops connecting stocks and flows
5. Estimate parameters from data where possible; conduct sensitivity analysis for uncertain parameters
6. Validate model against historical data and expert judgment
7. Explore behavior under different scenarios or policies

Validation in system dynamics: Following Sterman (2000), model validation in system dynamics involves multiple tests:

Validation Test	Purpose	Procedure
Structure verification	Ensure model structure is consistent with knowledge of actual system	Compare model structure to empirical evidence; have domain experts review
Dimensional consistency	Ensure units of measure are consistent throughout	Check that all equations balance dimensionally
Parameter verification	Ensure parameters are consistent with available data	Compare parameters to empirical estimates; conduct sensitivity analysis
Extreme conditions	Test model behavior under extreme inputs	Examine whether model produces reasonable output under extreme values
Behavior reproduction	Compare model output to historical data	Test whether model can reproduce observed time series
Behavior anomaly	Examine counterintuitive results	Investigate whether unexpected model behaviors reflect real dynamics or errors
Surprise behavior	Identify behaviors not anticipated in model design	Explore whether model produces behaviors that generate new insights

Importantly, validation is not a binary determination but an ongoing process of confidence-building. Models are always simplifications; the question is whether they capture dynamics relevant to the research question. Researchers should acknowledge that multiple model structures might produce similar outputs (equifinality in models), and should avoid claiming that validated models uniquely represent underlying systems.

Example of meaningful use: Repenning and Sterman (2002) used system dynamics to model how process improvement efforts can fail through capability traps. They specified stocks (capabilities, workload), flows (improvement activities, work completion), and feedback structures (reinforcing loops between capability and performance; balancing loops through workload pressure). Simulation revealed counterintuitive dynamics whereby improvement efforts can worsen performance before improving it, explaining empirically observed implementation failures.

Agent-Based Modeling

Agent-based models (ABMs) simulate systems from the bottom up by specifying heterogeneous agents with behavioral rules and observing macro-level patterns that emerge from their interactions (Gilbert, 2008; Davis et al., 2007).

When to use agent-based modeling:

- Interest in how macro patterns emerge from micro behaviors
- Phenomena involving heterogeneous actors with different characteristics or strategies
- Questions about the consequences of agent-level behavioral rules

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

- Theoretical development through "virtual experiments"

Operational guidance for agent-based modeling:

1. Define agent types and their characteristics
2. Specify behavioral rules governing agent actions and interactions
3. Define the environment in which agents operate
4. Implement the model using appropriate software (e.g., NetLogo, Mesa)
5. Verify that the model behaves as intended through debugging and testing
6. Validate by comparing model output to empirical patterns
7. Conduct sensitivity analysis and explore parameter space
8. Use results for theoretical development rather than point prediction

Validation in agent-based modeling: Following Rand and Rust (2011), validation of ABMs involves:

- *Face validation*: Do model behaviors appear reasonable to domain experts?
- *Empirical input validation*: Are agent rules and parameters grounded in empirical evidence?
- *Empirical output validation*: Do model outputs match observed patterns?
- *Cross-validation*: Does the model reproduce patterns it was not designed to reproduce?

A key challenge in ABM validation is that multiple agent-level specifications may produce similar macro-level patterns. Researchers should test alternative specifications and identify which micro-level assumptions are essential for generating observed patterns.

Example of meaningful use: Harrison, Lin, Carroll, and Carley (2007) used agent-based simulation to study how organizational demography affects organizational culture. Rather than empirically correlating demographic composition with culture outcomes, they specified agents with cultural attributes, simulated interaction and influence processes, and observed the emergence of cultural patterns. This approach could explore conditions under which cultural homogeneity versus diversity emerges—dynamics difficult to capture empirically.

Network Analysis Methods

Network analysis methods have become increasingly sophisticated, enabling examination of network structure, dynamics, and multilevel embedding (Borgatti et al., 2009).

Recent methodological advances:

- *Exponential random graph models (ERGMs)*: Statistical models for cross-sectional networks that can test hypotheses about tie formation processes
- *Stochastic actor-oriented models (SAOMs)*: Models for co-evolution of networks and actor attributes over time (Snijders et al., 2010)
- *Relational event models*: Methods for analyzing fine-grained temporal sequences of interactions
- *Multilevel network models*: Approaches for examining networks nested within larger structures

Operational guidance for longitudinal network analysis:

1. Collect network data at multiple time points or at the event level
2. Specify theoretical mechanisms expected to drive network change (e.g., reciprocity, transitivity, homophily, influence)
3. Select appropriate method based on data structure and theoretical questions:
    - *SAOMs* for panel data with focus on co-evolution
    - *Relational event models* for event-level data with fine temporal granularity
    - *Temporal ERGMs* for panel data without co-evolution focus
4. Model endogenous network processes (e.g., reciprocity, transitivity) alongside exogenous effects
5. Interpret results in terms of tie formation mechanisms rather than variable relationships
6. Conduct goodness-of-fit tests to assess model adequacy

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

Multi-Level Quantitative Methods

Multi-level quantitative methods enable examination of how phenomena at different levels relate (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000).

Operational guidance for multi-level research design:

1. Specify constructs at each level and justify level of measurement
2. Theorize cross-level relationships: bottom-up emergence, top-down effects, or cross-level interactions
3. Ensure adequate sample size at higher levels (typically 30+ groups minimum for stable estimates)
4. Use appropriate measurement models at each level
5. Select appropriate analysis approach (HLM, multilevel SEM) based on theoretical model
6. For emergence hypotheses, examine group-level properties that exceed aggregated individual properties

Testing emergence:

- *Composition emergence*: Test whether individual-level constructs aggregate reliably (rwg, ICC)
- *Compilation emergence*: Examine configural properties (variance, diversity indices) at group level
- *Discontinuous emergence*: Examine whether group-level constructs have relationships with outcomes that differ from individual-level constructs; use process-tracing to examine emergence mechanisms

Process Methods and Temporal Analysis

Qualitative and quantitative process methods enable examination of temporal dynamics central to systems perspectives (Langley, 1999; Langley et al., 2013).

Process research strategies:

Strategy	Description	When to Use
Temporal bracketing	Divide process into phases based on discontinuities	When process exhibits distinct periods with different dynamics
Visual mapping	Create graphical representations of process	When relationships among events are complex; for pattern identification
Narrative strategy	Construct detailed story of process	When context and sequence are essential; for thick description
Grounded theory	Develop theory inductively from process data	When existing theory is limited; for theory generation
Quantitative sequence analysis	Apply statistical methods to event sequences	When event data are available; for pattern detection and comparison

Operational guidance for process-tracing emergence:

1. Collect longitudinal data capturing both individual/local behaviors and collective/system-level patterns
2. Develop a timeline of key events and developments
3. Trace how micro-level actions aggregated or combined into macro patterns
4. Identify amplifying or dampening mechanisms affecting emergence
5. Examine how emerging patterns fed back to shape subsequent micro behavior
6. Use temporal bracketing to identify distinct phases in emergence process
7. Consider event history methods (e.g., hazard models) for analyzing timing of transitions

Qualitative comparative analysis (QCA): Set-theoretic methods including QCA enable examination of configurational patterns consistent with systems perspectives (Fiss, 2011). QCA examines how conditions combine to produce outcomes, aligning with systems attention to configuration rather than isolated variables. Recent developments include temporal QCA for examining sequences and multilevel QCA for examining configurations across levels.

Computational Social Science Approaches

Recent advances in computational social science offer new possibilities for systems-based research (Lazer et al., 2009).

Relevant approaches:

- *Digital trace analysis*: Using organizational digital records to observe behavior at scale
- *Natural language processing*: Extracting patterns from text data to examine constructs like culture, sensemaking, or discourse
- *Machine learning for pattern detection*: Using algorithms to identify nonlinear relationships, clusters, or predictive patterns in complex data
- *Network analysis from digital data*: Constructing networks from email, communication, or collaboration records

Opportunities and cautions:

These approaches enable observation of system dynamics at scales previously impossible. However, they raise challenges including measurement validity (do digital traces capture constructs of interest?), selection bias (what is missing from digital records?), algorithmic opacity (can we interpret what models are detecting?), and the risk of atheoretical pattern-finding. Meaningful use requires theoretical grounding, attention to validity, and appropriate humility about what patterns mean.

Theoretical Explanation

Systems perspectives reshape theoretical explanation by shifting attention from cause-effect relationships among variables toward patterns of interaction that generate outcomes.

Explanation Through Mechanisms and Processes

Systems explanations often specify generative mechanisms—particular configurations of elements and interactions—that produce observed outcomes (Hedström & Swedberg, 1998). Rather than identifying that X causes Y, mechanistic explanation articulates *how* X produces Y through intervening processes.

This approach connects systems perspectives to analytical sociology's emphasis on mechanism-based explanation (Hedström & Ylikoski, 2010). Both traditions reject purely statistical explanation in favor of specifying the processes through which causes generate effects. Systems perspectives contribute attention to feedback, emergence, and nonlinearity in those processes.

Operational guidance for mechanistic explanation:

1. Identify the explanandum (outcome to be explained)
2. Specify entities and activities involved in generating the outcome
3. Articulate the process through which entities interact to produce the outcome
4. Identify feedback loops, emergence, or nonlinearity in the generative process
5. Consider scope conditions: under what circumstances does this mechanism operate?

Concrete example: Explaining the persistence of organizational routines, a mechanistic account might specify: (1) individuals with skills and knowledge, (2) artifacts encoding routine procedures, (3) interaction patterns through which individuals cue each other, (4) feedback loops through which successful performance reinforces routine enactment. This specifies *how* routines persist rather than merely asserting that they do.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 30 March 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

Explanation Through Configuration

Systems explanations may identify configurational patterns—particular combinations of elements—that characterize effective systems (Fiss, 2011). Configuration approaches examine how elements combine rather than how individual variables exert independent effects.

Operational guidance for configurational explanation:

1. Identify the set of conditions potentially relevant to the outcome
2. Theorize how conditions might combine rather than assuming additive effects
3. Use set-theoretic methods (QCA or similar) to identify configurations associated with outcomes
4. Examine equifinality: are there multiple configurations leading to similar outcomes?
5. Develop explanations for why particular configurations are effective

Explanation Through Dynamics and Trajectories

Systems explanations often emphasize temporal dynamics—how systems evolve through sequences of states, how trajectories depend on initial conditions, how phase transitions occur.

Operational guidance for dynamic explanation:

1. Collect longitudinal data capturing system states over time
2. Identify distinct phases or regimes in system behavior
3. Examine transitions between phases: What triggers change? How rapidly does transition occur?
4. Consider path dependence: How do earlier states constrain later possibilities?
5. Develop explanations that account for temporal sequence, not just correlation

Systems Perspectives and Adjacent Theoretical Traditions

Systems perspectives exist alongside other major theoretical traditions in organizational scholarship. Understanding complementarities and tensions helps researchers position systems-based work and draw on relevant theoretical resources.

Institutional Theory

Institutional theory examines how organizations are shaped by regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive elements of their environments (Scott, 2014). Recent developments—including attention to institutional complexity, institutional logics, and field-level dynamics—engage with phenomena amenable to systems analysis.

Complementarities:

- Institutional fields can be conceptualized as systems with feedback dynamics, emergence, and evolution
- Institutional logics operate through mechanisms (meaning systems, practices) that can be analyzed with systems concepts
- Deinstitutionalization and institutional change involve nonlinear dynamics and tipping points
- Multi-level institutional analysis examines how field-level and organization-level dynamics interact

Tensions:

- Institutional theory often emphasizes stability and persistence; systems/complexity perspectives may emphasize change and adaptation
- Institutional accounts tend toward cognitive and cultural mechanisms; systems perspectives may underemphasize interpretation and meaning
- Some institutional work treats structure as constraining agency; systems perspectives may emphasize co-evolution and recursion

Existing integration efforts: Scholars have begun integrating institutional and systems perspectives. For example, work on institutional entrepreneurship examines how actors work to change institutional fields—an inherently systemic process involving feedback between actor

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

strategies and field-level structures. Research on institutional complexity examines how organizations navigate multiple institutional logics—a phenomenon involving multi-level dynamics amenable to systems analysis.

Opportunities for integration: Researchers might use systems methods (e.g., simulation, network analysis) to examine institutional dynamics, or use institutional concepts to address the cultural-cognitive dimensions that systems analyses sometimes neglect.

Organizational Ecology

Organizational ecology examines population-level dynamics of organizational founding, mortality, and change (Hannan & Freeman, 1989; Hannan & Freeman, 1977). This tradition explicitly employs evolutionary and systems concepts.

Complementarities:

- Ecology's population-level focus aligns with systems attention to emergence and aggregate patterns
- Concepts like density dependence, niche width, and structural inertia involve feedback dynamics
- Ecological competition and legitimation processes create reinforcing and balancing feedback loops
- Coevolution of organizations and environments is explicitly systemic

Tensions:

- Classical ecology emphasizes selection over adaptation; complexity perspectives may allow more room for organizational agency
- Ecological analyses often focus on organizational forms as units; systems perspectives may emphasize within-organization dynamics
- Methodological traditions differ: ecology has used event-history analysis; systems approaches may emphasize simulation

Existing integration efforts: Computational organizational theory has used simulation to extend ecological analysis. Hannan, Pólos, and Carroll (2007) developed a formal theory of organizational categories that could inform systems-based research on how categories emerge and evolve. Agent-based models have been used to explore ecological dynamics in ways that extend traditional analytical approaches.

Opportunities for integration: Multi-level ecological analysis, examining how organizational-level properties affect population dynamics and vice versa, offers rich potential for systems-based research.

Dynamic Capabilities

The dynamic capabilities perspective examines how organizations sense opportunities, seize them, and reconfigure resources in response to environmental change (Teece, 2007). This perspective is explicitly concerned with adaptation in complex environments.

Complementarities:

- Dynamic capabilities address how organizations adapt within complex, changing systems
- The microfoundations literature examines how capabilities emerge from individual and group processes
- Capability development involves feedback: successful sensing improves future sensing
- Coevolution of capabilities and competitive environments is explicitly systemic

Tensions:

- Dynamic capabilities research often focuses on firm-level capabilities and competitive advantage, potentially neglecting broader systemic context
- Some capabilities research retains relatively linear causal structure (capabilities → performance)

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

- The relationship between capabilities and performance may be more complex than often modeled (e.g., involving threshold effects, time delays, interaction effects)

Existing integration efforts: Scholars have begun examining how dynamic capabilities emerge through micro-level processes (microfoundations) and how they coevolve with competitive environments. Simulation-based work has explored capability development as a learning process on rugged landscapes (Levinthal, 1997).

Opportunities for integration: Systems perspectives can enrich dynamic capabilities research by examining feedback structures in capability development, modeling capability-environment coevolution, and addressing how collective capabilities emerge from micro-level processes.

Practice Theory

Practice theory examines how patterns of activity are produced and reproduced through ongoing enactment (Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011). This perspective offers distinctive approaches to understanding organizational dynamics.

Complementarities:

- Practices exhibit feedback dynamics: enactment reinforces or modifies patterns
- Practice emergence involves bottom-up aggregation from individual performances to collective patterns
- Practice approaches emphasize recursion between structure and agency
- Sociomaterial practice theory addresses sociotechnical system dynamics

Tensions:

- Practice theory may emphasize interpretation and meaning more than some systems approaches
- Systems perspectives may underemphasize the micro-interactional dynamics central to practice theory
- Methodological traditions differ: practice research typically uses ethnography; systems research may use simulation
- Ontological tensions: practice theory often adopts process ontology (becoming) while some systems approaches adopt substance ontology (being)

Existing integration efforts: Sociomaterial practice theory (e.g., Orlikowski & Scott, 2008) examines how social practices and material arrangements are mutually constituted—an inherently systemic concern. Research on routine dynamics examines how organizational routines emerge and change through enactment.

Opportunities for integration: Combining practice-theoretic attention to enactment and meaning with systems-theoretic attention to feedback and emergence could yield rich analyses of how organizational patterns develop, persist, and change. This integration would require careful attention to ontological and epistemological differences between traditions.

Paradox and Tensions Literature

The paradox literature examines persistent contradictions and tensions in organizational life (Smith & Lewis, 2011). This perspective has grown substantially and shares concerns with systems thinking.

Complementarities:

- Both perspectives recognize that organizations face competing demands not resolvable through optimization
- Paradox dynamics involve feedback: responses to tensions can intensify or resolve them
- Both perspectives attend to temporal dynamics and evolution of tensions
- Systems perspectives can illuminate how paradoxes emerge and evolve

Tensions:

- Paradox literature emphasizes cognitive and sensemaking dimensions

- Systems perspectives may treat tensions more structurally
- Different theoretical vocabularies may impede integration

Opportunities for integration: Systems perspectives could contribute dynamic modeling of paradox evolution; paradox perspectives could contribute attention to actor interpretation of systemic tensions.

Limitations and Critiques of Systems Perspectives

Meaningful engagement with systems perspectives requires acknowledging their limitations and engaging substantively with critiques. We address five major areas of concern, including ideological dimensions that deserve explicit attention.

The Problem of Cross-Domain Isomorphism

A foundational claim of general systems theory is that phenomena across physical, biological, and social domains exhibit isomorphic structural properties. Critics have questioned this claim on both empirical and philosophical grounds (Lilienfeld, 1978).

The critique: Social systems differ fundamentally from physical and biological systems. Social systems involve meaning, interpretation, reflexivity, and agency in ways that physical systems do not. Participants in social systems can reflect on system properties and act to change them—a reflexivity absent in thermodynamic or ecological systems. Importing concepts developed for physical or biological systems into social domains may therefore produce misleading analogies rather than genuine theoretical insight.

Assessment: This critique has merit. Organizational scholars should exercise caution in importing systems concepts and consider whether adaptation is required. For example, the concept of "equilibrium" may need reconceptualization for social systems where participants can intentionally destabilize equilibria. Similarly, "fitness" in organizational adaptation differs from biological fitness in important respects. The solution is not to abandon systems thinking but to adapt concepts thoughtfully and specify how social systems differ from natural systems.

Guidance: When importing systems concepts:

1. Explicitly consider how social system properties might affect concept applicability
2. Specify modifications required for social context
3. Acknowledge limits of the analogy
4. Consider whether indigenous concepts from social theory might better capture the phenomenon

Metaphorical Overreach and Loose Application

Critics have observed that complexity and systems concepts in management often function as evocative metaphors rather than rigorous theoretical tools (Maguire & McKelvey, 1999). Concepts like emergence, self-organization, and complexity may be invoked without specifying what these concepts mean in organizational contexts or how they might be operationalized.

The critique: Such metaphorical use provides rhetorical appeal without theoretical substance. It obscures rather than illuminates by substituting evocative language for precise specification. At worst, it represents a form of concept-stretching that empties systems concepts of meaning.

Assessment: This critique accurately describes much ceremonial use of systems concepts. The solution is not to abandon systems thinking but to demand rigor in its application.

Guidance for avoiding metaphorical overreach:

1. Define systems concepts precisely in organizational context
2. Specify what empirical observations would be consistent or inconsistent with systems-based claims
3. Operationalize concepts through observable indicators or simulation specifications
4. Distinguish systems-based predictions from predictions derived from alternative frameworks
5. Subject systems-based claims to empirical test rather than using them as post-hoc interpretations

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 30 March 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

Obscuring Power Relations

Critical theorists have argued that systems perspectives can obscure power relations by naturalizing existing arrangements (Jackson, 2000; Ulrich, 1983). Systems language can make contingent social arrangements appear as functional necessities, deflecting attention from choices and interests that produced them.

The critique: Describing an organization as a “system” may suggest that existing structures are necessary for system functioning, when in fact they reflect historical contingencies, managerial choices, or power relations. Systems analysis that focuses on equilibrium and homeostasis may normalize existing arrangements rather than questioning them. The very act of drawing system boundaries involves choices that include some perspectives and exclude others.

Assessment: This critique raises important concerns. Functionalist systems analysis can indeed naturalize existing arrangements. However, systems thinking need not be functionalist; critical systems thinking explicitly addresses power and boundary critique. The question is not whether to use systems perspectives but how to use them reflexively.

Guidance for addressing power:

1. Recognize that system boundaries are analytic choices, not natural facts
2. Consider whose interests are served by particular boundary definitions
3. Examine how power relations shape system structure and dynamics
4. Apply systems analysis to understand how power arrangements are reproduced through feedback processes
5. Consider emancipatory applications: how might system dynamics be altered to produce more equitable outcomes?

Systems Thinking as Ideology

Beyond obscuring power relations in particular analyses, a more fundamental critique positions systems thinking itself as an ideology serving particular interests (Lilienfeld, 1978).

The critique: Systems language inherently privileges managerial perspectives by framing organizations as wholes requiring coordination. This framing positions managers as legitimate system stewards and delegitimizes conflict as “dysfunctional” disruption of system equilibrium. The technical vocabulary of systems thinking requires expert knowledge, marginalizing experiential knowledge of workers and other stakeholders. Even reflexive and critical applications of systems thinking may carry this ideological baggage, as they still operate within a framework that constitutes organizations as systems to be understood and managed.

Assessment: This critique deserves serious consideration. Systems language does carry particular connotations and can serve particular interests. Researchers should be aware of what adopting systems vocabulary may signal or enable, and should not assume that reflexivity fully addresses ideological implications. At the same time, all theoretical vocabularies carry ideological implications; the question is whether systems perspectives offer sufficient insight to warrant their use despite these concerns.

Guidance for addressing ideological dimensions:

1. Acknowledge that systems framing is not neutral; it constitutes phenomena in particular ways
2. Be aware of whose interests are typically served by systems interventions
3. Consider alternative framings (e.g., conflict-based, narrative, practice-based) and what they would reveal
4. Examine how systems vocabulary is used by organizational actors for legitimation purposes
5. Maintain epistemic humility about the limits of any theoretical vocabulary, including systems perspectives

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

Difficulty of Empirical Testing

Critics have noted that systems-based theories often prove difficult to test empirically (McKelvey, 1999). Concepts like emergence, nonlinearity, and feedback may be empirically elusive, and the holistic orientation of systems thinking may resist the decomposition required for hypothesis testing.

The critique: If systems theories cannot be subjected to empirical test, they risk becoming unfalsifiable "framework" approaches that explain everything and predict nothing. The gap between evocative theoretical claims and rigorous empirical investigation represents a serious limitation.

Assessment: This critique identifies a genuine challenge. However, it may reflect limitations of conventional methods rather than inherent untestability. Developments in simulation, network analysis, and multi-level methods provide resources for testing systems-based claims that were not available when early critiques were formulated. Nevertheless, some systems propositions may remain difficult to test, and researchers should acknowledge this limitation honestly.

Guidance for enhancing testability:

1. Derive specific, falsifiable implications from systems-based theories
2. Use simulation to generate predictions that can be compared with empirical data
3. Employ methods designed for systems phenomena (network analysis, HLM, QCA)
4. Seek critical tests that distinguish systems-based predictions from alternatives
5. Accumulate evidence across studies rather than expecting single definitive tests
6. Acknowledge when propositions cannot be tested with available methods

When Systems Perspectives Are Most Relevant

Systems perspectives offer distinctive value for phenomena exhibiting particular characteristics. We identify five such characteristics, providing diagnostic questions to help researchers assess relevance.

Nonlinear Dynamics

Characteristic: Effects not proportional to causes; small changes can produce large effects; thresholds or tipping points exist.

Diagnostic questions:

- Are there thresholds beyond which qualitative changes in behavior occur?
- Do similar interventions produce dramatically different outcomes under different conditions?
- Is there evidence of accelerating or decelerating effects?

Examples: Organizational decline (gradual erosion precipitating sudden collapse), technological disruption (incremental improvements triggering tipping points), social movement mobilization (long-quiescent grievances rapidly igniting).

Feedback and Circular Causation

Characteristic: Outputs become inputs; circular causal chains operate; effects of actions feed back to affect future actions.

Diagnostic questions:

- Do outcomes of interest influence their own antecedents?
- Are there reinforcing dynamics whereby success breeds success or failure breeds failure?
- Are there stabilizing dynamics that resist change?

Examples: Reputation dynamics (reputation affecting stakeholder behavior affecting reputation), capability development (capabilities shaping opportunities shaping capability investment), organizational learning (knowledge enabling performance enabling knowledge acquisition).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

Emergence Across Levels

Characteristic: Properties at higher levels arise from lower-level dynamics in ways that cannot be predicted from lower-level properties alone; higher-level contexts shape lower-level behavior.

Diagnostic questions:

- Do collective phenomena exhibit properties not present at individual level?
- Do similar individuals produce different collective outcomes in different contexts?
- Do higher-level properties feed back to affect lower-level behavior?

Examples: Organizational culture (emergent from interactions yet shaping interactions), team effectiveness (emergent from member contributions yet irreducible to aggregated individual performance), industry evolution (emergent from firm strategies yet constraining firm options).

Interdependence and Interconnection

Characteristic: Elements substantially affect each other; outcomes depend on relationships rather than isolated factors; changes in one element reverberate through the system.

Diagnostic questions:

- Do changes in one element significantly affect other elements?
- Are outcomes better explained by configurations of elements than by individual factors?
- Do interventions produce widespread consequences beyond their immediate targets?

Examples: Supply chain dynamics (disruptions cascading across connected organizations), platform ecosystems (interdependence among platform, complementors, and users), organizational design (interconnection among structural elements).

Wicked Problems

Characteristic: Complex problems resisting decomposition; diverse stakeholders with conflicting values; feedback loops undermining intervention effectiveness; no clear stopping rule.

The concept of wicked problems originated with Rittel and Webber (1973), who identified problems that lack definitive formulation, have no stopping rule, and where solutions cannot be evaluated as true or false but only as better or worse. Such problems are not merely complicated but fundamentally ill-structured.

Diagnostic questions:

- Do efforts to address the problem seem to create new problems?
- Do stakeholders disagree about problem definition as well as solutions?
- Are causes and effects distributed across time, space, and organizations?
- Are interventions difficult to test or reverse?

Examples: Climate change, public health challenges, systemic inequality, digital transformation.

Table 3. Diagnostic Tool for Assessing Systems Perspective Relevance.

Characteristic	Low Relevance Indicators	High Relevance Indicators	Assessment Questions
Nonlinearity	Proportional relationships; smooth gradients	Thresholds, tipping points, disproportionate effects	Are effects proportional to causes? Are there critical thresholds?
Feedback	Unidirectional causation; no return effects	Circular causation; outputs affecting inputs	Do outcomes influence their antecedents?
Emergence	Simple aggregation; isomorphism across levels	Irreducible higher-level properties; discontinuity	Are collective properties predictable from individual properties?

Interdependence	Independent elements; separable effects	Mutual influence; configurational effects	Do elements substantially affect each other?
Wickedness	Well-defined problems; clear solutions	Contested definitions; value conflicts; intervention resistance	Do stakeholders agree on problem definition? Do interventions produce unintended effects?

Practical Guidance for Meaningful Use

We offer a structured framework for implementing systems perspectives meaningfully, addressing key challenges researchers encounter and acknowledging different epistemological orientations.

Diagnostic Checklist for Systems-Based Research

Before committing to a systems approach, researchers should assess:

1. **Phenomenon assessment:**
    - Does the phenomenon exhibit nonlinearity, feedback, emergence, interdependence, or wickedness?
    - Would linear approaches miss important dynamics?
    - Is systems framing substantively necessary or merely fashionable?
2. Conceptual preparation:
    - Can I specify system boundaries and justify inclusion/exclusion choices?
    - Can I identify key elements and their relationships?
    - Can I articulate feedback structures operating in the system?
    - Can I specify the emergence processes connecting levels?
3. Epistemological positioning:
    - What epistemological tradition will guide my research (realist, interpretivist, critical)?
    - How does my epistemological position shape what "meaningful use" entails?
    - Have I acknowledged my epistemological commitments transparently?
4. Methodological readiness:
    - Do I have access to methods capable of capturing systems dynamics?
    - Can I operationalize key systems concepts?
    - Can I derive testable implications from systems-based theory?
    - Have I considered validation challenges and how to address them?
5. Practical feasibility:
    - Are appropriate data available or collectible?
    - Do I have or can I develop necessary methodological expertise?
    - Can I communicate findings to intended audiences?
6. Ethical and political awareness:
    - Whose interests might be served by this systems analysis?
    - What perspectives might be marginalized by my boundary choices?
    - How might my findings be used, and by whom?

Meaningful Use Across Epistemological Traditions

The criteria for meaningful use presented in this review primarily reflect realist epistemology. Researchers operating from different traditions will engage systems perspectives differently:

Realist/positivist approach:

- Systems are assumed to exist independently of observers
- Goal is accurate representation of system structure and dynamics

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

- Methods emphasize measurement, modeling, and testing
- Meaningful use involves specifying structures, operationalizing concepts, and testing predictions

Interpretivist approach:

- Systems are understood as socially constructed frameworks for sensemaking
- Goal is understanding how actors construct and use systems interpretations
- Methods emphasize qualitative inquiry into meanings and interpretations
- Meaningful use involves examining how systems concepts shape actor understanding and action; reflexivity about researcher's own systems constructions

Critical approach:

- Systems are analyzed as potentially ideological constructions that serve particular interests
- Goal is uncovering power relations and emancipatory possibility
- Methods emphasize critique, participation, and action research
- Meaningful use involves boundary critique, examination of whose interests are served, and participatory engagement with multiple stakeholders

These approaches are not mutually exclusive; researchers may draw on multiple traditions. However, transparency about epistemological positioning strengthens research quality.

Framework for Balancing Holism and Tractability

The tension between holistic representation and analytic tractability requires strategic choices.

Step 1: Identify focal dynamics

- What specific systems dynamics are central to your research question?
- What dynamics can be safely treated as background or context?

Step 2: Define strategic boundaries

- Draw boundaries to include elements essential for focal dynamics
- Explicitly note what is excluded and why
- Apply boundary critique: whose perspectives are included? Whose are excluded?
- Consider sensitivity analysis: would different boundaries alter conclusions?

Step 3: Select appropriate resolution

- At what level of detail should elements be represented?
- Can some elements be aggregated without losing essential dynamics?
- Consider multiple resolutions: macro model supplemented by micro analysis

Step 4: Justify choices

- Articulate rationale for boundary and resolution decisions
- Acknowledge limitations introduced by simplification
- Discuss implications for generalizability
- Consider alternative approaches and why they were not adopted

Operationalizing Core Systems Concepts

Operationalizing Emergence

Quantitative operationalization:

1. Measure constructs at individual and collective levels
2. Assess within-group agreement (rwg) and between-group variation (ICC)
3. Test whether group-level constructs predict outcomes beyond aggregated individual measures
4. For discontinuous emergence, test for non-isomorphic relationships across levels

Qualitative operationalization:

1. Collect longitudinal data at multiple levels
2. Trace processes through which collective patterns form

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 30 March 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

3. Identify mechanisms of amplification, combination, or transformation
4. Document how emergent patterns feed back to shape individual behavior

Example study design: To study the emergence of team psychological safety, a researcher might:

- Survey team members on individual perceptions and behaviors (micro level)
- Assess team-level psychological safety climate through aggregated perceptions and external observation (meso level)
- Trace, through longitudinal interviews and observation, how safety climate emerges through critical incidents, leader behaviors, and interaction patterns (process)
- Test whether team-level safety predicts team outcomes beyond individual perceptions (emergence test)

Operationalizing Feedback

Identifying feedback structures:

1. Map causal relationships among key variables
2. Trace paths to identify loops (variables that influence themselves through intermediaries)
3. Classify loops as reinforcing (even number of negative links) or balancing (odd number)
4. Estimate time delays in each link

Testing feedback dynamics:

1. Collect longitudinal data capturing hypothesized loop variables
2. Use time-series methods (VAR, cross-lagged panel) to test reciprocal causation
3. Use system dynamics simulation to test whether hypothesized structures generate observed patterns
4. Look for signatures of feedback: oscillation (balancing loops with delays), exponential growth/decline (reinforcing loops)

Example study design: To study feedback dynamics in organizational reputation, a researcher might:

- Identify hypothesized feedback loops (reputation → attraction → performance → reputation)
- Collect longitudinal data on reputation, employee/customer quality, and performance
- Test reciprocal relationships using cross-lagged panel analysis
- Develop system dynamics model incorporating hypothesized structure
- Compare simulated dynamics to observed longitudinal patterns

Operationalizing Nonlinearity

Detecting nonlinearity:

1. Examine bivariate relationships graphically for evidence of curves, thresholds, or discontinuities
2. Test polynomial terms or splines in regression models
3. Use threshold or regime-switching models to test for discontinuities
4. Apply machine learning methods (random forests, neural networks) to detect complex patterns
5. Compare linear and nonlinear model fit

Example approaches:

- Threshold regression: Test whether relationships differ above/below critical values
- Spline regression: Allow flexible nonlinear relationships without imposing functional form
- Qualitative comparative analysis: Identify threshold conditions distinguishing outcome presence/absence

Navigating Reviewer and Editor Expectations

Systems-based research may encounter skepticism from reviewers unfamiliar with relevant methods or oriented toward linear approaches.

Strategies for success:

1. **Frame contributions clearly**: Explain what systems perspective enables that alternatives cannot

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 30 March 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

2. **Connect to established traditions**: Position work relative to recognized systems-oriented research
3. **Explain methods accessibly**: Provide sufficient methodological detail for non-specialists
4. **Demonstrate rigor**: Show that systems approach meets appropriate standards (validation for simulation, robustness checks for statistical analysis, transparency for qualitative work)
5. **Anticipate objections**: Address likely concerns proactively (generalizability, testability, complexity)
6. **Choose outlets strategically**: Target journals with track records of publishing systems-based research

Implications for Practice and Education

While this review focuses primarily on research implications, systems perspectives have significant implications for practice and for how we educate future organizational scholars and practitioners.

Implications for Practice

Systems perspectives suggest that organizational interventions should attend to:

- *Feedback effects*: Interventions may produce effects that feed back to modify the conditions the intervention was meant to address. Practitioners should anticipate and monitor feedback.
- *Emergence*: Outcomes emerge from interactions among many actors and cannot be fully controlled through top-down direction. Practitioners should focus on enabling conditions rather than detailed planning.
- *Unintended consequences*: Systemic interdependencies mean that interventions often produce effects beyond their intended targets. Practitioners should think broadly about potential impacts.
- *Leverage points*: Some intervention points have greater systemic impact than others. Practitioners should seek high-leverage interventions rather than dispersing effort (Meadows, 1999).

We note that systems thinking in practice has historically been associated with managerial perspectives. Practitioners should also consider:

- Whose problem is being addressed? Whose definition of the problem is being accepted?
- Who participates in systems analysis? Whose knowledge is included?
- How are tradeoffs among stakeholders addressed when interventions benefit some while harming others?

Implications for Doctoral Education

The meaningful use of systems perspectives requires competencies that doctoral programs do not always develop:

- *Conceptual*: Understanding of systems concepts, their origins, and their epistemological commitments
- *Methodological*: Familiarity with simulation, network analysis, multi-level methods, and process research
- *Critical*: Ability to examine power relations and ideological dimensions of systems framing
- *Interdisciplinary*: Capacity to engage with systems-relevant work in other fields

Doctoral programs might consider:

- Courses or modules on systems thinking, complexity, and related approaches
- Methods training that includes simulation and network analysis
- Critical theory exposure that enables reflexive examination of frameworks
- Interdisciplinary engagement through coursework, reading, or collaboration

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 30 March 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

Conclusions and Research Agenda

Systems perspectives offer organization and management research a powerful alternative paradigm for understanding the complex, dynamic, interconnected phenomena that characterize contemporary organizational life. By portraying social phenomena as dynamic wholes in which emergent outcomes arise from interdependent interactions among diverse elements spanning multiple levels, systems thinking challenges linear assumptions and offers resources for addressing phenomena that conventional approaches struggle to explain.

Summary of Contributions

This integrative review makes several contributions. First, we have developed a *typology distinguishing foundational, structural, and substantive systems perspectives*, clarifying relationships among diverse approaches and providing conceptual scaffolding for researchers. Second, we have articulated the *distinction between ceremonial and meaningful use*, providing criteria for assessment and guidance for improvement. Third, we have offered *operational guidance for implementing systems concepts*, including detailed treatment of emergence, feedback, and nonlinearity, with attention to validation challenges. Fourth, we have addressed *internal epistemological tensions* within systems perspectives, helping researchers navigate differences among foundational traditions. Fifth, we have *critically engaged with limitations and critiques*, addressing concerns about cross-domain isomorphism, metaphorical overreach, power obscuring, ideological dimensions, and testability. Sixth, we have *positioned systems perspectives relative to adjacent theoretical traditions*, identifying complementarities and tensions. Seventh, we have provided *practical frameworks* including diagnostic checklists, boundary specification strategies, and guidance across epistemological traditions.

Research Agenda

We conclude by identifying priority directions for advancing systems-based OM research.

1. *Methodological development:* Continued development and refinement of methods for studying systems phenomena remains essential. Priority areas include:
    - Methods for testing emergence hypotheses, particularly discontinuous emergence
    - Integration of computational modeling with empirical data
    - Approaches for capturing nonlinear dynamics in field settings
    - Multi-method designs combining quantitative and qualitative approaches
    - Enhanced validation frameworks for simulation methods
2. *Theoretical integration:* Greater integration between systems perspectives and adjacent theoretical traditions offers potential for mutual enrichment:
    - Institutional-systems integration examining field dynamics and institutional change
    - Practice-systems integration examining how patterns emerge through enactment
    - Ecological-systems integration examining population-level dynamics
    - Dynamic capabilities-systems integration examining capability development and coevolution
    - Paradox-systems integration examining dynamics of organizational tensions
3. *Addressing grand challenges:* Systems perspectives are particularly suited for addressing complex societal challenges:
    - Climate adaptation and organizational sustainability
    - Public health and organizational responses to health threats
    - Systemic inequality and organizational diversity, equity, and inclusion
    - Digital transformation and AI integration
4. *Critical and reflexive development:* The ideological dimensions of systems thinking warrant continued attention:

- Examination of how systems vocabulary is used for legitimation in organizational discourse
- Development of participatory approaches that include diverse stakeholders
- Comparative analysis of systems perspectives with alternative framings
- Reflexive examination of whose interests systems research serves

5. *Interdisciplinary collaboration:* Deeper engagement with other disciplines offers conceptual and methodological resources:
   - Collaboration with ecologists on resilience and adaptation
   - Collaboration with physicists and network scientists on complex network dynamics
   - Collaboration with engineers on systems design and intervention
   - Engagement with scholars in other fields who have developed sophisticated systems approaches

Closing Reflections

Moving from ceremonial to meaningful use of systems perspectives requires more than methodological refinement or theoretical development; it requires a shift in orientation toward organizational phenomena. Such a shift involves embracing complexity rather than seeking to eliminate it, attending to relationships as carefully as to entities, accepting that understanding is always partial and situated, and remaining humble about the limits of prediction and control in complex systems.

These orientations may feel uncomfortable to scholars trained in traditions that prize parsimony, precision, and predictive power. Yet they may prove essential for generating scholarship adequate to the challenges that organizations and societies face. The organizational challenges of our era—climate change, pandemic response, digital transformation, systemic inequality—are quintessentially systems challenges. They involve feedback loops, emergence, nonlinearity, and interdependence that resist decomposition. Addressing such challenges requires frameworks that can represent and reason about systemic complexity.

At the same time, we must acknowledge that systems perspectives, like all theoretical frameworks, are not neutral tools. They constitute phenomena in particular ways, serve particular interests, and carry particular ideological implications. Meaningful use of systems perspectives requires not only methodological rigor but also ethical and political awareness. We must ask not only "How can we understand this system?" but also "Whose interests are served by understanding it this way?" and "What alternatives might this framing obscure?"

Systems perspectives, employed meaningfully rather than ceremonially and critically rather than naively, provide valuable resources for understanding organizational complexity. The task for organization and management research is to move beyond surface engagement toward genuine integration of systems thinking into our theoretical and methodological practices while maintaining reflexive awareness of what any framework enables and constrains. This review aims to support that transition by providing conceptual clarity, practical guidance, and honest assessment of both possibilities and limitations. The challenges are substantial, but so too are the opportunities for developing organizational scholarship adequate to the complex world it seeks to understand and serve.

References

Adner, R. (2017). Ecosystem as structure: An actionable construct for strategy. *Journal of Management, 43*(1), 39-58.

Anderson, P. (1999). Complexity theory and organization science. *Organization Science, 10*(3), 216-232.

Ashby, W. R. (1956). *An introduction to cybernetics*. Chapman & Hall.

Bettis, R. A., Gambardella, A., Helfat, C., & Mitchell, W. (2014). Quantitative empirical analysis in strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 35*(7), 949-953.

Borgatti, S. P., & Foster, P. C. (2003). The network paradigm in organizational research: A review and typology. *Journal of Management, 29*(6), 991-1013.

Borgatti, S. P., Mehra, A., Brass, D. J., & Labianca, G. (2009). Network analysis in the social sciences. *Science, 323*(5916), 892-895.

Boulding, K. E. (1956). General systems theory—The skeleton of science. *Management Science, 2*(3), 197-208.

Brown, S. L., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (1998). *Competing on the edge: Strategy as structured chaos*. Harvard Business School Press.

Capra, F., & Luisi, P. L. (2014). *The systems view of life: A unifying vision*. Cambridge University Press.

Chen, G., Kirkman, B. L., Kanfer, R., Allen, D., & Rosen, B. (2007). A multilevel study of leadership, empowerment, and performance in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(2), 331-346.

Cherns, A. (1976). The principles of sociotechnical design. *Human Relations, 29*(8), 783-792.

Davis, J. P., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Bingham, C. B. (2007). Developing theory through simulation methods. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(2), 480-499.

Feldman, M. S., & Orlikowski, W. J. (2011). Theorizing practice and practicing theory. *Organization Science, 22*(5), 1240-1253.

Ferraro, F., Etzion, D., & Gehman, J. (2015). Tackling grand challenges pragmatically: Robust action revisited. *Organization Studies, 36*(3), 363-390.

Fiss, P. C. (2011). Building better causal theories: A fuzzy set approach to typologies in organization research. *Academy of Management Journal, 54*(2), 393-420.

Fleming, L., & Sorenson, O. (2001). Technology as a complex adaptive system: Evidence from patent data. *Research Policy, 30*(7), 1019-1039.

Forrester, J. W. (1961). *Industrial dynamics*. MIT Press.

George, G., Howard-Grenville, J., Joshi, A., & Tihanyi, L. (2016). Understanding and tackling societal grand challenges through management research. *Academy of Management Journal, 59*(6), 1880-1895.

Gilbert, N. (2008). *Agent-based models*. SAGE.

Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1977). The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology, 82*(5), 929-964.

Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1989). *Organizational ecology*. Harvard University Press.

Hannan, M. T., Pólos, L., & Carroll, G. R. (2007). *Logics of organization theory: Audiences, codes, and ecologies*. Princeton University Press.

Harrison, J. R., Lin, Z., Carroll, G. R., & Carley, K. M. (2007). Simulation modeling in organizational and management research. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(4), 1229-1245.

Hedström, P., & Swedberg, R. (1998). Social mechanisms: An introductory essay. In P. Hedström & R. Swedberg (Eds.), *Social mechanisms: An analytical approach to social theory* (pp. 1-31). Cambridge University Press.

Hedström, P., & Ylikoski, P. (2010). Causal mechanisms in the social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology, 36*, 49-67.

Jackson, M. C. (2000). *Systems approaches to management*. Kluwer Academic.

Jacobides, M. G., Cennamo, C., & Gawer, A. (2018). Towards a theory of ecosystems. *Strategic Management Journal, 39*(8), 2255-2276.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). Wiley.

Kauffman, S. A. (1993). *The origins of order: Self-organization and selection in evolution*. Oxford University Press.

Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Klein, K. J. (2000). A multilevel approach to theory and research in organizations: Contextual, temporal, and emergent processes. In K. J. Klein & S. W. J. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations* (pp. 3-90). Jossey-Bass.

Kozlowski, S. W. J., Chao, G. T., Grand, J. A., Braun, M. T., & Kuljanin, G. (2013). Advancing multilevel research design: Capturing the dynamics of emergence. *Organizational Research Methods, 16*(4), 581-615.

Langley, A. (1999). Strategies for theorizing from process data. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(4), 691-710.

Langley, A., Smallman, C., Tsoukas, H., & Van de Ven, A. H. (2013). Process studies of change in organization and management: Unveiling temporality, activity, and flow. *Academy of Management Journal, 56*(1), 1-13.

Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). *Organization and environment: Managing differentiation and integration*. Harvard Business School Press.

Lazer, D., Pentland, A., Adamic, L., Aral, S., Barabási, A.-L., Brewer, D., ... & Van Alstyne, M. (2009). Computational social science. *Science, 323*(5915), 721-723.

Leonardi, P. M. (2011). When flexible routines meet flexible technologies: Affordance, constraint, and the imbrication of human and material agencies. *MIS Quarterly, 35*(1), 147-167.

Leonardi, P. M. (2012). Materiality, sociomateriality, and socio-technical systems: What do these terms mean? How are they different? Do we need them? In P. M. Leonardi, B. A. Nardi, & J. Kallinikos (Eds.), *Materiality and organizing* (pp. 25-48). Oxford University Press.

Levinthal, D. A. (1997). Adaptation on rugged landscapes. *Management Science, 43*(7), 934-950.

Lichtenstein, B. B., Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., Seers, A., Orton, J. D., & Schreiber, C. (2006). Complexity leadership theory: An interactive perspective on leading in complex adaptive systems. *Emergence: Complexity and Organization, 8*(4), 2-12.

Lilienfeld, R. (1978). *The rise of systems theory: An ideological analysis*. Wiley.

Maguire, S., & McKelvey, B. (1999). Complexity and management: Moving from fad to firm foundations. *Emergence, 1*(2), 19-61.

March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science, 2*(1), 71-87.

Meadows, D. H. (1999). Leverage points: Places to intervene in a system. *Sustainability Institute*.

Meadows, D. H. (2008). *Thinking in systems: A primer*. Chelsea Green.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*(2), 340-363.

Obstfeld, D. (2005). Social networks, the *tertius iungens* orientation, and involvement in innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 50*(1), 100-130.

Orlikowski, W. J., & Scott, S. V. (2008). Sociomateriality: Challenging the separation of technology, work and organization. *The Academy of Management Annals, 2*(1), 433-474.

Pfeffer, J. (1982). *Organizations and organization theory*. Pitman.

Plowman, D. A., Baker, L. T., Beck, T. E., Kulkarni, M., Solansky, S. T., & Travis, D. V. (2007). Radical change accidentally: The emergence and amplification of small change. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(3), 515-543.

Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1984). *Order out of chaos: Man's new dialogue with nature*. Bantam.

Rand, W., & Rust, R. T. (2011). Agent-based modeling in marketing: Guidelines for rigor. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 28*(3), 181-193.

Repenning, N. P., & Sterman, J. D. (2002). Capability traps and self-confirming attribution errors in the dynamics of process improvement. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 47*(2), 265-295.

Rittel, H. W. J., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences, 4*(2), 155-169.

Scott, W. R. (2014). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities* (4th ed.). SAGE.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Doubleday.

Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *Academy of Management Review, 36*(2), 381-403.

Snijders, T. A. B., van de Bunt, G. G., & Steglich, C. E. G. (2010). Introduction to stochastic actor-based models for network dynamics. *Social Networks, 32*(1), 44-60.

Sterman, J. D. (2000). *Business dynamics: Systems thinking and modeling for a complex world*. McGraw-Hill.

Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 28*(13), 1319-1350.

Thomas, L. D. W., Autio, E., & Gann, D. M. (2014). Architectural leverage: Putting platforms in context. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 28*(2), 198-219.

Trist, E. L., & Bamforth, K. W. (1951). Some social and psychological consequences of the longwall method of coal-getting. *Human Relations, 4*(1), 3-38.

Tsoukas, H., & Chia, R. (2002). On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational change. *Organization Science, 13*(5), 567-582.

Uhl-Bien, M., & Arena, M. (2018). Leadership for organizational adaptability: A theoretical synthesis and integrative framework. *The Leadership Quarterly, 29*(1), 89-104.

doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2314.v1

Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(4), 298-318.

Ulrich, W. (1983). *Critical heuristics of social planning: A new approach to practical philosophy*. Haupt.

von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*. George Braziller.

von Foerster, H. (2003). *Understanding understanding: Essays on cybernetics and cognition*. Springer.

Whiteman, G., Walker, B., & Perego, P. (2013). Planetary boundaries: Ecological foundations for corporate sustainability. *Journal of Management Studies, 50*(2), 307-336.

Wiener, N. (1948). *Cybernetics: Or control and communication in the animal and the machine*. MIT Press.